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Negotiating a position within heteroglossic diversity: \textit{wh}-clefts and \textit{it}-clefts in written discourse$^1$

Abstract. \textit{It}-clefts and \textit{wh}-clefts (both basic and reversed) function as a rhetorical device by which authors negotiate an intersubjective position for themselves in relation to heteroglossic diversity. The representation of one of the clause elements as a semantic gap in the cleft clause opens up the utterance to heteroglossic negotiation. The establishment of the identity of that clause element by the clefted constituent closes down discussion. This study compares what types of clause elements are represented as semantic gaps in the cleft clauses of each of these three cleft constructions in the FLOB corpus of written British English, and finds that there are distinctive patterns of intersubjective positioning for each cleft type. These reflect, among other things, the different kinds of prominence each cleft type gives to its clefted constituent.

1. Introduction. No utterance occurs in isolation. It is preceded by other utterances that have been spoken or written earlier and it anticipates prospective utterances which may respond to it. Each utterance occurs thus against a background of other utterances with which it enters into a relationship of one kind or another. Seen from this Bakhtinian perspective (1986), then, all verbal communication is heteroglossic, i.e. it is oriented in some way in a social context where other utterances have been or could have been expressed, and speakers and writers position themselves in relation to this heteroglossic diversity in various ways. They may, for instance, choose to ignore diversity altogether by asserting a positive declarative statement, such as \textit{An electrical fault caused the delay}. On the other hand, they may choose to acknowledge the possibility of the existence of alternative positions, by, for instance, modifying their utterance with a modal expression of probability, such as \textit{might} in \textit{An electrical fault might have caused the delay}, which recognises that there may be other reasons for the delay.

Within appraisal theory, developed by Martin (2000) and White (White and Don 2001 and White 2003), the meanings speakers and writers express to ignore or acknowledge heteroglossic diversity and to position themselves within that diversity belong to the system of engage-
ment. As well as modal expressions of probability, these include, for instance, expressions of reality phase, e.g. It seems that an electrical fault might have caused the delay, hearsay or attribution to an identified source, e.g. They/Williams said an electrical fault caused the delay, proclamation, e.g. An electrical fault did cause the delay, and expressions of expectation, Of course, an electrical fault caused the delay, and counterexpectation, e.g. Amazingly, an electrical fault caused the delay. These are just a few of the ways in which speakers and writers may make their utterances subject to heteroglossic negotiation by recognising the existence of possible divergent positions.

In this study I would like to add another type of linguistic construction to the list of resources by which speakers and writers relate their utterances to heteroglossic diversity. These are cleft constructions such as it-clefts, as in (1a) and wh-clefts, as in (1b) and (1c). (I will refer to wh-clefts such as (1b) as basic wh-clefts and wh-clefts such as (1c) as reversed wh-clefts, respectively).

(1) (a) It was an electrical fault that caused the delay.

(b) What caused the delay was an electrical fault.

(c) An electrical fault was what caused the delay.

My aim is (i) to show that these three cleft constructions function as a heteroglossic rhetorical strategy by which speakers and writers both recognise the existence of divergent positions and negotiate an intersubjective space for themselves within that diversity; and (ii) to compare what kinds of intersubjective positioning the three cleft types are used to negotiate. First, in section 2, I will show how all three cleft constructions function as a heteroglossic rhetorical strategy in discourse. Then, in section 3, I will briefly describe some of the differences among these three cleft constructions. Finally, in section 4, I will compare what kinds of intersubjective positions the three clefts negotiate in a corpus of written British English.

2. The heteroglossic rhetorical function of cleft constructions. Cleft constructions are defined by Lambrecht (2001:467) as

"a complex sentence structure consisting of a matrix clause headed by a copula and a relative or relative-like clause whose relativized element is coindexed with the predicate argument of the copula. Taken together, the matrix and the relative express a logically simple proposition, which can also be expressed in the form of a single clause without a change in truth conditions."
The three types of cleft constructions in (1) above, then, package the information of a simple clause, *An electrical fault caused the delay*, into the following complex sentence structures:

**it-clefts:**

1. *it* copula *be* clefted constituent cleft clause
   - *it was* an electrical fault *that caused the delay*

**basic wh-clefts:**

1. cleft clause copula *be* clefted constituent
   - *what caused the delay* was *an electrical fault*

**reversed wh-clefts:**

1. clefted constituent copula *be* cleft clause
   - *An electrical fault* was *what caused the delay*

In what way, then, do these complex clause constructions function as a heteroglossic rhetorical strategy which both recognises the existence of divergent positions and also negotiates an intersubjective space for the authorial position within that diversity? Each cleft construction contains a cleft clause and a clefted constituent. The cleft clause, i.e. *what/that caused the delay*, because of its status as a dependent clause, presents part of the information, i.e. that “something caused the delay” as presupposed and not at issue, and the remaining clause element, the clefted constituent, *an electrical fault*, is highlighted in contrast. The cleft clause also leaves open the identity of one of its clause elements by referring to it by a pronoun. In the examples of clefts in (1) above, it is the identity of a person, thing or state of affairs which “caused the delay” that is left open. One of the chief characteristics of cleft constructions is, then, that they contain a cleft clause which is an open proposition with a semantic gap (Geluykens 1988:827). The semantic function of these cleft clauses is thus to represent a variable for which the identity of the unidentified clause element can be specified as its value. (Declerck 1984:252, 1988:3f., 10, 1994:212). Thus, as any candidate may be referred to by the pronoun in the cleft clause, the cleft clause implicitly acknowledges the existence of alternative positions, i.e. that there may be several possible causes for the delay, and thereby opens up the utterance to heteroglossic negotiation.

