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ABSTRACT

In recent years there has been considerable interest in the way micro-level lexicogrammatical choices realise discourse goals at various levels of written text. Much of this work has focused on how writers start their sentences and has made use of the theme-rheme perspective on clause and sentence structure associated with a Hallidayan approach to text analysis. At the same time, there has been increasing awareness of the influence of generic context on language use and several studies have sought, in particular, to relate choices of linguistic form to the methodological practices of particular academic disciplines. This study also makes use of the theme-rheme model, along with other perspectives on the organisation of information in written text, in order to examine the discourse goals served by choices as regards placement of various types of lexicogrammatical items in academic writing. The specific context chosen for the investigation is the academic journal article in the field of history, a discipline whose discourse has been under-researched so far.

Four history journal articles were selected for analysis, two from the sub-discipline of modern history and two by medieval historians. All the sentence themes in these articles were classified as either marked, unmarked or non-prototypical themes. They were then categorised according to semantic function and further subdivided according to grammatical form. The investigation then focused on the discourse goals achieved by particular theme choices, especially with regard to the organisation of the content of the text. In the case of adverbial clauses, initial placement was compared with final placement to see whether there was any difference in pragmatic function.

The analysis confirmed several claims made in the literature and disconfirmed others, while providing a number of new insights into pragmatic uses of particular lexicogrammatical forms. In most cases, these insights are relevant to academic writing in the humanities in general; several pertain to the written discourse of history in particular; while others serve to distinguish the styles of individual writers within the same discipline.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Writing is choice making, the evaluation of options...To study choices is to notice what they accomplish and what they don’t.

(Bazerman 1988:13).

At the most general level, this study has been motivated by an interest in how competent writers manipulate the grammar of English to present their ideas as clearly and cogently as possible. More specifically, the main focus is on how writers of academic history journal articles exploit thematisation, especially initial and final position in sentences, to deploy lexicogrammatical devices in ways that best achieve their discourse goals. The research is a qualitative rather than a quantitative study: the functions of particular thematisation choices are examined in some depth but in a limited sample, four texts of the same genre and register. This examination reveals strategic uses of lexicogrammatical devices for presenting dense information content in ways which make it more accessible for the reader. Several of these seem particularly useful in history discourse, which is an interesting register to investigate, being a blend of the narrative and argumentative modes of discourse; others distinguish the style of an individual writer from that of others writing within the same genre and register. Thus, the research contributes to the linguistic characterisation of academic writing in the humanities, a relatively neglected area in comparison to the more thoroughly examined discourse of science.

1.1 THE RESEARCH CONTEXT

The research falls within that area of linguistics referred to by Dubin and Olshtain (1980) as textual discourse analysis, in that it is concerned with the interpretation and regularities of distribution of linguistic forms in stretches of language in interaction with context (Brown and Yule 1983:x; Cook 1994:23, 25; Carter 1997:xiv), and particularly with the form of a written end-product. As advocated by Jucker (1992), the approach is eclectic. Analysis of the strategic use of certain linguistic features to achieve specific goals in specific contexts is an approach associated with the ethnography of speaking; interest in linguistic features as style markers, varying in density across contextually related texts, is characteristic of
traditional stylistics; and text structure and the sequencing of information in paragraphs has always been a concern in rhetoric and writing instruction. As in correlational approaches to sociolinguistics, where possible, language use is related to features of the context, in this case the discipline of history and the genre of the academic journal article. Particularly influential, however, is the systemic functional approach to language study developed by Michael Halliday and his followers, from which is derived the focus on thematic choices.

The analysis is concerned with the interface between grammar and discourse and responds to the perceived need to relate local level lexical and syntactic choices to higher level discourse goals. Text studies are said to have focused until recently mainly on macro-level rhetoric and to have neglected the sentence level (Davies 1997:52; MacDonald 1994:147); on the other hand, Flowerdew (1998) finds a preoccupation in the field of corpus linguistics with local level surface features of lexicogrammatical phrasing and little indication of their discourse functions in the text overall, of the relationships between phrases, or how meanings are built up across text. Nevertheless, he notes some studies along the right lines: Wu's (1992) more discoursal approach to corpus analysis in examining organisational, rhetorical and discoursal features of the lexicogrammar; Swales's (1990) identification of lexicogrammatical phrases realising particular moves in the field of genre analysis; Hoey's (1983, 1979) and Crombie's (1986) examination of both intra-clausal and inter-clausal relations between words; and the interest of functional linguists in the interpersonal metafunction and thematic structure.

Investigation of how sentence level thematic choices relate to higher level discourse concerns such as text structure and genre has frequently been advocated by researchers working within the systemic functional approach (Fries 1995b, Martin 1993b, Mauranen 1992, Gosden 1992 and Francis 1989). Davies (1997, 1988), Fries (1995a), Gosden (1993, 1992) and Eiler (1986), have studied generic uses of themes; MacDonald (1994) has investigated grammatical subject choices in relation to academic knowledge-making and text-making, and Dubois (1981) has examined how noun phrases are gradually built up across text in medical research articles. So far such studies have mainly focused on initial position in the sentence, with little attention as yet to types and patterning of rhemes. However, some insights into choices in rheme can be gained from other perspectives on the sentence, such as investigations of the effects of initial versus final placement of adverbial
clauses, Hannay and MacKenzie's (1990) tripartite structure model, and observations made in the sixties and seventies about what were then referred to as final free modifiers.

The present study investigates the interface between discourse and grammar by integrating these various perspectives on sentence structure within the broad framework of thematisation in order to examine how linguistic choices for both theme and sentence-final position contribute to the achievement of discourse goals. This is in line both with Granger's (cited in Flowerdew 1998) observation that 'there is scope for in-depth research into the relationship between particular sentence positions, especially initial and final, and particular discourse functions' and with de Beaugrande's (1996) proposal of using a corpus to explore which types of words or collocations tend to be used for beginning or ending a sentence. Thematisation as a framework for investigation permits inclusion of a range of lexicogrammatical features and the integration of several lines of enquiry within a single text study.

1.2 THE GENERIC CONTEXT

Since language choices reflect very specific features of context, a context for the investigation needed to be clearly defined, addressing the need noted by Fries (1995a:339) for data from a range of carefully defined genres, with careful description of factors which can help explain the nature of the texts examined. The expository prose of academic journal articles seemed a particularly suitable source of evidence of how competent writers achieve clarity and coherence since the unwieldy bulk of content that needs to be dealt with in academic writing presents a high degree of challenge as regards coherent and cogent presentation so that the reader does not lose sight of the thesis and main line of reasoning. It also caters for a perceived need for more analysis of longer and more complex texts and genres (Davies 1997:53).

In the interests of precision in determining how linguistic forms function in discourse, it was appropriate to define the context even more precisely. One line of research in discourse and genre analysis explores how the rhetoric and the deployment of grammar and vocabulary in academic texts reflect the methodological procedures of particular disciplines. Langer (1992), for instance, perceives a need for identification of how argument and evidence,
comparisons, critiques and summaries are used to package knowledge in discipline-specific ways which represent ways of thinking unique to the discipline. It has been observed that science taxonomises (Martin 1991), history uses grammatical metaphor to generalise (Eggins et al 1993), while in written geology discourse there is movement from unspecific to specific (Love 1993, 1991). MacDonald (1994) has investigated how grammatical subject choices reflect differences in methodology across three disciplines: social sciences, history and literary studies.

Much of the analysis of academic research articles up to now has been of science, medical and economics discourse, and it has been noted that writing in the humanities has not so far received the attention it deserves (Thetela 1997; MacDonald 1994, Mauranen 1993). What little research there has been into the discourse of non-science disciplines has tended to focus on school or university undergraduate textbooks rather than on the professional writing of one specialist for other specialists (e.g. Eggins et al 1993 on history, Love 1993, 1991 on geology). Several researchers have suggested history as a discipline whose discourse is worthy of investigation with regard to lexicogrammatical choices, both those which are universal in academic writing and those which are specific to a particular discipline (Mauranen 1992, MacDonald 1994, Martin 1993b, Jacobs 1981), and Eggins et al (1993), preface their analysis of grammatical metaphor in school history textbooks with the observation that comparable studies of mature history discourse are not yet available. There seemed good reason, therefore, to select the register of history discourse and the genre of the academic journal article as the context for analysis of the discourse functions of lexicogrammatical forms.

1.3 THE AIMS OF THE RESEARCH

The overall aim was to investigate how certain lexicogrammatical items are exploited to achieve the discourse goals of written academic text, particularly as regards the organisation, foregrounding and signposting of the content. A secondary aim was to demonstrate stylistic variation across texts by different authors writing within the same discipline and genre. It was also hoped that the study would reveal uses of language which might be considered characteristic of history in particular, but it was recognised that observations based on examination of only four journal articles could not be considered
conclusive, so the intention was merely to suggest, where possible, how certain instances of language use might serve the particular purposes of historians. The benefit of such a limited sample is that it permits greater depth of analysis, demonstrating the need for qualitative studies to complement quantitative analysis of large corpora.

**Specific aims**

1. To investigate the functions of different types of themes at the sentence level.

2. To investigate the functions of certain types of peripheral dependent elements in sentence-final position.

3. To examine variations in function according to whether placement of the same type of item is in initial or final position.

4. To note similarities and differences between the four authors in their deployment of these items with a view to characterising particular writing styles.

5. To note any aspects of the deployment of these lexicogrammatical devices which might be said to characterise history discourse.

**1.4 OVERVIEW**

Part 1 presents a literature review divided into two chapters. The first of these, Chapter 2, provides a description of the rhetorical and linguistic features of the genre of academic exposition, of the methodology of history, in particular, and of argumentative discourse, said to be characteristic of history. Chapter 3 discusses the systemic functional view of clauses and sentences in terms of theme-rheme structure. It looks at how theme is defined, and various types of themes, including certain grammatical constructions which are problematic for analysis according to this model. It touches briefly on the less researched topic of rheme, and on thematic progression and method of development and how these relate to characterisation of different genres. The theme-rheme model of the clause or sentence is then related to other perspectives on the sentence, and, finally, the focus on rheme is
narrowed to one on final peripheral items in the sentence in contrasting initial and final placement of adverbial clauses and -ing clauses.