In the superordinate clause of the cleft, however, the identity of the clause element referred to by the pronoun in the cleft clause is provided by the clefted constituent. This is specified by the copula *be* as the value which satisfies the definition in the variable. By supplying the identity of the missing clause element in the cleft clause, the superordinate
clause in the cleft closes down negotiation and asserts the authorial position in preference to any other. It specifies one specific item in preference to all other possible candidates that might satisfy the variable, and thereby implies a contrast between the value selected and the potential ones that are not. The semantic function of specifying a value for a variable thus creates an exclusive and exhaustive implicature, i.e. it implies that there is one value and one value only which satisfies the variable (Halliday 1967:225, 1994:42, Declerck 1984:271, 1988:25f., and 1994:216, Huddleston 1988:462, Collins 1991:69, Delin 1990:19f., M. Johansson 2002:33 and Huddleston and Pullum 2002:1416). In the clefts in (1), then, the clefted constituent an electrical fault, is specified exclusively as the value of the variable “something or someone caused the delay” and thereby asserted as the one and only cause of the delay.5

To sum up, then, the three cleft constructions in (1) allow the speaker or writer both to acknowledge the possibility of the existence of divergent positions and also to express his or her own position in contrast to these positions. In each of their complex clause structures, then, the cleft clause acknowledges the possible existence of several alternative positions by representing it as a variable which may be satisfied by more than one candidate. The superordinate clause expresses the authorial position in preference to all other alternative positions by specifying one particular item or set of items, which satisfies the definition in the variable. Within the framework of appraisal, then, cleft constructions may be considered dialogistically contractive, i.e. they “act to challenge, fend off or restrict the scope of such [dialogically alternative positions]” (Martin 2003:262). They represent the internal voice of the text, that of the writer or speaker in preference to all other positions, and this is a rhetorical strategy used by speakers and writers to increase the argumentative force of what they are saying. In contrast to a simple declarative SVO clause such as, An electrical fault caused the delay which merely expresses the proposition “that an electrical fault caused the delay”, and ignores heteroglossic diversity, the cleft constructions in (1), What caused the delay was an electrical fault. An electrical fault was what caused the delay. It was an electrical fault that caused the delay, increase the rhetorical force of the authorial position on causality by both acknowledging the possibility of the existence of alternative causes and also closing down discussion by asserting that one item, an electrical fault, is the cause in contrast to all other alternative causes.

Having established, then, that cleft constructions are a heteroglossic rhetorical strategy, I will now go on to examine some of the differences among the three types of clefts in (1).
3. *It*-clefts and *wh*-clefts compared. Although each of the three clefts in (1) contains a cleft clause and clefted constituent linked by the copula *be*, there are a number of significant differences among these constructions. First, *wh*-clefts are usually reversible and *it*-clefts are not. In *it*-clefts, then, the clefted constituent is always the complement of the copula and the subject pronoun *it*. In *wh*-clefts, on the other hand, the clefted constituent may be either the subject or complement of the copula. In Hallidayan terms, the *it*-cleft is a predicating structure and the *wh*-cleft is an equative structure (Halliday 1967, Collins 1991:84f., 171). The former gives the clefted constituent prominence of a textual nature, i.e. it draws attention to its status as the starting point of the message by predicating it as the complement of *it* and the copula *be*. The latter gives the clefted constituent prominence of an ideational nature, i.e. it draws attention to the information it represents by equating it with a definition of its content.

Second, as well as giving different kinds of prominence to their clefted constituents, there are also differences in what is clefted in the three cleft types. Corpus studies (e.g. Geluykens 1988, Delin 1989, Collins 1991, Johansson 2002) have recorded differences both in the forms and functions of the clefted constituents and also in the coreferential pronouns in the cleft clause. In *it*-clefts the clefted constituents are usually an NP, a PP, an adverb phrase or an adverbial clause. The coreferential pronouns in the cleft clause are usually *that*, *which*, or *who* and they most frequently have the syntactic function of either subject or adverbial. In basic *wh*-clefts the clefted constituents are usually either a clause (finite or non-finite) or an NP. The coreferential pronouns in the cleft clause are nearly always *what* and they most frequently have the syntactic function of object, sometimes of subject. In reversed *wh*-clefts, the clefted constituents are nearly always an NP. In fact, the clefted constituents tend very frequently to be the anaphoric demonstratives *that* or *this*, which have what Halliday and Hasan (1976:66) call extended text reference to a chunk of the preceding text. The coreferential pronouns in the cleft clause are usually *what*, *why*, *where*, or *how* and they most frequently have the syntactic function of either object or adverbial. The clefted constituents in *wh*-clefts and *it*-clefts tend thus to highlight different types of semantic relations (Downing 2002:248–250). *It*-clefts, where the clefted constituents are usually NPs, PPs or adverb phrases, tend to highlight people, things or circumstantial relations (e.g. places, times, causes, etc.) but not states, processes, actions or propositions (unless these are represented by nominalisations). Basic *wh*-clefts, where the clefted constituents are usu-
ally NPs or finite or nonfinite clauses, tend to highlight things, states, processes, actions and propositions, but not people or circumstantial relations. Reversed wh-clefts, where the clefted constituents are usually the demonstratives that and this, which may have extended reference to, in principle, all types of experience, may highlight most types of semantic relations: from people, things and states, processes or actions to propositions and circumstantial relations.

Finally, the three cleft constructions differ in the thematic ordering of their cleft clause and clefted constituents, and also in the types of given/new information each of these represents. In it-clefts the pronoun it is in initial position followed by the copula and clefted constituent and then the cleft clause. Since the theme is usually identified as the element that comes first in the clause (Halliday 1994:38), it may therefore be regarded as the theme of the it-cleft. However, as it has very little semantic content, and the theme is, according to Halliday’s definition, for instance, “the point of departure of the message: it is that with which the clause is concerned” (Halliday 1994:37), many analyses (e.g. Eggins 1994:294, Martin, Matthiessen and Painter 1997:34, Downing and Locke 2002:247) regard the clefted constituent as the real theme and the it-cleft is seen as a predication of the theme. Two chief types of information structure have been distinguished in it-clefts: new information in the clefted constituent and old in the cleft clause (stressed focus it-clefts according to Prince (1978:896), and topic clause clefts according to Hedberg (1990:135ff.)) or old information in the clefted constituent and new in the cleft clause (information-presupposition it-clefts according to Prince (1978:898), and comment-clause clefts according to Hedberg (1990:135ff.)).

In basic wh-clefts, the cleft clause is thematic and the clefted constituent is rhematic. The former therefore usually represents given information and the latter newsworthy information. In reversed wh-clefts, on the other hand, the clefted constituent is thematic and the cleft clause is rhematic. The former therefore usually represents given information, whereas the latter is more likely to contain some newsworthy information (Prince 1978, Delin 1989:217f. and 1990, Collins 1991:117f., Biber et al. 1999:962, M. Johansson 2002:185f.). However, as it is also a dependent clause, its content is downranked in information value, and it may have very little new informational content at all (Collins 1991:145).

Because of their different types of clefted constituents, the different types of prominence they give to their clefted constituents and the differences in their thematic ordering and information value, the three cleft types tend to be used for different discourse functions, and, consequently, the frequency in which they are used in different registers has
been found to differ somewhat. *It*-clefts are typically used to express a contrast, and the contrast is often quite explicit (Prince 1978:890, Jones and Jones 1985:5, Sornicola 1988:366, Collins 1991:182, Biber et al. 1999:962). Further, as they place the clefted constituent early in the clause, they are often used to express a connection with the preceding text and thereby mark a transition from this to the following segment of discourse (Hedberg 1990:211ff., Biber et al. 1999:962). Because of their contrastive function and also because of their similarity to impersonal constructions with *it*, *it*-clefts often occur in persuasive and opinionative text types (Collins 1991:182). They are also used more frequently in writing than speech, most probably because they can be used by the writer to direct the reader to interpret the information in the clefted constituent as a marked, newsworthy theme, whereas in speech this could be indicated by intonation (Collins 1991:182).

Basic *wh*-clefts are typically used to highlight newsworthy information (Prince 1978, Delin 1990:26, Hedberg 1990:41, Collins 1991:213, Biber et al. 1999:963, Johansson 2002:203), or to return to old information after a digression (Hedberg 1990:41). Collins, for instance, observes that basic *wh*-clefts follow a linear progression from non-news to news and “function as an interpersonal ‘tracking’ device within the flow of discourse”. Downing and Locke (2002:250) list three major functions of basic *wh*-clefts in discourse: to introduce new topics, to refer retrospectively to a precious part of the discourse, and to correct a previous statement. Basic *wh*-clefts have been found to occur frequently in opinionative text types (Gómez-González 2001:328) and they are used more often in speech than writing (Collins 1991:178f).

Reversed *wh*-clefts, on the other hand, are typically used to either comment on, draw conclusions from or merely repeat or summarise information which has already been conveyed by the text or which may be inferred by its context (Prince 1978, Delin 1990:26 Hedberg 1990:42, Collins 1991:117f., Biber et al. 1999:962, M. Johansson 2002:185f.). Collins (1991:181) notes that “the text-anaphoric function of the theme, in conjunction with the exclusive equation of this item with backgrounded material in the relative clause, provides the construction with a special ‘internal referencing’ function. Reversed pseudo-clefts contain minimal ‘news’ having an almost clichéic quality (as in *that’s what happened, that’s what he said*) which enables them to draw together various threads of the text.” Reversed *wh*-clefts have been found to occur more frequently in speech than in writing and they are often used in informal registers between people of equal and intimate status. In writing they are used most frequently in fiction, where there is a lot of constructed dialogue (Collins 1991:178–189).
Thus, although all three clefts are used to express an authorial position against a background of heteroglossic diversity, they tend to highlight different areas of experience, and to give different kinds of prominence to this experience. This means that they also have different discourse functions which are reflected in a certain degree of register variation. In the next section I will go on to examine what types of authorial positions each of the clefts is used to express.

4. Intersubjective positioning by *it*-clefts and *wh*-clefts. In order to compare the authorial positions expressed by the three cleft constructions, I have collected examples of each construction from the Freiburg LOB Corpus (FLOB) of written British English and examined what kinds of semantic relations are opened up to heteroglossic negotiation by the semantic gap in the cleft clause and then identified by the clefted constituent.

The FLOB was compiled in 1991 and contains one million words of written British English. The corpus is the same size and is based on the same text type classification as the Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen corpus (LOB) of British English (1961). I have collected the examples of *it*-clefts using *it* and examples of basic and reversed *wh*-clefts using the *wh*-words, *what*, *where*, *when*, *how*, *who* and *why* in the concordance. “Truncated clefts” where the cleft clause has been omitted e.g. Haven’t you been wondering who the dickens put them in that water melon? Of course you have; but you might have known it was Janet, because no one else would have done it (Hedberg 1990:6 and 151), and “inferentials” (Delahunty 2001) or sentential-focus clefts (Hedberg 1990:181ff.) which have a sentential clefted constituent but lack a cleft clause, eg. It isn’t that it’s unstable. It’s just that it’s warped, have been excluded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal Location</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Location</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous(^{21})</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Semantic gaps in basic *wh*-clefts in the FLOB corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Concept</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous(^{22})</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Semantic gaps in reversed *wh*-clefts in the FLOB corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Location</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous(^{23})</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from the study, as well as clefts which have predicational meaning, e.g. *It's pretty that Mary is* (Declerck 1988:187), (See e.g. Higgins 1979:7, Declerck 1983, and Hedberg 1990:70f.).

The total number of clefts found was 723: 359 *it*-clefts, 141 basic *wh*-clefts and 223 reversed *wh*-clefts. In each corpus example, I have examined what type of semantic relation is opened up to heteroglossic negotiation, i.e. what semantic relation has been made into a semantic gap in the cleft clause and which is identified by the clefted constituent in the superordinate clause. The chief types of semantic gaps in each cleft type are listed in rank order of frequency in Table 1 and exemplified below.\(^{20}\) As I wish to give a very general, overall profile of what types of semantic relations are negotiated by each cleft type, I will include only the most frequent types of semantic gaps in the corpus examples, i.e. those represented by at least 5% of each type of cleft. Then I will discuss what generalisations can be made concerning the
kinds of authorial positions each cleft type is used to express and how these relate to the different properties of each cleft type.

4.1. Semantic gaps in it-clefts in the FLOB Corpus. The chief types of semantic gaps in the cleft clauses of the it-clefts in the corpus are exemplified in rank order of their frequency as follows:

1. Agent (33.1%), i.e. someone or something responsible for the activity in the cleft clause.

(2) (a) “It was he who married us and it is up to him to persuade her that it is her Christian duty not to desert her husband.” (L23 103)

(b) The piano and strings have much to do, but it's the hard work and energetically played bandoneon that gives tango music its breathy, heady, yearning flavour. (C10 181)

2. Temporal Location (17.3%) i.e. the time when the activity in the cleft clause takes place.

(3) (a) It was at this moment that Edgar sat up and began to rub his eyes. (K06 162)

(b) It was perhaps two or three weeks later that our friendship reached a decisive phase—a phase when I had to make a conscious decision whether to accept or reject him and his life. (L18 70)

3. Spatial Location (10.9%) i.e. the place where the activity in the cleft clause takes place.

(4) (a) It is in the local tax office, the local hospital and the local school that the citizen will look for improvements and judge whether the charter is a reality. (H17 62)

(b) It was there, as a child, that Chrissie met Danny and, over the years, their friendship had turned to love. (P20 13)

4. Evaluated (10.0%) i.e. someone or something which is evaluated by the cleft clause.

(5) (a) But it is John Major’s visit that really counts for China. (A01 194)

(b) It is this essential difference between metal-working and elastic straining which is all-important in formulating a workable theory. (J71 104)
5. **Goal** (6.1%) i.e. someone or something that undergoes the activity in the cleft clause.