Part 2 presents the analysis of the four history journal articles. Chapter 4 explains the method of analysis and presents the more general findings, including a general description of the sample texts. Chapter 5 examines unmarked themes and Chapter 6 non-prototypical themes, that is special sentence constructions which do not easily fit into the classification into marked and unmarked themes. The next three chapters are primarily concerned with marked themes and corresponding final free modifiers, categorised according to semantic function, and sub-categorised according to lexicogrammatical form. Chapter 7 deals with location in time and space, and reference to human participants, as well as with various miscellaneous semantic categories. Chapter 8 is concerned with condition, reason and addition. Chapter 9 examines signals of contrast, including concession. The final chapter summarises the conclusions and also notes other interesting features of these texts worthy of further investigation but which could not be investigated in any depth within the space and time constraints on the present research.
PART 1  LITERATURE REVIEW
CHAPTER 2  THE GENERIC CONTEXT

Since language choices are governed by generic considerations, this chapter considers the genre from which the sample texts are taken. The first section looks at two categorisations of the text types encountered in academic writing, and then at its characteristic lexicogrammatical features. The second narrows the focus to the discipline of history and surveys views of what it is that historians do, since academic writing is said to reflect the methodology of particular disciplines, and, in the case of school and university textbooks, to acculturalise students to that methodology (MacDonald 1994; Martin 1993b, 1991; Love 1993; Gosden 1992; Eiler 1986). From this it emerges that argument is seen to be a prestige type of discourse in history; therefore the third section looks at rhetorical and lexicogrammatical features of written argument.

2.1  ACADEMIC EXPOSITION

2.1.1  TEXT TYPES

Academic writing is described as highly informational (Biber 1988:193), characterised by precision, detail and accuracy (Channell 1990), and expository (Drury and Gollin 1986; Martin 1985a), typically presenting a thesis along with supporting arguments (Martin et al 1985:65).

Martin et al (1985) distinguish two broad types of exposition: hortatory (concerned with the way the world should be) and analytical (concerned with the way the world is, true or false). Examples of hortatory exposition are newspaper editorials, letters to the Editor, sermons, debates and political speeches, while academic writing falls into the category of analytical exposition. Connor, Gorman and Vähäpassi (1988) and Connor and Lauer (1985) would presumably call the former persuasive discourse, which they define as integrating rational, credibility, and affective appeals in order to effect co-operation and identification with an audience. But they also use this label for academic writing in the humanities and the arts, distinguishing this type of `emotional argument', which employs persuasive rhetorical devices and is more subjective and humanistic, from the `rational argument' characteristic of
the sciences and most of the social sciences, which appeals to objectivity, reason and scientific principles. Argument in this second sense is one dimension of persuasion. But for Martin et al academic writing of both types is distinguished from hortatory exposition and termed *analytical exposition*.

Analytical exposition is sub-categorised into *factual* and *persuasive* analytical exposition. The former explains how the world is while the latter argues a case for a particular interpretation of how the world is (unlike hortatory exposition, which attempts to change the world as it is by arguing for the way it should be). Factual exposition is in turn subclassified into *explanatory A* (typically, accounts of taxonomies or systems) and *explanatory B* (typically, processes, procedures, or cause and effect chains), while persuasive exposition can be *interpretive, evaluative* or *argumentative*. Interpretive exposition presents an interpretation of raw material backed up with relevant examples; evaluative exposition justifies a particular evaluation of certain data according to criteria which it provides; and argumentative exposition supplies reasons for supporting a particular thesis.

In Biber's (1988) typology, based on computerised analysis of corpora for co-occurring linguistic features, academic prose is distributed across four text types, only three of which are labelled *exposition*. He finds academic writing in all disciplines is highly explicit and abstract, and, except in mathematics, highly informational. However, there is considerable variation as to the degree of explicitness, technicality and abstraction and the extent to which narrative is used, with humanities prose making far more use of narrative. There is also considerable variation in the extent to which academic texts argue for a particular point of view rather than simply presenting informational findings and Biber suggests the difference between persuasive prose and factual prose cuts across traditional genre categories, which tallies with the broad distinction Martin et al (1985) make between factual and persuasive analytic exposition.

Biber's category *scientific exposition*, which accounts for 44% of the academic texts in his sample, appears to be equivalent to Martin et al's *factual analytic exposition*. It includes texts from natural science, engineering/technology, and medicine, but also, sometimes, social science and humanities texts which are relatively technical in content and adopt an abstract, technical style. 31% of the academic texts are of the type he calls *learned exposition*, which includes social science and humanities texts, philosophical and analytical
studies, which deal with abstract, conceptual information, and, occasionally, natural science and engineering texts which are more dynamic and less abstract in style than is the norm for these disciplines. Both scientific exposition and learned exposition are extremely informational, highly explicit in reference, non-narrative, and non-persuasive, but the former is extremely technical in style whereas the latter is more ‘learned’ and ‘literate’ in presentation.

17% of Biber’s academic texts are labelled *general narrative exposition*, a very general type of exposition which he describes as primarily informational and expository and moderately narrative, using narrative to convey information that is an integral part of the expository information being conveyed, but not very learned, persuasive, technical, abstract or explicit. Only 9% of the academic texts in the sample, mainly from the fields of political studies, education and law, are what Biber calls *involved persuasion*: prose which depends on logical development and argumentation and is characteristically argumentative or persuasive in its primary purpose. It is moderately involved, nonnarrative, nonabstract and elaborated in reference. More peripheral texts in this category may be highly informational, with a higher incidence of the linguistic features which characterise learned exposition, while at the same time being overtly persuasive, considering arguments and counter-arguments and forcefully arguing in favour of a point of view. This kind of writing seems to include both Martin *et al*’s *argumentative analytical exposition* category of analytic persuasive writing and also non-academic texts such as newspaper letters to the editor, which Martin *et al* classify as *hortatory exposition*. The difference between academic and non-academic *involved persuasion*, according to Biber, is that the former is primarily informational.

Biber finds considerable variation among academic texts in the extent to which they argue for a particular point of view, rather than simply presenting informational findings, and considers non-persuasive texts - exemplified for him by social science texts - to be more typical of academic prose. Yet Mauaranen (1992) claims that most academic articles try to convince their readers of the factual status of the results presented, or to persuade readers of the validity of the argument put forth and many try to do both of these things, the overall rhetorical goal being high credibility. Allison (1995) considers the status and warrants of argument and assertions to be an important consideration in the humanities and social sciences that has parallels with attention to accuracy and rigour in the sciences. And, Eggins
et al (1993) claim that argument is the most prestigious type of text in history. Accordingly, the final section in this chapter looks more closely at argument.

2.1.2 LEXICOGRAMMATICAL FEATURES OF ACADEMIC WRITING

2.1.2.1 DETACHMENT

Chafe (1985) contrasts the fragmented and involved quality of spoken language with the integration and detachment of formal written language, reflecting the social isolation of the writer. Detachment manifests itself in the use of passives, abstract noun phrases, clauses as subjects, and the absence of first and second person pronouns and of devices indicating lively interest in the subject such as really and dozens of (Chafe and Danielewicz 1987, Chafe 1985, Martin et al 1985). Chafe and Danielewicz (1987) also see minimal use of reference to specific times and events by means of temporal and spatial adverbials as manifestations of detachment from concrete reality. Biber et al (1998) and Davies (1997) note the use of extrapolosed constructions such as It is possible that... in academic and expository writing respectively.

Martin (1985) notes the absence in analytical exposition of direct imperatives and requests for action, which involve the writer’s own desires, and minimal use of verbs of perceiving, feeling, thinking and saying; any emotive language is used for attacking misleading statements rather than expressing emotions or attitudes. People are referred to half as often as in hortatory exposition, and when they are it is experts who are referred to. Academic writers use hedges to avoid being blamed if counter-examples are found. They evaluate reliability of information in a more detached way, with words which reflect statistical reliability, such as essentially and generally (Chafe 1985), and express speculation more cautiously, with modals like should rather than must and words such as presumably. Unlike speakers, they rarely mention sensory or hearsay evidence but do include citations of information derived from another source.

2.1.2.2 INTEGRATION

Chafe (1982) uses the term integration to refer to the packing of more information into an idea unit than is normally allowed by the rapid pace of spoken language. Writers have more
time for deliberation and revision in choosing precisely the right expression to match what they want to say (Chafe and Danielewicz 1987), and for thinking of a number of ideas which may be integrated into a single information unit (Chafe 1982). This larger span of ideas can also be assimilated much more quickly by a reader than a listener (Chafe 1982).

Integration of several ideas in a single information unit can be done by means of a complex linguistic unit involving devices seldom used in speaking (Chafe 1982). Constructions which in spoken language are used with a one-new-idea-at-a-time constraint, for example noun phrases, can have an increased new-idea density in written language, as with complex noun phrases (Chafe 1992). In addition, the subject-predicate construction is exploited in writing with more grammatical subjects expressing new ideas in writing than in speaking (Chafe 1992).

The most frequently used linguistic devices for packing information into an idea unit are: prepositional phrases, attributive adjectives and nominalisation (Biber et al 1998, Biber 1988; Chafe and Danielewicz 1987, Chafe 1986). Other devices used for integration are: participles, constituents conjoined in pairs, constituents conjoined in series, complement clauses, restrictive relative clauses, adverbial phrases, indirect questions, and indirect quotations. Idea units are integrated into sentences by means of dependent clauses, appositive expressions in separate idea units, and participial clauses (Chafe 1985:109-112). All these features are especially evident in academic writing (Chafe and Danielewicz 1987).

2.1.2.3 LEXICAL DENSITY

Integration has been associated with lexical variation (Biber 1988, Chafe and Danielewicz 1987, Chafe 1986) and lexical density - the proportion of lexical items (content words) to the total discourse (Halliday 1987:61, Chafe and Danielewicz 1987:96, Martin 1985a). Greater lexical variation has been found to distinguish good writing from poor writing (Neuner 1987, cited by Yang 1989; Linnarud 1986, cited by Wikberg 1987), though not by Connor and Lauer (1985). Lexical density is higher in more reflective, less active and less spontaneous language (Halliday 1987:61, Ure 1971), and particularly high in texts which aim to impart information (Ure 1971:450). A lexical density of 60% has been found to be typical of formal written language, compared with around 40% or under for conversational language (Chafe 1992:289, Ure 1971:445).
Halliday (1987:73-4) attributes the lexical density of formal written English to use of complex noun phrases with recursive embedding, allowing open-ended absorption of lexical items, together with a low density of function words. Logical relations realised explicitly by conjunctions in spoken language are likely to be expressed incongruently by means of prepositional, noun or verb forms, or else remain implicit in written English (Martin 1985b). Written English thus has a much simpler sentence structure and fewer clauses, while spoken English, according to Halliday, is characterised by complexity in the clause complex and is less lexically dense. Because of the compact yet faceted and embedded form of its sentences, Halliday (1993a:66, 1987:66) describes written language as crystalline and dense and oriented towards things, with meanings related as components in superordinate structures, and processes represented as if they were things. Speech, on the other hand, is oriented towards events and spun-out, with meanings related serially (Halliday 1987:74).

Biber (1988:202) uses the terms *structural elaboration* and *lexical elaboration and precision* to distinguish between the complexity of spoken informational genres and that of planned written genres such as academic prose. Scientific exposition and learned exposition have a high concentration of nouns, prepositional phrases, attributive adjectives, relative clauses, long words, and varied vocabulary. There are few 'private' verbs, first and second person pronouns or contractions, and verbs are usually in the present tense. But scientific exposition has a more abstract and technical style, more conjuncts to mark logical relations between propositions, and more passives, being more concerned with entities being acted on rather than agents. Involved persuasion makes greater use of conditional subordination, first and second person pronouns, emphatics, hedges, suasive verbs, verbs expressing personal feelings and opinions and modals for prediction, necessity and possibility.

### 2.1.2.4 SENTENCE LENGTH

Sentences in academic writing have been found to be typically between 23 and 26 words in length (MacDonald 1990, Chafe and Danielewicz 1987:105), with those in humanities prose being longer than those in science (MacDonald 1990). MacDonald associates extreme sentence length with extreme use of nominalisation and gives an example from literary criticism which is 177 words in length and contains a list of complex noun phrases involving nominalisation, one of which consists of 49 words.
2.1.2.5 NOMINAL CHARACTER

It can be seen from the above that academic writing is nominal in character. Noun phrases permit high information content and subtle shades of meaning because of their potential for expansion by means of pre- and postmodification, which in turn may have embedded noun phrases with modification; recursive embedding of both prepositional phrases and relative clauses in postmodification is common in academic writing (Chafe and Danielewicz 1987:98, Chafe 1986:22, Ellegard 1978), contributing to its characteristically greater sentence length. Noun modification is easier to manipulate and more versatile than modification of the verb (Nickel 1968:15-16, Rensky 1966, Jespersen 1933), while noun phrases permit flexibility in packaging information because of their freedom of movement within the clause; 'There are a lot of things that can only be said in nominal constructions' (Halliday 1985c:73).

Dubois (1981) tracks the gradual build-up of complex premodification throughout sections of medical research papers as a result of progressive movement of content from rheme through post-head to pre-head position as new information becomes given, reflecting the writer’s assessment of the recoverability of the information. This process can culminate in a noun phrase in the last sentence of a discourse unit with complex premodification containing several elements of information, each previously introduced into the text separately in rheme. Dubois maintains that the discourse function of such a noun phrase at the end of the introduction section of one of her biomedical journal articles is to delimit this section of text, while the construction of noun phrases of smaller scope serves to mark off subsections.

Horsella and Perez (1991) discuss the variety and complexity of the semantic relations possible between the component parts of compound nouns, and illustrate how particular kinds of semantic relation can characterise different text types in science, distinguishing between college textbooks, undergraduate level literature and highly technical papers. Bartolic (1978) notes a gradation in the length of nominal compounds in scientific English, ranging up to six nouns preceding the head noun, and suggests such compounds have developed from noun phrases with embedded phrases in postmodification functioning as shortened forms of definitions.
2.1.2.6 NOMINALISATION

The useful resource afforded by noun phrases may be expanded by means of nominalisation, which also results in more abstract text, and so contributes to the formal, detached, objective tone appropriate for academic exposition. Nominalisation, 'a means of packing a sentence into a bundle which fits into other sentences' (Vendler 1967:125), is one of the three main ways of packing information into idea units identified by Chafe. This is the most common form of grammatical metaphor, Halliday's term for noncongruent grammatical realisation of meaning, as when nouns realise processes instead of verbs, or realise attributes instead of adjectives.

The term nominalisation embraces a variety of constructions, ranging from finite what- or that-clauses and infinitival constructions at the least nominalised extreme, through -ing constructions exhibiting different degrees of 'nounness', to phrases with a derived nominal head arrived at by morphological derivation. Huddleston (1988:103-105) groups the various forms of nominalisation under three headings: (1) subordination of clauses; (2) noun phrases without noun heads, as in The strong should help the weak, and conversion, as in She's an intellectual (conversion from the adjective intellectual); (3) affixation and compounding. Vendler (1967) uses the terms imperfect for nominalisations which still have a verbal character, being able to incorporate tense, auxiliaries and adverbs, and perfect for more noun-like nominalisations, which can take articles, prenominal adjectives and the objective genitive. Eggins et al (1993) use the terms grammatical metaphor and nominalisation with regard to nouns which are not the product of any of the processes Huddleston lists as types of nominalisation. For instance, they describe the phrase medieval ways as a case of nominalised action although the noun ways is not derived from a verb. And they discuss the way history discourse replaces sequence in time, realised by conjunctions and adverbs like before, after and then, with setting in time, which may involve technicalised names for periods of time, such as the Renaissance.

Nominalisation permits a process, attribute or conjunctive relation to become a participant in clause structure and so be moved around within the clause to whatever position best suits the discourse requirements. Information which would otherwise be distributed across several clauses can be compressed into one noun phrase. This makes nominalisation a powerful discourse-organising device when it summarises the content of preceding stretches.
of text. The potential of the noun phrase for semantic complexity permits depth of information while the informational compactness of the nominalisation contributes to ease of processing by helping the reader to concentrate on the essence of the line of reasoning (Dressler & Barbaresi 1987, Martin 1985). Suomela-Salmi (1992:258) points out that such summarising nominalisation at the beginning of a new paragraph simultaneously ensures cohesion and the dynamic progression of the text: it marks explicitly what is to be conserved and what can be wiped off the mental blackboard, while pre- and post-modification within the noun phrase allow the narrowing down of the scope of what may have previously been discussed in general terms.

Nominalisation contributes to clarity by permitting economy of expression and by simplifying sentence structure. The relationships between ideas are made explicit and lucid when the information in complex noun phrases is brought structurally into immediate relation with the verb, and, if it is a relational verb, with other noun phrases. Halliday (1967:23) notes that one-clause sentences with this structure are characteristic of scientific writing, where the noun phrases frequently represent processes and the verb expresses a relationship such as cause and effect between these processes. He observes that nominalisation can present an idea as if its truth is taken for granted, and that when both subject and complement of a relational verb are realised by nominalisations, the relationship between the entities taken for granted is foregrounded rather than the semantic content of a verb (Halliday 1993b:78, 1987:78). Martin (1985b) comments that reasoning with nouns such as cause rather than conjunctions is typical of analytical exposition, a means of strengthening the argument and making it less vulnerable to attack by burying the reasoning and presenting it as unassailable fact.

Nominalisation enables a writer to omit information when expedient by omitting agents and complements and marking for tense, perhaps to conceal or minimise the fact that he does not know who the agent is or avoid having to list numerous agents or provide details associated with an event or state of affairs. The omission of agent and tense marking and use of a noun instead of a more dynamic verb can also make the expression of meaning more abstract and impersonal, distancing it from the writer and and therefore creating an impression of objectivity. Together with the presentation of an idea as taken for granted, this can lead to ambiguity as to whether a consensus or partisan view is being expressed and so covertly
present an ideological point of view with a spurious objectivity in discourse whose actual purpose is covertly ideological (Lemke 1990, Thibault 1991).

### 2.1.2.7 DISCOURSE ORGANISING NOUNS

Many nominalisations are *discourse-organising nouns*. This is a category of nouns which have also been called labels (Francis 1994), discourse-organising words (McCarthy 1991), carrier nouns (Ivanic 1991), procedural vocabulary (McCarthy 1991, Widdowson 1983), text-structuring words (King 1989; Carter and McCarthy 1988), anaphoric nouns (Francis 1986), generic nouns (Jordan 1985), summative expressions (Weissberg 1984), general nouns (Halliday and Hasan 1976) and container nouns (Vendler 1968, 1967). They are nouns such as *reason, summary, conclusion, aspect* and *chapter*, which point forwards or backwards to their specific lexical realisation elsewhere in the text, either within the same noun phrase, the same clause or sentence, in an adjacent or nearby sentence, or across a considerable stretch of text.

In their anaphoric and cataphoric function discourse-organising nouns resemble pronouns but are more informative, being lexical items with semantic content. They can be used to chunk, summarise, reformulate, label and evaluate text, and so signal to the reader how segments of text are to be interpreted as well as how they relate to the text structure. For instance, Dressler and Barbaresi (1987) note the clarification function of the word *suggestion*, which can summarise a preceding stretch of text, signal how it is to be interpreted and specify the degree of commitment of the speaker or writer to the validity of a proposal. Such words interest them from a morphopragmatic perspective, as illustrations of how derivation and compounding can have a text pragmatic role.

These nouns can have a powerful text-organising function. They participate in relations between unspecificness and specificness, which Winter (1992) sees as one of the two most fundamental text-organising connections inside and outside the sentence, the other being systematic repetition of the clause and its topic. As noted by Meyer and Rice (1982), when words such as *problem* and *solution* indicate larger text patterns and build up expectations about the shape of the whole discourse, they enable the reader to assign an appropriate schema to the text. Words such as *constraints* and *demands*, which combine signalling of macrostructural components with evaluation, have been found to be a distinguishing feature.
between good student essays and poor student essays (Peters 1986). When the same sentence contains both forward-pointing (cataphoric) nouns and backward-pointing (anaphoric) nouns, it can act as a sort of pivot on the boundary between sections of text, wrapping up the preceding section and tying it to the next section while indicating how the next section will carry the development of ideas forward. Thus, Francis (1986) finds these nouns tend to occur at the beginning of paragraphs, relating the orthographic appearance of text to the non-linear structuring of information. In this earlier work she uses the term anaphoric nouns for backward-pointing discourse-organising nouns, but later (1994) she refers to them as retrospective labels and to forward-pointing discourse-organising nouns as advance labels.