(6) (a) He saw it was the ashtray that she had flung at him as she now came back to sudden life and pulled herself off the bed. (L13 215)

(b) So you want to talk to me about the stone circle, do you? Now, *is it a school party you want to bring*, or are you doing a study of them at college?” (L10 116)

6. **Instrument** (5.6%) i.e. the means by which the activity in the cleft clause takes place.

(7) (a) But even if the papers can’t make the connection between a constitutional monarchy and the way the country is run, *it’s by looking laterally at a tabloid’s politics that you can get a handle on its attitudes towards the royals.* (R06 127)

(b) Now, as the tiny Doris prattled on, Marie felt the blood drain from her face and *it was only by the most almighty effort of will she managed to retain a fixed, polite smile.* (P14 155)

7. **Reason** (5.3%) i.e. the reason why the activity in the cleft clause takes place.

(8) (a) “I should have thought your mother was absolutely sure of success.” “*It is because she isn’t that she is successful ... if you understand what I mean.*” (P22 120)

(b) He said *it was just because it was so trivial that it got him down.* I sort of saw his point.” (P21 236)

In sum, then, about a third of the semantic gaps in the *it-*clefts in the corpus are the identity of an **Agent**, slightly fewer than a third are the identity of either a **Temporal** or **Spatial Location**, and the remaining semantic gaps are the identity of the **Evaluated**, **Goal**, **Instrument** or **Reason**. It appears from this, then, that a very large proportion (about two thirds altogether) of the *it-*clefts in the corpus express authorial positions concerned with establishing agency or location. How does this relate to the chief properties of *it-*clefts noted above, i.e. the fact that they give textual prominence to people, things and circumstances, they are typically contrastive and often mark transitions between stages of discourse?

First, agency and location are semantic relations which frequently have thematic status in the clause. Agents are often realised as subjects,
and as such they occur in initial position in simple declarative clauses. Similarly, temporal or spatial adverbials are also frequently placed initially in the clause (Downing and Locke 2002:230). It appears, then, that as the type of prominence given to the clefted constituents of it-cLEFTs is of a textual nature, i.e. attention is drawn to their status as themes, the semantic relations that are most frequently opened up to heteroglossic negotiation by it-cLEFTs are those which otherwise would normally have thematic status in the clause and therefore have little textual prominence. By establishing the identity of these relations against a background of heteroglossic diversity, the it-cLEFT increases their rhetorical force while maintaining their thematic status in the message.

Second, agency involves the assignment of responsibility for a certain state of affairs or activity, and is therefore often placed in a relation of contrast to other relations which are not held responsible. As it-cLEFTs are typically contrastive in function, they are often used for this purpose. This is reflected in the high frequency of it-cLEFTs found in persuasive and opinionative written texts, mentioned above. The cLEFTs in (9) and (10), for instance, which occur in an editorial and in an expository text concerned with religious matters, respectively, both express explicitly contrastive authorial positions concerning what or who is responsible for activity in the cleft clause.

(9) (a) First and foremost among the facts, and one which many people seem to have overlooked, was that it was not the council which imposed the 14-day prison sentence—it was the magistrates, as was their right. (B25 100)

(b) The Department of Transport, in rejecting calls for a second test a year after the first, argues that it is not incompetence which causes accidents but showing off. (B18 54)

(10) J. A. T. Robinson takes up a position very similar to van Unnik’s, stating that it is the title “Messiah” rather than “Logos” which controls John’s Christology in the body of the Gospel. (D01 135)

Finally, agency and location are central semantic features, and changes in these features, i.e. in the protagonists in the activity or in the temporal or spatial setting, often mark new stages in the discourse. The frequency of it-cLEFTs establishing the identity of the agent of the activity or its temporal or spatial setting is thus a reflection of the fact that it-cLEFTs are often used as transitional devices. The cLEFT in (11), for instance, introduces a new topic in a sports report by highlighting the
agent. The cleft in (12), for instance, introduces a new development in a
narrative by highlighting a change in its temporal location, and the clefts
in (13), mark different temporal or spatial stages of a person’s life in
their biographies.

(11) *This week it was Smith, averaging 93.66 from 281 runs in the series
so far, who gave England their biggest scare. He dropped out of
Hampshire’s game against Worcestershire at Portsmouth with a
pain in the finger struck by an Ambrose beamer at Southampton
three weeks ago.* (A22 91)

(12) And talking of Blake, his cryptic note about nest eggs and cuckoos
was hardly a sandman. I puzzled over and analysed the wording,
like some fanatic doing The Times crossword, just to make sure
my initial interpretation was correct. By around four thirty a.m. I
had come to the conclusion that it probably was, but then stewed
over how the hell Sexton thought I could find where Stover had
stashed his savings (provided there were any, of course, and that
Stover had not blown them on some extravagance or other we
hadn’t yet caught up with—like other ladies, or the down payment
on a motorbike or car, or whatever), if he, Whetstone and the
whole of the Dorset force had not been able to trace them. By Sex-
ton’s cryptic ‘clue’, I assumed they must have tried all the more
likely places, like Stover’s home, banks, building societies and so
on. So I guessed that all I was left with, thanks very much, were
unlikely places, which at the most conservative of estimates, just
had to add up to a few billion alternatives.

*It was around five a.m. that Arabella woke up to my tossing and
turning. She rolled over and asked, “You all right?”* (L11 190)

(13) (a) *It was at Steventon and on holidays in different parts of Hamp-
shire and Kent that she drafted her first three novels, Sense
and Sensibility, Pride and Prejudice and Northanger Abbey,
all between the ages of nineteen and twenty-three.* (G29 9)
(b) *It was in Aldermaston that Jim did his major work leading to
his election to the Royal Society: he contributed some 40
papers to various learned bodies and in due course (1960) sub-
mitted them to Cambridge for his Sc.D.* (G32 128)

4.2. Semantic gaps in basic *wh-*clefts in the FLOB Corpus. The
chief types of semantic gaps in the cleft clauses of the basic *wh-*clefts in
the corpus are exemplified in rank order of their frequency as follows:
1. *Evaluated* (44.0%), i.e. something which is evaluated by the cleft clause.