These functions arising from the lexical content of such words are enhanced by their versatility as nouns: not only do they have freedom of movement within clause structure, there is potential within noun phrase structure for different types of reference depending on the choice of determiner and for expansion of information content by means of other modification. Indeed, Francis (1994) asserts that writers often choose this labelling device precisely because of the modification options it offers, and that labels are often primarily carriers for their modifiers. The combination of determiner and discourse-organising noun in a phrase such as several reasons neatly indicates to the reader not only what sort of discourse relation to look out for but also how many instances to expect (Ivanic, 1991); Francis (1994) notes how what she calls textual modifiers - words such as same, similar, different, next, another, second and third - contribute directly to the organisational role of labels by contrasting and sequencing items. Modifiers can restrict the range of reference or provide evaluative comment on a preceding stretch of discourse, as in the phrase this preposterous suggestion (Francis, 1994; Ivanic, 1991), where retrospective summative reference is combined with evaluation.

Francis divides labels into non-metalinguistic and metalinguistic according to whether they refer to something in the world outside the text or signal text-internal relations or illocutionary force. Winter (1992) points out that metalinguistic non-specific nouns from his Vocabulary 3 class (1977, 1975), such as reason, signal text-internal relations by labelling both the kind of message realised by a particular clause and the kind of relation which exists between this clause and another clause, whereas metalinguistic non-specific nouns which signal illocutionary force, like suggestion, label the kind of message realised
by one or more clauses rather than a relation between clauses. Francis (1994) excludes signals of logical relations from her categorisation of metalinguistic labels, which include illocutionary nouns such as *suggestion*, typically having cognate illocutionary verbs; language activity nouns such as *account*, which are similar but do not have cognate illocutionary verbs; mental process nouns, such as *belief, thesis, view*, which refer to cognitive states and processes and their products; and text nouns such as *paper, section*, which refer to another location within the same text.

Gosden (1993) provides nouns from several of Francis’s categories as illustrations of grammatical subjects which refer to what he calls the discourse domain (*interpretation, conclusion, argument, explanation, observation, description, paper, report, thesis*) and the hypothesised and objectivised domain (*a significant difference, the most surprising feature, one of the factors, further evidence*). He finds some of these noun phrases have a high degree of evaluative modification, often with strongly cohesive anaphoric reference. Tadros (1994) includes both metalinguistic and non-metalinguistic cataphoric nouns in her *predictive categories* in expository text, which consist of prospective rhetorical devices which commit the writer at one point in the text to a future discourse act. Thus she includes the nouns *reasons, aspects and advantages*, as well as what she calls discourse reference nouns, such as *definition, classification, example*. She uses the term *advance labelling* for prospective labelling of an act of discourse. She also looks at associated enumeration and other determiners such as *two, three, a few, several*.

Mauranen (1993) uses the term *text reflexivity* for metalinguistic nouns which realise an author’s comment on or reference to his own text rather than to other texts. She finds that text references mostly contain a demonstrative element which typically points backwards in the text with the entire noun phrase compressing the content of previous stretches of text into a participant in a new proposition and providing the starting point for what is to follow, so that the text develops in a certain direction and the argument in the text appears well integrated. When text references are nested one within another, the argument appears as a hierarchy of interwoven arguments which develop to a culmination point by progressively building on earlier steps. Mauranen suggests these features are typical of well-formed texts and that it would be interesting to see whether data from different disciplines could uncover varying preferences or rhetorical strategies in different discipline areas. Francis (1994) also advocates studying various genres to determine the incidence and range of labels, and the
modifiers and lexical and syntactic contexts associated with them. Both she and Ivanic (1991) suggest discourse-organising vocabulary is most readily found in non-narrative texts in which the author presents views and arguments, and is therefore particularly prevalent in academic discourse.

2.1.2.8 THIS, THAT and SUCH

Francis comments on a similarity in function between a label and demonstrative this, used as a pro-form. Mauranen (1992) notes frequent use of selective demonstrative reference by means of this in medical academic texts, and suggests it compensates for the relatively infrequent use of pronouns in academic writing. In making explicit which particular referential connection is being made, this provides a compromise between the explicitness of a lexical noun phrase and the identifying ability of anaphoric pronouns. She suggests it gives a sense of the writer closely following the same argument and contributes to solidarity between writer and reader by implying they are looking at things from the same perspective.

For McCarthy (1994), analysis of the use of this and that sheds light on the status of paragraphs and other discourse segments and how writers structure their arguments, create foci of attention in texts and signal desired interpretations.

Demonstrative this can occur unattended (Geisler et al 1985), as noun phrase head, or as a determiner in a noun phrase with a lexical head (attended), and can be co-referential with a preceding noun phrase, a clause or a longer stretch of text. Describing this as discourse-deictic, Lakoff (1974) notes that it may refer forwards or backwards, but it must refer to something mentioned specifically in the previous sentence rather than inferrable; in speech, it may be used only if the two sentences are uttered by the same speaker, or to comment immediately on a prior remark by another speaker. Mauranen (1993) finds this as noun phrase Head usually refers to the content of the preceding sentence or of a longer stretch of text ending with the preceding sentence, while this together with an anaphoric noun (Francis's label) can have a referent further back in the text. According to Geisler et al, both attended this and unattended this pick out the central predication of the preceding discourse and bring it newly into focus for further discussion.

Whereas ordinary pronouns continue with topics already in focus, unattended this can also bring an out-of-focus topic into focus (McCarthy 1994). Geisler et al find it refers to a topic
already in focus, as long as nothing has so far been predicated of that topic other than its existence, as in We now turn to a disease called cancer This is an illness that has... When attended this refers to a topic which is already in focus, it serves to emphasise or further characterise the topic, as when reference to it is made with a different noun, introducing a new perspective on it. It can also bring back into focus a topic which has recently been introduced in an out-of-focus position, perhaps in a subordinate constituent of a clause or clause complex, or one which has slipped out of focus because other topics have subsequently been introduced. Unattended this has the virtue of economy while attended this has the advantage of clarity and of being exploited for emphasis or further characterisation (Geisler et al).

Both Lakoff and McCarthy associate that with distancing. According to McCarthy, whereas this indicates a new item is taking over as a focus of attention, that indicates a new item has already taken over. It seems to refer back from the current focus, across a focus boundary, to a topical entity or proposition previously in focus, often for the purpose of marginalising it, rejecting its validity or importance to an argument, or else attributing it to a third party.

A determiner used in a similar way for anaphoric reference, though almost always with a noun, is such. Harweg (1994) suggests that with both this and such there is implicit inclusion of the predicate of a preceding clause or sentence, unlike ordinary pronouns, which can only be co-referential with a preceding noun phrase. This is even more the case with such, which appears to him to detach the predicate from the antecedent and transfer it to another entity, thereby increasing its informational load. He suggests therefore that, strictly speaking, a noun phrase with such cannot be interpreted as anaphoric, or at least not as a co-referential anaphoric of the antecedent.

2.1.2.9 PRESUMING VERSUS PRESENTING REFERENCE

Academic writing is often described as decontextualised and highly explicit, reflected in more frequent use of endophoric than exophoric reference. Mauranen (1993) associates the high level of explicitness with frequent use of esphoric reference, in which the identity of the referent is recoverable from modification within the noun phrase. Jacobs (1989) observes that in newspaper editorials esphoric reference enables the writer to dispense with unnecessary preliminaries and get straight to the point, while catering for both the informed
and the uninformed reader at the same time. The former is not faced with an assertion of information already known as if it were new, while the noun phrase contains sufficient information to compensate the uninformed reader for lack of background information and at the same time flatters him by treating him as if he were more knowledgeable than he really is. Similarly, esphoric reference allows the academic writer to cater for both specialist and non-specialist reader within the same discipline. Dillon (1991) considers such reference in history discourse to be an indication that it is not necessary to look further for information - what is provided is sufficient for the present purposes.

There is a high level of presupposition in scholarly and technical texts. Love (1993), for instance, notes how premodification in geology texts allows the writer to compress information by presupposing specific detail, often in participle forms. Presuming reference strengthens the factual status of a proposition and avoids stating the obvious, while it also throws the categorical assertions, or presenting reference, into relief. The degree of commitment to assertions can be varied by choosing between presupposition, realised by noun phrases, and categorical assertion, realised clausally (Allison 1995). Skilled manipulation of these options results in directness and force in argument, which helps convince the reader of the strength of claims, an important goal of academic writing (Mauranen 1992).

But the information in the noun phrase is often not recoverable from previous mention in the text; instead, there is exophoric reference of the kind termed homophoric (Mauranen 1992), which assumes the information to be part of the knowledge the expert reader brings to the text. The context of shared background information available to the informed reader allows the writer to strike a careful balance between what needs to be said and what can be assumed (Sinclair 1993), but can mean a text is impenetrable for non-specialist readers (Levi 1978). As Dillon (1991) observes with reference to academic history discourse, a definite noun phrase which does not provide sufficient information indicates a gap in the reader’s knowledge and that it might be advisable to go and find out the background information.
2.2 HISTORY

2.2.1 THE METHODOLOGY OF HISTORY

From her survey of literature on the methodology of history MacDonald (1994) concludes there is an identity crisis within the discipline, arising from both a tension between the knowledge-making mode of the humanities and that of the social sciences, and a split within the humanities between knowing what and knowing why. The issue, as she sees it, is whether there is some knowledge, form of reasoning, or rhetoric distinctive to history as a discipline or whether history is, in effect, an interdisciplinary field with no content or logic of its own, needing to borrow concepts and modes of explanation from other disciplines.

History has always been distinguished from the sciences by its narrative rhetoric but in the twentieth century this rhetoric became more analytic (Langer 1992; Megill and McCloskey 1987). In the 1960s, the eminent Tudor historian Elton (1967) categorised historical works as either description, analysis or narrative, with the first two being rarely divorced in practice and both often involved in the third. Description provides an account of, for example, an institution at a particular point in time, without the dimension of change over time, and is to be distinguished from antiquarianism, or devotion to detail for its own sake and a desire to know rather than to understand. Analysis sets the thing described in a wider context, identifying relationships and establishing causal connections and motives. Proper narrative history is distinguished from chronicle, the mere recording of events one after another without discrimination and forerunner, according to Elton, of the more uninspired modern university textbooks.

Elton’s definition of analysis accords with Munz’s (1977, cited in Mink 1981) assertion that the characteristic historical act is construction, that is the assembling of sub-events into events and events into larger events, by means of generalisation. Dray (1981) uses the term colligation for this placing of ‘events in their context by tracing a myriad of connections between them and other events with a view to discovering and characterising the larger historical wholes which they jointly compose’, and speaks of ‘colligating events under appropriate conceptions, for example, ‘the rise of the gentry’, ‘the evolution of Parliament’. He cites Walsh’s (1967) claim that historians find meaning in some rather arbitrarily limited stretch of historical space and time by seeking out dominant trends or pervasive themes.
Martin (1993a, b) and Eggins et al (1993) also see generalisation, about sets of behaviours, periods of time and so on, as characteristic of history discourse, though their observations are based on examination of school history textbooks rather than mature history discourse.

MacDonald (1994) attributes the focus on generalising or synthesizing, apparent by the 1960s, to the prestige of the social sciences and the influence of the philosophy of history in a climate of logical positivism, but notes that the traditional historical concern with particulars remained too, especially with the new interest in social history. She sees a tension between conceptually-driven, explanatory discourse, which generalizes about historical processes, and discourse which elucidates local particulars. According to Megill and McCloskey (1987), some historians see themselves as soberly writing up what is in the archives, first gathering discrete disconnected facts and then, in a separate operation, inducing generalisations, as if the main work of historians were 'squirrelish nut-gathering' (p223). But they also observe that professional historians nowadays are less likely than past historians to make confident generalisations, being more aware of the quantitative nature of their judgments, subject to quantitative tests, and the need to question their evidence. This suggests a view of history as objective scientific enquiry.

Langer (1992) sees a further shift, to history as interpretation. She finds in history, as in other disciplines, an increasing focus in instruction on the tentative nature of truth, and the need for active questioning and interpreting rather than a simple accumulation of facts - a shift away from the idea of a verifiable, constant and stable body of knowledge towards the view that meaning is fluid and depends on individual interpretation in the light of new evidence. As Mink (1981) puts it: 'the professionally recognised mode of innovation is to put new questions to old archives or old questions to new archives'. The more distant the historical period, the more fragmentary the documentation is likely to be, as noted by Verne (1971, 1984, cited in Megill and McCloskey, 1987); Eggins et al's (1993) term 'the recoverable past' is an apt one. Yet, though the truth may not be proved conclusively, even today historians can present their generalisations with an air of confidence so long as there is a substantial body of evidence to support them. As Goldstein (1976, cited in Pompa and Dray 1981) puts it: 'an historical hypothesis, perhaps starting as little more than an intelligent guess, is progressively confirmed by its relation to evidence of many different kinds, assessed from many different directions, including much argument from probability, with the historian coming to have an increasing degree of conviction about the hypothesis'.
There may be several equally plausible interpretations of the same facts (Maimon et al 1981, cited in Dillon 1991). This gives rise to argument, said to be the most prestigious type of history text (Eggins et al 1993): 'the discourse of history is argument in which evidence and the interpretation of evidence are crucial but do not issue in one right answer' (Bizzel 1982, cited in Dillon 1991). Argument provides a framework within which the historian is able to present new facts, as support for the argument. The prominence of argument in history is often noted (e.g. Eggins et al 1993; Megill and McCloskey 1987; Bizzel 1982, cited in Dillon 1991). All the historians interviewed by Stockton (1995) saw history as argument, or taking a stance, debating someone else's interpretation of the facts. According to Walsh (1967, cited in Gorman 1981): 'the interpretations of one historian are indignantly repudiated by another'. But Stockton points out that, though overtly oppositional, the writing of historians is implicitly collaborative and therefore constructive.

Walvoord and McCarthy (1990) assert that opinionated argument is what makes what professional historians do different from study of history in high school. Martin (1993) describes school history textbooks as long generalised recounts of what happened, within which reports and, more occasionally, exposition are embedded. Eggins et al (1993) identify three types of text in school history textbooks: story-like, report and argument. Story-like text is concerned with specific individuals and sequence in time, and frequently provides supporting evidence or examples for more abstract generalisations. Report provides supporting evidence by focusing on generic classes of people and periods of time, as when a chapter has an introduction giving a precis of the relevant facts and indicating the general questions the chapter is going to address. Argument employs exemplification in discussing arguments either for or against a proposition, leading to a conclusion which sums up the argument.

It is original argument which should be the proper pursuit of university students, according to Langer (1992): they should grasp the concept of conflicting opinions in print, recognise and adopt a critical approach to the opinions of others, develop their own opinions on controversial issues and, with supporting evidence, argue them against opposing points of view. Yet Stockton (1995) finds a discrepancy between what university history teachers say their students should be doing - argument - and what they actually expect of them: at lower levels, organising relevant information into taxonomies of cause and effect, and at upper
levels, complex narrative rooted in the logic of cause and effect, in which argument is subordinated to storyline.

MacDonald notes that many historians value good writing, and historical writing has been said to resemble literature more than other academic disciplines in the value placed on style and flourish, with the voice of the author perhaps more prominent than in a social science or science text. Style is valued by Trevelyan (1903, cited in Megill and McCloskey 1987), who ascribes three functions or operations to history: the scientific, whereby historians first accumulate facts and sift evidence; the imaginative, involving guesses and the making of generalisations; and, after all this, the literary exposition of the results of science and imagination in a form that will attract and educate. But Megill and McCloskey disagree with this separation of the structure of historiography from the nature of evidence and inference. They claim that style is integral to the work of history, as the rhetoric of persuasion supplies the standards of relevance for inclusion or exclusion of evidence and points.

Thus several views of the historian at work emerge: the historian painstakingly assembling a body of facts, the historian objectively and scientifically presenting evidence to support generalisations, the historian tentatively suggesting an interpretation of fragmentary evidence, and the historian vigorously arguing the case for a particular interpretation. And several types of rhetorical organisation appear to feature in historical writing: description, narrative, cause and effect, and argument, of which argument is viewed as the most prestigious type (Eggins et al 1993). In addition, there is the impression that some historians at least take pains with the style of their writing.

Biber et al (1998:160-1, 169) find that history research articles, though considerably more narrative than ecology research articles, are relatively non-narrative when compared to general fiction, and note that it is therefore misleading to characterise history as very narrative. As noted earlier in this chapter, history discourse would seem to fall into Biber’s category general narrative exposition in being primarily informational and expository while moderately narrative, except that he finds texts in this category are not very learned or persuasive, which conflicts with the the view of history discourse as indignant and opinionated argument and repudiation put forward by Walsh (1967, cited in Gorman 1981) and Walvoord and McCarthy (1990). And historians would presumably object to their
discourse being described as not very learned. But Biber’s learned exposition and involved persuasion are non-narrative, and the former is also non-persuasive. However, Biber does allow for the fact that some texts are peripheral with regard to his categories, sharing features of more than one category. He also notes (1989:39, 1988:198) that involved persuasion requires further study.

Perhaps Martin et al’s persuasive analytical exposition, which argues a case for a particular interpretation of how the world is, is more accommodating. The three sub-categories interpretive, evaluative or argumentative allow for the variation in history discourse which the differing perspectives on what a historian does would lead one to expect. Interpretive exposition presents an interpretation of raw material backed up with relevant examples; evaluative exposition justifies a particular evaluation of certain data according to given criteria; and argumentative exposition supplies reasons for supporting a particular thesis.

Amongst today’s historians there may be a range of views as to the methodology they are engaged in, reflected in a range of ways of presenting evidence albeit within the same discipline and genre, the academic journal article. If so, such differences could well result in differences in linguistic expression, so that analysis of history text might reveal not only lexicogrammatical forms which history discourse has in common with other academic discourse, and those which distinguish history discourse from the discourse of other disciplines, but also linguistic choices which distinguish one type of history text from another, reflecting different views of the methodology of history. As MacDonald (1994:156) observes, not only do we know far less about the degree of standardisation and the conventions of academic history journal articles than those in science, we also know little about whether there is a high degree of homogeneity from one writer to another within any particular discourse community in the humanities. The present study makes a small contribution to knowledge about both standardisation and variation in linguistic choices in history discourse by examining the lexicogrammatical choices in the four journal articles.

2.2.2 LEXICOGRAMMATICAL FEATURES OF HISTORY DISCOURSE

Lexicogrammatical features of history discourse have been described by Eggins et al (1993) and Martin (1993) with regard to school history textbooks, and by MacDonald (1994, 1992), Thetela (1997) and Biber et al (1998) with regard to academic history journal articles.
Egginse et al (1993) range the three types of text in school history textbooks - story-like, report and argument - along a continuum of abstraction, with history at its most abstract in argument. They consider grammatical metaphor, particularly nominalisation, to be a key feature in achieving this abstraction, and that the range of abstraction is reflected in a corresponding range of use of grammatical metaphor, which is most dense in argument. Grammatical metaphor enables the historian to generalise experience and so get beyond talking about the behaviour of individuals at specific moments in time and relating events in temporal order. Instead, sets of behaviours and periods of time are presented within some other kind of rhetorical organisation, achieving a distance between the historical facts and the way they get written about and permitting interpretation of the past rather than straightforward story-telling. In argument, the focus is on classes of people, actions presented as entities, and non-human participants of time and place.

Martin (in Halliday and Martin 1993:226) finds reports in secondary school history textbooks classify and describe in order to generalise across classes of participants, and occasionally rearrange old knowledge by arranging generic classes with respect to each other in new ways (p 233) by means of intensive attributive classifying relational processes, as in Women became full-time members of the armed forces in the south, and also descriptive attributive relational processes, which instead of assigning a participant to a more general class ascribe some quality to it, as in The local militia kept villages fortified with trenches, traps...(p 232). Historical explanations are expository, foregrounding internal rather than external conjunctive relations, such as exemplification, restatement and specification, with very little of this internal conjunctive structure made explicit (p 233). Reasoning is realised inside rather than between clauses, which entails nominalising events as participants and verbalising the logical relation between them (p 228). But Martin (p 226) finds the discourse of these textbooks similar to that of English literature textbooks in that there is an absence of technical terms other than a small set referring to periods of time (the Middle Ages, the Dark Ages, the Renaissance) and some -isms and other terms usually borrowed from other disciplines (e.g. socialism, capitalism, market forces).