(14) (a) *What was essentially wrong in Britain with engineering and building qualifications was that too few people took them*—but I believe there was nothing fundamentally wrong with the qualification-procedure itself. (J47 56)

(b) *What must make it even more frustrating for Rickman is that he is so terribly good at playing these villains.* (A17 30)

2. *Mental Concept* (17.7%), i.e. something experienced by cognition or perception.

(15) (a) *He discovered now that what he really remembered from then was not the boy or the place but his own extraordinary sense of well-being; pure joy welling up, running down his chin like sweet juice.* (K24 89)

(b) *The film's violent depiction of retribution for molesting males has had a fantastic response from women in America with critics labelling it a feminist version of the Rambo syndrome. “What we are seeing is a sort of post-feminist howl,” suggested Peter Rainer of the Los Angeles Times. “It's a sisterhood bash-a-thon.”* (C17 55)

3. *Possession* (13.5%) i.e. something which is owned, and may be shared or transferred.

(16) (a) *What we also have, however, is a, by now, highly developed set of practical examples of what it means to authorize women to behave as full ministers of the Church; we are not simply innovating in the dark, we are not simply responding to some fashionable current of 'liberal' opinion, we are watching a situation develop and trying to learn from what is happening.* (D17 200)

(b) *“We have avoided a catastrophe. What we have is just a grave accident,”* the minister told reporters. (A14 212)

4. *Message* (9.9%), i.e. something communicated verbally or symbolically.

(17) (a) *‘I’m not arguing that she deserved to die. It doesn’t matter whether she was happy, or childless, or even much use to anybody but herself. What I’m saying is that I wanted her dead.’* (G52 174)
(b) I think what he meant was, when a coon around here is too poor to own any cattle, then a shoe—even one that’s not real hide—just has to do, hey?” “Hmmm,” said the Widow Fourie. (L05 108)

5. Activity (5.7%) i.e. something that is done or takes place.

(18) (a) For, at this juncture, it should perhaps be spelt out that it is not being argued that the proscribed songs of L’Assommoir put it in formal breach of the existing legislation; that would be to rewrite the laws of the time by extending the brief of the authorities from public performance to private reading. What the songs of the novel certainly do, however, is dramatize the impotence of the legislation, in keeping with Zola’s irony at the expense of its absurdities and hypocrisy. (G44 104)

(b) What in fact occurred was a spontaneous popular uprising that the guerrillas could not ignore. (A04 213)

In sum, then, almost half of the semantic gaps in the basic wh-clefts in the corpus are the identity of a Mental Concept, Message, Activity or Possession, and slightly less than the remaining half are the identity of the Evaluated. It appears, then, that on the one hand, many of the basic wh-clefts in the corpus express authorial positions concerned with establishing the identity of mental concepts, verbal communication, activities, etc., and, on the other hand, many are concerned with evaluations of various kinds. How does this relate to the chief properties of basic wh-clefts noted above, i.e. the fact that they give ideational prominence to nonhuman experience, and that this is typically newsworthy information such as a new topic or a correction of what has been conveyed earlier?

First, Mental Concept, Message, Activity or Possession are concepts which define how nonhuman experience enters our consciousness, is communicated verbally, is an activity of some kind, or is just generally something owned or shared. These definitions, then, give ideational prominence to the informational content of the clefted constituents by defining its contextual status. Further, their rhetorical force is increased by the fact that these definitions are negotiated against a background of heteroglossic diversity. This type of basic wh-cleft is often used, for instance, to present newsworthy information which explains, clarifies, or corrects, etc. what has been conveyed earlier. The basic wh-cleft in (19a), for instance, which occurs in a text on religious matters in the corpus, presents information to clarify the current topic of the text; the
basic *wh*-cleft in (19b), which also occurs in a text on religious matters, presents information to interpret a quotation; the basic *wh*-cleft in (19c), which occurs in constructed dialogue in the fiction category, presents a correction of what the character said earlier; and the basic *wh*-cleft in (19d), which occurs in a review in the press category, presents the writer's standpoint concerning the topic.24

(19) (a) There is a principle here which we are prepared to acknowledge in other spheres, but which apparently we do not always apply to our spiritual life. No lover would offer his girl a bouquet of artificial flowers—though there are some very lifelike creations—and they would last longer! No art expert is fooled by the most clever reproduction of a masterpiece—or by a daub claimed to be 'art' in the latest fashion! No musical virtuoso can be 'explained' in terms of his perfected technique alone.

What we are concerned with here is what Dr Fosdick called "The Principle of Released Power". And he goes on to say: "Power is primarily a matter not of self-generation but of appropriation. Not strenuous activity but hospitable receptivity is the ultimate source of energy." That was Paul's liberating discovery. (D12 111)

(b) He is the author of that seeming paradox, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God who works in you to will and to act according to his good purpose." What Paul is saying is that, having come to the end of our resources, *God in Christ supplied the missing impetus*. But having now divine resources, we must use them. We cannot initiate the new life, but we must cooperate in its fulfilment. Christian discipleship never can be a laid-back affair. (D12 132)

(c) "You must be joking. I'm always referred to their legal department." He took the point, though she could sense that he didn't appreciate it being made so forcefully. Tactlessness—and instant regret—were such a regular feature of her life that she automatically backtracked, adding quickly: "*What I mean is, they've been less helpful than they could have been.*" (K17 108)

(d) Oral poetry presupposes illiteracy on the part of the audience no less than the minstrel. Since by its very nature it has no universally fixed text, how can one address the material using the conventional critical armamentarium? The printed grapheme
is vastly different from the ephemeral phoneme. In Havelock’s
words, “oral language does not fossilize”. In fact, **what we
have in the Homeric epics is at best oral-derived poetry, edited
most famously under Pisistratus in the sixth century BC and
meticulously divided into their now canonical twenty-four
books by the librarians at Alexandria in the third. The words
were now trapped on papyrus. The music was lost for ever.

(C13 51)

Second, evaluations often form the perspective from which news-
worthy information is presented, and their most typical position is ini-
tial position preceding the evaluated information (Biber 1999:971). In
this position the evaluation has thematic status and is presented as
shared background knowledge which is difficult to challenge (Hunston
and Thompson 2000:9). It appears, then, that basic wh-clefts are very
frequently used to present newsworthy information from an evaluative
perspective (about half of the total number of basic wh-clefts express
evaluative positions, see Table 2). This is perhaps not surprising consid-
ering that in basic wh-clefts the cleft clause which represents the evalu-
ation is in initial position. Furthermore, by negotiating the identity of
these evaluated relations against a background of heteroglossic diver-
sity, the basic wh-cleft increases the rhetorical force of the evaluative
standpoint they represent. This is also probably one reason for the high
frequency of basic wh-clefts found in opinionative spoken text types
(Gómez-González 2001:328). The basic wh-clefts in the corpus often
express authorial positions evaluating the desirability, necessity,
salience, probability, or general positive or negative value, etc. of the
information they present. The basic wh-cleft in (20) for instance, which
evaluates desirability, is a quoted comment in a news report.