Similarly, but with regard to academic history journal articles, MacDonald (1992) found nearly half the grammatical subjects of sentences referred to generalised categories of agents. But she also notes that humanities fields are more particularistic than science and
finds the history articles in her sample tend to occupy a middle ground between psychology articles and literature articles in degree of particularism, and also as regards what she calls ‘negotiating knowledge claims within a research community, realised by grammatical subjects which refer to research methods and interpretation. The percentage of such subjects in her history sample was 21, as opposed to 61% in the psychology and 12% in the literature articles. She suggests that humanities fields might be comparatively constrained by a lack of generalisable patterns from building elaborate epistemic frameworks for negotiating knowledge claims. Thetela (1997) finds the balance between research oriented evaluation and topic-oriented evaluation to be unevenly distributed throughout history journal articles compared with articles in other academic disciplines, with the latter dominant and the former typically concentrated in the introduction and the conclusion sections and very sporadic in the body of the article. She also finds history uses strikingly evaluative lexis to provide vivid images of past events.

Biber et al (1998:165) also find many passages concentrate on people or social groups, history being focused on human events. But they also note features of impersonal style: past participial reduced relatives which are often used to elaborate a referent, and passive voice when abstractions are discussed or when human agents are not the focus of concern. The history texts in their sample interweave narration of past events with discussion of the problems being addressed or the current importance of historical events, thus having both narrative and non-narrative concerns. Thus, though Chafe and Danielewicz (1987) characterise academic writing as detached from concrete reality, there is variation across disciplines, with reference to specific people, times and places to be expected in history and literature studies, and even across sections of a journal article, with reference to specific objects, times and places to be expected in the methods sections of scientific papers. The impression gained from this brief review of the literature on history suggests, however, that more generalised reference, to classes of people and periods of time, is more characteristic of academic history discourse, and that, while it is far from being purely narrative in text type, it is not as abstract as academic writing in some other disciplines.
2.3 ARGUMENT

2.3.1 RHETORICAL FEATURES

Connor et al (1988) note confusion in the literature over whether argument is the same as persuasion. Traditional classifications of discourse into description, narration, exposition, argumentation and persuasion have separated the two, whereas Connor et al view argument as one component of persuasion. They define the former - 'rational argument' - as sober appeal to objectivity, reason and scientific principles, whereas the latter - 'emotional argument' - is more subjective, humanistic and rhetorical. Their category of persuasion seems to extend further into the academic sphere than Biber's involved persuasion, since they see this type of argument as particularly appropriate in the humanities and the arts whereas he finds the involved persuasion text type uncharacteristic of academic prose, with only 9% of the academic texts in his sample falling into this category. Outside the academic sphere, the range in both cases appears to embrace what Martin et al term hortatory exposition.

Traditional classifications would categorise purely explanatory academic prose in the sciences as exposition, and it is labelled factual analytical exposition in Martin et al's taxonomy. But science prose which presents any sort of argument would seem to merit the term argument, though not persuasion, as these terms are used by Connor et al, and so fall into Martin et al's category of persuasive analytical exposition, which would therefore include text types ranging from what Connor et al term argument, in the sense of sober, rational appeal, to those they term persuasion, or argument involving more subjective appeal and more rhetorical flourish. Perhaps the two terminologies could be reconciled if Martin et al's category of persuasive analytical exposition were renamed argument, and the sub-category, argumentative exposition, within this category either retained its name or was renamed persuasive exposition.

When it is claimed that 'Argument is at the heart of most academic disciplines' (Connor et al 1998:157), and that historians view history as argument (Stockton 1995) and engage in opinionated argument (Walvoord and McCarthy 1990) indignantly repudiating the interpretations of other historians (Walsh 1967, cited in Stockton 1995), the word argument appears to mean both persuasion and argument in Connor et al's terms, the full range of
persuasive analytical exposition in Martin et al's terms and more of Biber's categories than just involved persuasion. Biber does not have a separate category for texts which present arguments without being markedly 'argumentative' and persuasive, but he does note that the academic texts in his involved persuasion category are peripheral since they are highly informational rather than involved (affective and interactional). Since the peripheral texts in this category constitute only 9% of the academic texts in his sample, many of the academic texts which fall into three of his other categories - scientific exposition, learned exposition and general narrative exposition - must be of types which others would recognise as argument, if not persuasion.

In the present analysis, the term argument is used in the broad sense of presenting an interpretation, evaluation or thesis supported by relevant illustrations, data or reasons, with the aim of demonstrating its correctness to the reader, irrespective of the degree of force, or rhetorical flourish used to persuade the reader. Within this broad category, texts which present the argument with greater force and rhetorical flourish are described as more highly rhetorical. Academic argument can be seen as ultimately collaborative even at its most argumentative. As Barton (1995) observes, in the process of arguing backwards and forwards over familiar territory by means of claims and counter-claims, academic texts weave additional facts into the argument, leading to greater precision of knowledge. Similarly, Connor et al (1988:157) observes that academic disciplines 'proceed by a series of additive steps in which argument is used to test each new step or turn of the discipline'.

Hyland (1990) outlines a three-stage macro-level move structure: thesis, argument and conclusion. Within this structure, the argument consists of claims - direct assertions in support of the thesis - and counterclaims - assertions which support the thesis by responding to potential distractions or criticisms (Barton 1995). Claims need to be supported by data for which there are warrants - links between the evidence and shared knowledge and values which validate the data. Allison (1995) notes the need to neither overstate nor understate claims in relation to the evidence presented or assumptions that might reasonably be made about shared knowledge and values, and suggests it would be useful to investigate when it is appropriate to make a categorical assertion. Freedman (1984) also notes the importance of strong writer commitment, which, he says, derives from knowledge about the topic, which gives the writer power over both the topic and the audience and results in writing that has force, authority and definiteness.
Evensen (1990b) examines the foregrounding of claims and data and the backgrounding of warrants, explanations, illustrations and material establishing a context for the argument, and points out the importance of sufficient background material as a measure of argumentative written competence at secondary levels of education. Lindeberg (1985) also finds good writing has more subordinate propositions per topic or sub-topic. She examines the patterns of functional roles - 'assert', 'cause', 'contrast', 'evaluate', 'result', specify' - in expository and argumentative writing which contribute to coherence, and finds good writing features more developmental roles, which elaborate on an item previously introduced, particularly 'specify'; frequent combinations of 'assert-contrast-specify'; and a higher percentage of roles that indicate movement upwards in levels of generality, such as 'summarise', 'generalise' and 'conclude'. Tirkonnen-Condit (1985) lists the rhetorical relations associated with argument as antithesis, contrast, evaluation, concession, evidence and justify.

### 2.3.2 Lexicogrammatical Features of Argument

Allison (1995) suggests it would be useful to study the effects of alternative linguistic choices on consistency of argumentation and levels of writer commitment throughout a text. Contrastive language in particular is considered characteristic of academic argumentation. In introduction sections to academic journal articles, for instance, it enables the author to establish and occupy a niche (Swales 1990) by indicating differences between the author's claims and those of previous scholarship, with the latter often being introduced with a non-contrastive connective and the writer's own claim in response with a contrastive connective, emphasising its significance (Barton, 1995, 1993; Hunston 1993; MacDonald 1987).

Barton found the predominant method of argumentation in her academic corpus was the presentation and development of claims, but there were also frequent counter-claims, appearing in a two-part structure in which the first part, introduced by a non-contrastive connective, mentioned the potentially detracting information or competing interpretation, and the second part, introduced by a contrastive connective, presented a counterclaim in response. She found that 33% of the claims in her sample were highlighted with some connective expression, and in 72% of these cases this expression was contrastive. Most of these claims marked by contrastive connective expressions - 14% of the overall total of
claims- occurred in two-part structures, as did 71% of the counterclaims. The use of a two-part structure permits the use of contrastive language, which explicitly sets up opposition and calls attention to what is being stated. It also allows links across paragraph boundaries: she found the primary signalling device for presenting a claim or a counterclaim was the use of a new paragraph, typically with the first sentence presenting the claim and the second the counterclaim.

Some of the examples Barton gives of connectives used in the presentation of claims and counterclaims are: 1) contrastive connectives which explicitly set up opposition: but, however, nevertheless, on the contrary, yet; 2) non-contrastive connectors explicitly denying opposition: of course, true enough, to be sure, granted, still; 3) other non-contrastive connective expressions used in the presentation of claims: thus, as a result, first, second, at the same time, in short, it should be no surprise that, I would argue that: 4) other non-contrastive connective expressions used in the presentation of counterclaims: it seems to me that, advocates overlook the fact that, the view seems to assume. Most of the connectives in the first and second categories are markers of concession, which is a two part relation consisting of claim and counter-claim. As will be seen, concessive contrast is the predominant form of contrast in the history texts examined in the present research.

Barton suggests that presenting two claims in a two-part structure with a linking contrastive connective is an indication of shared emphasis between writers and readers in an academic community that values contrast as a basis for creating knowledge via argument, and also that the combination of contrastive and non-contrastive connective expressions to emphasise claims and mitigate counterclaims within two-part structures serves interpersonal purposes of politeness within the academic community, which places a high value on criticism in academic writing but which also values politeness and solidarity. She suggests it would be worthwhile examining what other conventions of politeness might be operating in various genres of argumentation in written language.

Different types of thematic progression, elaborated on in the next chapter, have been associated with argument and persuasion. Signalling of the general-particular relation in professional argumentative text is said to depend crucially on choices in theme and rheme, especially rheme (Tirkkonen-Condit 1985). Linear thematic progression has been associated with a dynamic style, and sustained logical argument (McCarthy & Carter, 1994; Enkvist
1973, cited in Vande Kopple 1986:92): Fries claims that, since in argument each successive idea tends to be an expansion of and dependent on a previous one, it is to be expected that the theme or beginning of a clause will pick up an idea from the theme or later part of some previous clause. On the other hand, Hawes and Thomas (1996) maintain that constant progression is exploited for demagogic rhetoric, while the indirect style of persuasion in academic writing involves derived progression, which assumes extensive background knowledge on the part of the reader, enabling the connection to be made between theme and hypertheme.

Halliday (1985c) draws attention to the importance in argument of the interaction of recursive embedding within noun phrase structure and nominalisation with information structure. Thetela (1997) suggests further investigation to confirm whether the noun phrases in a paper dealing with theoretical arguments for a particular position would exhibit considerable reference to thinking process entities. Biber (1989, 1988) found overt expression of persuasion was realised by conditional subordination, suasive verbs (e.g. agree), split auxiliaries, infinitives, and modals of prediction, necessity and possibility, and Allison (1995) also notes the use of modal signalling, to bolster the status of arguments and knowledge claims, indicating strong writer commitment.