(20) Licensed victuallers’ association officials say breweries have used
a Monopolies and Mergers Commission decision to cut the num-
ber of pubs they run as an excuse to boost rents and scrap mainte-
nance agreements in their remaining premises. Jim Hayburn,
spokesman for the Macclesfield and Congleton LVA, said: “The
new leases are a recipe for bankruptcy. Rents are going up astro-
nomically while the breweries at the same time are divesting them-
selves of responsibility for care and maintenance. It will mean that
prices will rise, hundreds of pubs will no longer be viable and
many landlords will be forced out of their livelihoods. **What we
want is for the Government to force the brewers to either allow us**
to buy the pubs in a competitive market, or to rent them at a commercial rent, not just to let us be dictated to through a feudal system of ownership.” (A29 122)

Some evaluative basic wh-clefts in the corpus, such as (21), for instance, increase the focus on their informational content by evaluating its salience.

(21) (a) LIKE HALL, Flimm recognises that this is a play dominated by the sea: the Hamburg setting is a tilted circular greensward behind which is a cut-out cave leading on to a shimmering marine perspective. But Flimm enjoys certain practical advantages not found in England: one is the luxury of 12 weeks’ rehearsal (Hall had six). Another is a continental philosophy of lighting which creates mystery by casting the forestage in shadow. What is most striking, however, is the way Teutonic intellectualism, which we casually deride, turns Twelfth Night into an exploration of the Platonic idea of love as a link between the sensible and the eternal world. (A18 61)

(b) And although the 16th century was to misinterpret part of this implication (by taking it to mean not that syllables were ‘long by position’ but that their vowels ‘lengthened by position’), what is crucial here is the idea of syllable structure. (J35 214)

4.3. Semantic gaps in reversed wh-clefts in the FLOB Corpus. The chief types of semantic gaps in the cleft clauses of the reversed wh-clefts in the corpus are exemplified in rank order of their frequency as follows:

1. Reason (25.6%), i.e. the reason why the activity in the cleft clause takes place.

(22) (a) In the last four years the average working days lost yearly through strikes have been less than 3.4 million. That’s why Britain now has the highest share of American and Japanese investment in Europe. But union reform isn’t finished. (B14 69)

(b) This could well be Rickman’s secret. It is why, for example, his portrayal of the callous roué in Les Liaisons Dangereuses was so painfully sympathetic. And why, after an hour’s exposure to his hypnotic charm, I felt a desperate urge to write the most gushingly favourable interview sycophancy could devise. (A17 85)
2. Evaluated (18.4%), i.e. something which is evaluated by the cleft clause.

(23) (a) As I said to Stevens . . . they believe, that's what counts. (L07 47)
   (b) The same had been given to Richard after all, and no doubt William would do just as well as soon as he was back from America. And this was what I'd always wanted after all—something I could call my own. (P17 30)

3. Message (13.4%), i.e. something communicated verbally or symbolically by the cleft clause.

(24) (a) "That's what he said, did he? Well, let us just wait and see." (A33 214)
       (b) What he meant was that he had a right to know they were all worrying themselves sick on his behalf, and blaming me (K07 84)

4. Activity (9.0%) i.e. something that is done or takes place.

(25) (a) If Kinnock had invited a Turkish-Cypriot, Asil Nadir, to dine and sent effusive letters of thanks for donations to the party funds adding up to over pounds 1,500,000 (much of them covering the election campaign), wouldn't the soap-boxes have been erected between Fleet Street and Westminster for editors to cry "Scandal"? Yet that is what Lady Thatcher did. (B05 82)
       (b) And—although he is careful to say that he is not questioning the right of a scientist, on the empirical level, to say what he needs to say—this in the end, in my view, is exactly what Derrida does. (G37 149)

5. Instrument (8.5%) i.e. the means by which the activity in the cleft clause takes place.

(26) (a) You'll have got your pictures into print, and you'll get paid for the words too. That's how I got started! (E10 118)
       (b) For the absolute beginner, the thought of building a shortwave radio may be somewhat daunting. Nevertheless, this is how many start, with a considerable degree of success due to the availability of simple kits of parts. (E26 18)
6. **Attribute (7.2%)** i.e. something that is a description or classification.

(27) (a) I call Mr Major’s brainchild ‘The Customer’s Charter’. *That’s what it really is.* It’s first class. (B14 8)
(b) “Consumers,” said Kate, with a shrug, “*that’s what we are.*” (R02 213)
(c) “You don’t think she’s carrying things a little far, Toby? I mean, Macbeth is not a horror picture . . .” “Oh, I don’t know, old boy. In its own way, *that’s exactly what it is.*” (P16 183)

7. **Spatial Location (5.8%)** i.e. the place where the activity in the cleft clause takes place.

(28) (a) “Easy! I parked it round the corner, in Riverside Road. Force of habit, I suppose, *that’s usually where I park during the day.*” (L10 179)
(b) “I don’t know. I suppose, if *that’s where the family were killed,* that it would be a tourist attraction for the wrong reasons.” (N01 17)

In sum, then about a third of the semantic gaps in the reversed *wh*-clefts in the corpus are the identity of *Activity, Attribute* or *Message*, about a third are the identity of a *Reason* or *Instrument*, and about a sixth are the identity of the *Evaluated*. It appears, then, that like basic *wh*-clefts, many of the reversed *wh*-clefts in the corpus express authorial positions concerned with establishing the identity of activities, verbal communication, etc., and some express positions concerned with evaluations of various kinds. Further, unlike basic *wh*-clefts, many of the reversed *wh*-clefts in the corpus express authorial positions concerned with defining why or how certain relations come about. How do these authorial positions relate to the properties of reversed *wh*-clefts noted above, i.e. the fact that they give ideational prominence to most types of experience, and that they are typically used to summarise, comment on and draw conclusions from information already conveyed in the text?