The literature review in this chapter leads to an expectation that the history journal articles to be analysed in Part 2 will display the rhetoric of argument and feature a high number of contrastive connectors as well as complex noun phrases. But it also allows for variation from one author to another in degree of persuasiveness and in the balance between argument, narrative and explanation. It will be interesting to see to what extent the rhetorical and linguistic features of academic discourse in general, and of history and argument in particular show up in an analysis of theme, which is the topic of the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3: THEMATISATION

Thematisation, or the linear organisation of text (Brown and Yule 1983), operates at any level of text - phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph or text level - but much recent analysis of thematisation has focused on the clause or clause-complex. Studies of theme-rheme structure and choices at clause and sentence level deal with the interface between grammar and discourse, linking micro-level lexicogrammatical forms to the realisation of discourse goals: the selection, distribution and sequencing of various types of themes has been shown to be directly related to topic continuity, the logical development of ideas, and text structure, and a means of distinguishing genres. Analysis of theme has so far been under-researched but useful insights can be derived from relating the theme-rheme model of sentence structure to other perspectives on sentence structure. This chapter first reviews the literature on theme-rheme structure and then looks at other views on sentence structure. These include Hannay and Mackenzie’s (1990) tripartite model, analysis of free modifiers, studies of the effects of initial versus final placement of adverbial clauses, and a paper on the functions of final -ing clauses. The present research aims to integrate insights from these various approaches in analysing the types of themes and the varying effects of initial and final placement within the context of the academic history journal article.

3.1 THEME-RHEME STRUCTURE

3.1.1 THEMES

3.1.1.1 DEFINITIONS OF THEME

Most analysis of theme-rheme structure has focused on themes rather than rhemes. The term theme has been defined in semantic terms as ‘the point of departure for the message’ (Halliday 1985a:38), and in syntactic terms as what occurs in first position in the clause, everything else in the clause being known as the rheme. It has also been defined as what the message is going to be about but this is difficult to reconcile with the definition of theme as the leftmost constituent of the clause since this constituent does not always indicate what the clause is about (see e.g. Fries 1995a, 1994; Downing 1991).
As most English clauses are declarative and begin with the grammatical subject (GS), GS in strict initial position is referred to as unmarked theme. In clauses where the GS is not initial, an item such as an adverbial phrase or clause preceding the GS is generally referred to as marked theme. However, there is disagreement over whether unmarked themes are restricted to declarative clauses or whether they also include unmarked initial elements in interrogative, exclamative and imperative clauses (an auxiliary or wh-word in an interrogative or exclamative clause and the predicator in an imperative clause). Halliday (1985a) and Martin et al (1997), for instance, class all these as unmarked themes, while others (e.g. Hawes and Thomas, 1996) treat themes in non-declarative clauses as marked. The status of existential there and anticipatory it GS is also problematic, as discussed below.

There is also disagreement over how far into the clause the theme extends and what clause elements it may consist of. Some restrict theme status to the leftmost item in a clause. Others exclude from theme status items such as and, if and because, which, though not normally in first position in terms of frequency of occurrence are obligatory in that position when they do occur. Fries (1983) does include such items but extends the scope of theme to include the nearest item whose position does result from choice. He and Eiler (1986) distinguish between weakly thematic items such as but, which can only occur initially, and strongly thematic items such as however, which can occur in more than one position. Halliday (1985a) does not consider minimal adjuncts - modal and conjunctive adjuncts, conjunctions and relatives - to be a marked choice since they are more or less obligatory, but Davies (1997) disagrees, on the grounds that, in a semantic categorisation of themes, minimal adjuncts realise the same semantic functions as adverbial phrases and clauses.

Since it is with ideational elements that there is the greatest degree of choice as to order of occurrence in a clause, and consistency in ideational theme is considered important for coherence, Halliday (1994, 1985a) and others (e.g. Fries 1995a), consider an ideational element to be obligatory. Thus, the theme extends as far as the first ideational element and also includes any textual or interpersonal elements that may occur before this first ideational element. If the ideational element is the very first item in the clause then the theme consists of only this; if the first ideational element is preceded by one or more textual or interpersonal elements, then these together with the ideational element make up a complex theme. Thus a distinction is made between simple and complex (multiple) themes.
The term complex theme has been used not only in cases where the theme consists of elements relating to different macrofunctions but also for themes made up of elements which differ in semantic function within the same macrofunction, as in the combination of a time and a place ideational element in yesterday at school (Eiler 1986), though this conflicts with the notion that the theme extends only so far as the first ideational element. Martin et al (1997:35) even use the term theme complex for a case where two elements have the same semantic function, that of place adverbial, in At Sezana, on the Yugoslav border, whereas Eiler treats expansion within the same semantic function in yesterday before dinner as simple theme. Matthiessen (1992) notes how the piling up of experiential adjuncts at the beginning of a clause can result in successive thematic contextualisation. Gosden (1992) distinguishes the various parts of multiple themes in terms of primary semantic notion, realised by the very first element, secondary semantic notion, realised by the next element, and so on. Davies (1997) identifies three types of complex themes: 1) consisting of more than one constituent realising the same semantic category, 2) consisting of more than one constituent each realising a different semantic category, 3) consisting of one constituent simultaneously realising more than one semantic category.

Ending theme with the first ideational element often means excluding the GS. Hawes and Thomas (1996) follow Halliday in extending the theme up to and including the first ideational element, but when this produces a theme which does not really show where the passage is going, they extend it further to include the GS. Other analysts (e.g. Ravelli 1995; McCarthy & Carter 1994; Gosden 1993; Berry 1989; Davies 1997, 1988; Enkvist 1973) consider the GS should always be included in the theme of declaratives because of the close association between GS and the topic of a given stretch of discourse. Downing (1991) makes the point that the GS represents a participant role in the semantic structure of the clause and is therefore inherent in both the semantics and the syntax. When the GS coincides with the topic of the clause, as it normally does, by virtue of its position early in the clause, it signals the relevance of the topic of the clause to the topic of the wider stretch of discourse of which the clause is a segment (Berry 1989), and reoccurrence of the same topical element or a related topical element as GS is a primary means of achieving the continuity of coherent discourse. Accordingly, more frequent display in GS position of material highly relevant to the thesis of a text has been found to distinguish between writing proficiency levels (Hult 1986). But inclusion of GS in theme poses a problem where fronted complements result in subject-verb inversion as in some sentences this seems to entail treating an entire sentence as theme with no rheme.
Inclusion of the GS gives rise to two-part analyses of theme. Where some other element precedes the GS, Taglicht (1985) and Dubois (1987) talk of a marked theme being followed by an unmarked theme, while Davies (1988) speaks of obligatory topic realised by the GS and optional context frame (CF) realised by any elements preceding the GS. On the basis of comparison of thematic choices in English and Finnish, in which the preferred position for topic is immediately before the finite verb, Mauranen (1996) divides theme into orienting theme, equivalent to Davies’s context frame, and topical theme - a topic-type nominal entity before the finite verb which is not necessarily realised by the GS, though this is its most common realisation in English. This is different from Davies’s use of topic to mean obligatory GS and also Halliday’s (1985a:56) use of the term topical theme for the first element in the clause with some function in the ideational structure, which could be, for instance, an adverbial clause of time and therefore what Mauranen would call an orienting theme. Halliday’s use of the word topical in connection with ‘point of departure’ for the message accords with Chafe’s (1976:50) conception of topic as setting the spatial, temporal or individual framework within which the predication holds.

Several analysts favour treating everything in preverbal position as having a thematic role (Mauranen 1996; Berry 1996, 1989; McCarthy and Carter 1994; Matthiessen 1992; Downing 1991). There have even been suggestions that theme should include the first auxiliary of the verb (Staunton 1993, cited in Berry 1996) and even the lexical verb (Berry 1996). Berry identifies four positions for the cut-off point between theme and rheme: pre-subject, subject, between subject and verb, between auxiliary and lexical verb, lexical verb, and even wonders about the position between the lexical verb and the rest of the clause or sentence. Associating theme with weight of textual and interpersonal meaning and rheme with weight of ideational meaning, she suggests it could be considered congruent for both to be extensive, with the boundary between them somewhere in the middle of the clause or sentence.

Downing and Locke (1992) make a distinction between clausal themes and discourse themes, the former being clause constituents such as subjects, and fronted objects, complements and adjuncts, and the latter items which connect the clause to the previous part of the text, including adverbial linkers, co-ordinating and subordinating conjunctions, relative pronouns and items expressing a point of view or perspective, such as admittedly and status-wise. This use of the term clausal theme differs from Francis’s (1996) use of the same
term for themes which take the form of clauses, including modifying clauses, embedded clauses and clefts. Discourse themes are what Halliday (1985a) calls minimal adjuncts, as opposed to circumstantial adjuncts - phrases and clauses which have ideational content. Minimal adjuncts or discourse themes include both items which Fries and Eiler view as weakly thematic (conjunctions and relative pronouns), and items which they view as strongly thematic (adverbial modals and connective such as however).

3.1.1.2 NON-PROTOTYPICAL THEMES

Existential there and anticipatory it in cleft and extraposed constructions constitute an interesting subset of themes which have been variously referred to as predicated themes (Halliday 1995a), theme predication (Fries 1995a) rhematized theme (Dubois 1987) invisible subject (Davies, 1988), and empty theme choices (Quirk et al, 1985). In each case, GS position is occupied by a ‘dummy’ subject empty of information and the notional subject is postponed until after the verb, as in the following examples from Fries (1995b), in which he has underlined what he considers to be the themes:

*There is a man at the door.*
*It is obvious that he doesn’t like it.*
*It was John who came yesterday.*

Such constructions have been analysed as cases where theme extends beyond the GS (there and it) in order to include the first ideational element (e.g. Davies 1988). Halliday (1985a:60) has proposed a dual level of analysis for clefts, as in the third of these examples: at clause level, it is the theme of one clause and the relative pronoun the theme of the other, while at sentence level all the material underlined above is treated as theme and the rest as rheme. However, Lowe (1987b) maintains that it is impossible to talk about a segmentable initial element with clefts, and also pseudoclefts and sentences beginning with negative adverbials.