First, *Activity, Attribute* and *Message*, are concepts which define an activity of some kind, how something is to be described or classified, or how it is communicated verbally. These definitions, then, give ideational prominence to the informational content of the clefted constituents by defining their contextual status, and they are placed in end focus by the rhematic status of the cleft clause. This type of reversed *wh*-cleft is often
used to summarise information conveyed earlier in the discourse. By negotiating the definition against a background of heteroglossic diversity, then, the reversed *wh*-cleft increases its summative effect. This is probably one reason why reversed *wh*-clefts are often used in speech and in constructed dialogue in fiction (Collins 1991: 178–189). Here, they are often used to monitor the discourse by confirming, questioning or denying actions, chunks of text, or descriptions which have been conveyed earlier in the text, such as the clefts in (29), which all occur in constructed dialogue in the fiction category of the corpus.

(29) (a) “I went out for a coffee, yes, *that's what I did.*” (L10 171)
(b) “Did you push him, love? *Is that what happened?*” Stella blew her nose. “He fell, I think.” (K26 6)
(c) “Anna, please . . . talk to me . . . who are you?” There was a long silence.
“I am what you desire,” she said.
“No. *That's not what I meant.*” (K08 121)

Second, evaluations, when realised as the cleft clause of a reversed *wh*-cleft, follow the relations they evaluate and are given end focus by their thematic status. The reversed *wh*-clefts in the corpus chiefly express authorial positions commenting on the necessity or desirability of what has been conveyed earlier. Many of these evaluative reversed *wh*-clefts occur in constructed dialogue in fiction, such as (30a) for instance, and in quoted comments in press categories, such as (30b), for instance.

(30) (a) So you're telling me it's on, are you?” Charles nodded. “Oh yes. Myself and Barkworth. *It's just what the country needs.* Particularly that bit where we're on the barge in the Thames and Dr Barkworth asks me what the tall building over there is. And I smile at him and say ‘I don't know, but it Really Is Appalling’.” (R05 190)
(b) “I feel I am going to have another son—anyway *that's what Willie wants,* and I'm thinking that way too,” said Amanda, whose former husband is also getting married—their 1983 wedding was at the ultra-fashionable St Margaret's Westminster and the union lasted four years. (A10 182)

Finally, relations brought about as a result of certain conditions or by a certain means are conclusions which may be drawn from information conveyed earlier in the discourse. When realised as the cleft clause of a
reversed wh-cleft, then, these relations are, again, given end focus by their rhematic status. The authorial position expressed by this type of reversed wh-cleft is typically explanatory in function, and is often used to clinch an argument, as in (31) for instance, which occurs in constructed dialogue in the fiction category.

(31) (a) “You’re English!” I stared at him. “But—but your French is faultless!” He smiled ruefully and said, “That’s why I’m here.” (N26 150)
(b) “Well, Brian—that’s Mr Tressider—he came in, about one it must’ve been, because Heather said he’d come in and that’s why she had to ring off. (L03 193)
(c) “Their parent company, Yum-Yum Puddings, want you to handle their new campaign . . .” And that’s how Thomas and Sophie moved into the super-tax bracket. (P27 112)

5. Conclusion. In this study I have claimed that it-clefts, basic wh-clefts and reversed wh-clefts function as a dialogically contractive heteroglossic rhetorical strategy, i.e. they increase the argumentative force of what is being said by both recognising the possible existence of alternative divergent positions and at the same time asserting one authorial position in preference to all other alternatives. This rhetorical effect is created by the complex clause structure of the cleft construction, which consists of a cleft clause and a superordinate clause. The cleft clause makes way for heteroglossic negotiation of the utterance by leaving open the identity of one of its clause elements and thereby inferring that it is possible for any candidate to fill this semantic gap. The superordinate clause, on the other hand, closes down negotiation by exclusively identifying the one and only item that fills the semantic gap.

There are, however, significant differences between it-clefts, basic wh-clefts and reversed wh-clefts, including the types of relations they highlight in their clefted constituents, the kinds of prominence they give to these relations, and the functions they are used for in discourse. The comparison of the semantic gaps in the cleft clauses of the three clefts in the FLOB corpus showed that, although there is some overlap (all three clefts have, for instance, semantic gaps for the identity of the Evaluated), there are also some differences in the types of relations they open to heteroglossic negotiation. Thus, although all three clefts share the function of heteroglossic rhetorical strategy, they tend to be used to express different types of authorial positions. Very broadly speaking, then, it-clefts, which give a textual kind of prominence to the informa-
tion they highlight, chiefly express authorial positions concerned with establishing thematic relations of agency or location in time or space. Wh-clefts, which give an ideational type of prominence to the information they highlight, chiefly express authorial positions concerned with either defining or evaluating their information content. Basic wh-clefts, where the cleft clause is thematic and whose discourse function is usually to present newsworthy information, are most frequently evaluative. Reversed wh-clefts, where the cleft clause is rhematic, and whose discourse function is usually to summarise, comment on or draw conclusions from old information, are more often defining.

Department of English  
Box 200  
S-405 30 Göteborg  
Sweden  
jennifer.herriman@eng.gu.se

ENDNOTES

1 This research has been financed by The Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet).

2 I have not included all-clefts, ih-clefts (See Collins 1991), or other types of clefts such as there-clefts (See e.g. Davidse 2000 and Lambrecht 2001).

3 The information in the dependent clause cannot, for instance, be challenged by a tag question, e.g. *What caused the delay was an electrical fault, didn't it? *It was an electrical fault that caused the delay, didn't it? For a discussion of presuppositions in clefts, see e.g. Delin (1989:17), Hedberg (1990:145ff.), Collins (1991:97), Gundel 2001:6) and Johansson (2002:30f.)

4 For convenience, I will use the label pronoun to refer to all the different types of words which introduce the cleft clause and which are coreferential with the clefted constituent. This includes where, why, how etc., which are not normally included in this word class.

5 Through the Mood structure of the superordinate clause, i.e. the finite verb, its subject, and any optional mood adjuncts (Halliday 1994:71ff.), it is possible to negotiate and modify the expression of the authorial position by interpersonal meanings. The value-variable specification may be negotiated by varying the type of clause (interrogative, negative vs. affirmative clause). For instance, the specification of the value an electrical fault for the variable what/that caused the delay may be affirmed, or questioned e.g. Is an electrical fault what caused the delay? Is that what caused the delay? Was it an electrical fault that caused the delay, or denied, e.g. What caused the delay was not an electrical fault. An electrical fault is not what caused the delay. The value-variable specification may also be modified by modal operators, mood adjuncts, intensifiers, modal clauses, etc. e.g. What caused the delay may be an electrical fault. That is really what caused the delay. I think it was an electrical fault that caused the delay (Herriman 2003).

6 According to the Hallidayan Systemic Functional Linguistic approach, language creates ideational, interpersonal and textual meaning. Ideational meaning is the representation of our experience of the world around us and inside us. Interpersonal meaning is when language is used to interact with other people. Textual meaning is the organisation of ideational and interpersonal meanings into a message. (Martin 1992:7f., Halliday 1994:xiii, Matthiessen 1995, Eggins 1994:12f.).

In Delin’s (1989:101), Collins’ (1991:56), and Johansson’s (2002:91) corpus studies more than half of the clefted constituents in the it-clefts are NPs, (64.5%, 50.4% and 66.7%, respectively) about a quarter are PPs (20.4%, 29.4% and 21.5%, respectively) and a small proportion are adverb phrases or clauses (14.8%, 6.8% and 5.9%, respectively). (In Collins’ study 14.5% of the examples of it-clefts are zero clefts, e.g. *If so, it must be that their God was more powerful than the Kikoyu’s Ngai* (1991:55)).

In Geluyken’s (1988), Collins’ (1991:56), and Johansson’s (2002:91) corpus studies about half of the cleft pronouns in cleft clauses of it-clefts are subjects, (53.2%, 38.3%, 51.7%). In Collins’ (1991:56), and Johansson’s (2002:91) studies more than a third are adverbials (36.7% and 32.9%) and a small proportion are objects (6.8% and 11.7%). In Geluyken’s study about a quarter (27.7%) are objects and a small proportion (19.1%) are adverbials.

In Delin’s (1989:101) and Collins’ (1991:58) corpus studies more than a half of the clefted constituents in the basic wh-clefts are finite and nonfinite clauses (55.6% and 65.7% respectively), and about one third are NPs, (43.8% and 33.3%). In Johansson’s study (2002:94) about two thirds of the clefted constituents are nouns (61.4%) and more than a third are finite and nonfinite clauses (38.6%).

In Geluyken’s (1988), Collins’ (1991:65) and Johansson’s (2002:94) corpus studies roughly half of the cleft pronouns in the cleft clauses of basic wh-clefts are objects (48.3%, 37.3% and 54.4%, respectively) and somewhat smaller proportions are subjects (14.2%, 32.8% and 31.6%, respectively).

Nearly all of clefted constituents of reversed clefts in Delin’s (1989:101), Collins’ (1991:59) and Johansson’s (2002:96) corpus studies are NPs (99.0%, 98.8% and 99.4%, respectively). Of these a large proportion are the demonstrative anaphors *that* and *this*.

In Geluyken’s (1988) Collins’ (1991:59) and Johansson’s (2002:97) studies roughly a third of the clefted constituents in reversed wh-clefts are objects (45.6%, 38.3% and 33.5%, respectively), about third are adverbials (32.3%, 34.4% and 39.6%, respectively) and a small proportion are subjects (18.4%, 14.2% and 10.4%, respectively).

I am using the term “circumstantial” here in the Hallidayan (1994:149) sense to refer to expressions of time, manner, place, cause, etc., which are typically realised by adverb or prepositional phrases.

Although it is unusual, it is not impossible for it-clefts to highlight propositions, e.g. *I wonder if it was that they hadn’t enough room for them up in the house that they put them out here in the woods?* (Delahunty 2001:520) and for basic wh-clefts to highlight people, e.g. *What you need is a good wife. which you don’t have.* (Kuno in Hedberg 1990:62).

It is regarded as the theme of the it-cleft by Gundel (1977) and Geluykens (1988), for instance.

Basic and reversed wh-clefts also differ from each other in that reversed wh-clefts tend to be negotiated by questioning and negation more frequently than basic wh-clefts, and also tend to be sharpened in focus more frequently by intensifying adverbs such as *exactly*. This is probably because the summative type of reversed wh-clefts is often used to challenge or deny already established authorial positions (Herriman 2003).

For more information about the Freiburg LOB corpus, see www.khnt.uib.no/icame/manuals/lob/


The miscellaneous semantic gaps are those which each occur in fewer than 5% of the it-clefts in the corpus: Mental Concept (14 it-clefts) e.g. More surprisingly it is the reality of beliefs themselves which philosophers are more and more inclined to doubt (G63 5); Senser (12 it-clefts), e.g. It was not only Margaret Thatcher who had grown disenchantment with incomes policies, national economic plans and the rest. (B01 86); Sayer, (6 it-clefts) e.g. In the end it was Nick who spoke first, softly. (P23 91); Message (3 it-clefts) e.g. It...it's something Joe told me in his letter. (P19 45); Source (3 it-clefts) e.g. It isn't from the filling station that Bwana Chirak makes his money (K26 81); Recipient (3 it-clefts) e.g. It was Ballesteros who benefited most from Baker- Finch's demise at St Andrews in '84. (A07 116); Activity (1 it-cleft) e.g. It is a reframing of the symbolization which occurs when the present adaptive needs of the individual demand an act of explanation or interpretation. (J62 54)

The miscellaneous semantic gaps are those which each occur in less than 5% of the basic wh-clefts in the corpus: Agent (6 basic wh-clefts) e.g. I suggest that what broke Edward's army was the sight of the men who led them (N25 73); Existent (4 basic wh-clefts) e.g. What had developed in the history of English was a new kind of trading relationship between syllabic heaviness and stress. (J35 190); Attribute (3 basic wh-clefts) e.g. What he did become, however, among many other things, was a competent conductor. (J68 17).

The miscellaneous semantic gaps are those which each occur in less than 5% of the reversed wh-clefts in the corpus: Mental Concept (9 reversed wh-clefts), e.g. That's what the Consult-General thought too. (L09 177); Agent (7 reversed wh-clefts) e.g. This is what will determine the outcome of the election (A02 240); Temporal Location (5 reversed wh-clefts) e.g. Once fraud and corruption gets a hold in any particular area, that is when you are in trouble; Possession (3 reversed wh-clefts); Goal (3 reversed wh-clefts) e.g. I find a battered black leather box with a round bulge at one end, and I realize that this is what I was looking for all the time (N15 133).

Interestingly, in the basic wh-clefts in the corpus where the semantic gap is a mental concept or possession (as in (19a) and (19d), the subject of the cleft clause is very often the pronoun we. This is often a means of involving the reader in the authorial position expressed by the wh-cleft, as it presents it as something shared with the reader. (Herriman 2003).

None of the clefted constituents in the reversed wh-clefts in the corpus had human referents, however.

REFERENCES


Herriman, J. (in preparation.) “Identifying relations: the experiential functions of wh-clefts in English.”