Davies (1997, 1988) and Hawes and Thomas (1997) treat all three constructions as marked themes whereas Gosden (1993) classes constructions with predicated notional subjects as unmarked themes and Martin, Matthiessen and Painter (1997) view only the cleft, which they call predicated theme, as marked theme. They treat existential there and non-representational it in extraposed constructions as non-prototypical unmarked topical themes because, though not participants in the experiential structure of the clause, they do give
thematic status to the choice of mood or the meaning 'existential'. Davies (1997:79), however, argues that the unmarked expression of 'existence' is the specification of a participant and so the presentation of existence or viewpoint through *there* or *it* is marked. She therefore includes these 'marked subject choices' in a semantic categorisation of marked themes, treating them as interpersonal projections of the writer's message or viewpoint in relation to the 'existent' which they introduce. She also treats nominalisations, noun phrases objectivising viewpoint and noun phrases referring to discourse goals as marked themes.

Her solution for reconciling this markedness with her model of theme made up of optional context frame and obligatory subject leads her to split grammatical clause constituents and ignore differences in grammatical rank, as shown by her underlining of theme and division between contextual frame and topic in the following examples:

*It doesn't make sense for youngsters approaching school-leaving age to have a financial incentive to opt for the dole rather than to go into training for higher education.*

*It is clear that* (contextual frame) *the government* (topic) ..........

In her analysis of GS roles, MacDonald (1994) also extends the string to be considered in extraposed constructions such as *it is noteworthy that*... beyond the empty grammatical subject *it* to include the verb *be* and the adjective immediately following it but disregards the postponed notional subject, and even, in *it is important to note* splits an infinitive from the rest of the string realising the notional subject. She does not indicate how she categorises clefts and existential *there* sentences.

In the following two examples given by Davies (1988) it seems inconsistent to separate the prepositional phrase complement from its Head in one case and not in the other:

*There appear to be several competing explanations for this phenomenon.*

*The responsibility for coherence lies with the utterer which in the case of printed material is a composite entity including everyone who participated in the production of the text.*

On the other hand, if the superordinate noun phrase is not split in the first sentence, the wish to include more than the empty subject *there* in the theme would result in a sentence which is all theme and no rheme, as is also the case where there is no postmodification at all, as in:
There's the other alternative.

Davies also treats the following as a marked subject theme, setting up a Contextual Frame:

*The evident inability of the higher education authorities to honour the principles laid down under the Freedom of Speech Act*

Her rationale is that, as realisations of objectivised viewpoint, such themes set up an evaluation frame for the message in a similar way to *There is clear evidence* and *It is obvious that*. It is somewhat confusing, however, that such nominalisations, as well a GSs representing discourse goals, such as *The aim of my study*, appear in the Topic/Subject column rather than the Contextual Frame column in her layout of illustrations yet are included in a table of Contextual Frames. Gosden includes anticipatory *it* and existential *there* in his category of empty theme choices by coding the semantic function of the predicated theme. He provides no cleft example but it can be assumed that clefts would be treated in the same way.

The idea of projection has also led to theme being extended to include the lexical verb in reporting clauses, labelled *projecting* (Hasan 1991) or *preface* (Cloran 1995) clauses. Mauranen (1996:216) treats these as orienting themes, giving the following example from an English text by a Finnish writer.

*Khrohn et al. noticed that youngsters who have more stronger bounds to their friends tend to smoke more.*

Gosden's (1993) partial solution to the problem of whether to classify particular themes as marked or unmarked is to have three categories: GS - grammatical subject (unmarked theme); CF/GS - grammatical subject preceded by another element functioning as context frame (marked theme); and NON CF/GS - including fronted complements, imperatives and question forms. As already indicated, he follows Halliday (1985a) and Martin et al (1997) rather than Davies (1997) and Hawes and Thomas (1997) in classing anticipatory *it* and existential *there* as unmarked themes. But two of the items in his third category - questions and imperatives - are classed as unmarked themes by Halliday and Martin et al, and as marked themes by Hawes and Thomas (1997) and Contextual frames by Davies (1997). The other, fronted complements, is considered by Halliday to be the most marked of marked themes, and treated as marked theme by Hawes and Thomas (1997) and Contextual frame by Davies (1997). Hawes and Thomas (1997) also treat exclamatives, elliptical themes, and
even infinitive clauses functioning as GS as marked themes.

It can be seen from the above that both syntactic and semantic criteria have been used to arrive at definitions of theme. Syntactically, theme is distinguished by word order as the element in initial position in the clause or sentence; when defined as 'what the sentence is about', that is associated with topic, or as giving a context frame for or orientation towards what follows, semantic criteria are being resorted to. Certain scholars have been careful to separate the notion of topic from analysis of theme-rheme structure: Fries (1995a, 1994), for example, points out that the perception of a nominal item as realising the topic of a text segment is not necessarily related to the thematic or rhematic references to that item, though there is a correlation of topic with theme, and of point being made about the topic with rheme. The decision about whether to base the definition on syntactic grounds alone or on a combination of syntactic and semantic criteria is central to the debate about how far theme extends into the sentence or clause from the leftmost position.

3.1.1.3 UNIT OF ANALYSIS

Though any clause, dependent or independent, has theme-rheme structure, it is the thematic structure of independent clauses that is considered to make the main contribution to the method of development of a text and has attracted most interest (Berry 1989; Dubois 1987; Brandt 1986; Gosden 1993). As regards independent clauses, subordinate clauses and clauses embedded within subordinate clauses, Dubois (1987) talks of thematisation on the primary, secondary and tertiary level respectively. Taking the main clause as the basic unit of analysis is not completely straightforward, however.

One problem is the treatment of clauses with ellipsis of one or more constituents, particularly subject and verb. Martin et al (1997:29) treat an ellipsed GS as an ellipsed topical theme. Hawes and Thomas (1997) view ellipsed themes as marked themes. Eiler excludes from analysis clauses with ellipsis of more than one constituent. A second problem is with the identification of signals of co-ordination. For instance, Quirk et al (1985) view for as on a gradient between a pure co-ordinator and a pure subordinator. It resembles and and but and differs from most subordinators in being sequentially fixed, following the clause its own clause is in relation with. Like so and or but unlike other subordinators, apart from so that, for cannot be preceded by another conjunction. And, like and and but, and also yet, for can begin a sentence. Also, certain other conjunctions conventionally categorised as
subordinators according to syntactic criteria sometimes introduce clauses with content which seems as important as or even more important than that in the related main clause, as will be seen in this study.

Where a complex sentence contains only one main clause, an initial subordinate clause such as *When the clock struck midnight* can be treated as a marked theme at sentence level, in the same relation to the main clause as an initial prepositional phrase such as *At midnight*. If the GS is seen as an obligatory constituent of theme, the theme can be seen as extending to include both the initial subordinate clause and the GS of the main clause, as in the following examples:

\[ \text{At midnight he entered the house.} \]
\[ \text{When the clock struck midnight, he entered the house.} \]

Here analysis is confined to the primary level, leaving the subordinate clause unanalysed. Most analysts base their analyses on the independent clause together with all hypotactically related clauses and words dependent on it, treating the entire subordinate clause in initial position as theme or, if the subordinate clause is not initial, everything up to and including the first ideational clause-level constituent of the superordinate clause, usually the GS.

It follows from a decision to focus on the theme-rheme structure of main clauses only that more than one clause is analysed in a compound sentence, as in the following sentence, though there is still a decision to be made as to whether or not to include *and* in the theme of the second clause since it is obligatory in this position.

\[ \text{All the children played games and all the grown-ups sat and talked.} \]

But theme-rheme analysis of a compound sentence is not so straightforward when the GS of the first main clause in a compound sentence is preceded by an item with scope extending beyond this first clause, as in the following examples.

\[ \text{When the clock struck midnight, John got up and Mary went to bed.} \]
\[ \text{Fortunately, the sun was out and the tide was in.} \]

Here the initial adverbial provides a context frame for the rest of the entire sentence rather than just the first following clause. Taylor (1983) uses the term *scope base* for all the
clauses included within the scope of the material in initial position. Yet to regard the entire remainder of the sentence as rheme would be contrary to the desire to take the main clause as the unit of analysis and also raise difficulties if the GS is considered to be part of theme, since the initial element here is in the same relationship with two GSs in this sentence. Moreover, the initial elements in some sentences have scope which extends beyond the sentence boundary to include two or more sentences. It seems then that accounting for sentence-initial elements involves more than the three levels identified by Dubois. In addition to clausal themes at the level of independent clauses, the level of subordinate clauses, and the level of clauses embedded within subordinate clauses, it seems necessary to talk of sentence themes, and text span themes. Indeed, thematic structure has been perceived to operate at paragraph and text level (Martin 1993, Giora 1983), as well as at the lower level of nominal and verbal groups (Halliday 1985a:158, 166, 176).

3.1.1.4 THEMES AS CONTEXT FRAMES

Theme is viewed as playing a dual role in the organisation of discourse. Within the clause or sentence it provides the point of departure for, or orientation to, the message by providing a framework within which the theme can be interpreted (e.g. see Fries 1995, Downing 1991, Thompson 1985, Chafe 1976). For instance, an initial purpose clause, in naming a goal, raises expectations about the means used to achieve this goal which are fulfilled by the material in the main clause, unlike final purpose clauses, which do not set up a span but are part of the message delivered within this framework (Fries 1995b; Downing 1991; Thompson 1985). Outside the clause or sentence, theme relates the current point of departure to what has gone before by indicating its relevance to preceding text (Martin et al 1997:21). It can set up a framework with a scope which extends beyond the sentence in which it occurs by establishing participants, time, location or other circumstances for a stretch of text, as when new episodes in a story begin with thematic reference to a new temporal or locational setting or new characters (Fries 1995b, Lowe 1987b). Or it can give the direction in which the next part of the argument is going, as with contrast connectors; or indicate illocutionary force, for instance a question or a statement; or provide evaluation of the importance or reliability of the information in the following discourse, as with attitude or modal adverbs (Lowe 1987b). Mauranen (1996) suggests that if the topical theme in a sentence does not share content with a preceding sentence, then an orienting theme must be present to establish a connection; or, in the absence of a paragraph boundary, signal a shift in topic.
Fries (1995b) identifies several ways in which themes may establish a framework for interpretation of what follows: by providing information required to interpret the main message, by cancelling an assumption established in the previous context, by preventing misinterpretation, or by highlighting the point of elaboration. The first three functions are usually realised by marked themes while elaboration usually involves something introduced in an earlier clause becoming the GS of some following clause. Thus, although Davies reserves the term context frame for what others refer to as marked theme, both marked themes and unmarked themes can proved context frames, according to Fries. In addition, he notes that material may be placed in theme rather than rheme in order to avoid ambiguity or unwanted end focus, and that some themes have the function of cramming as much information as possible into few words rather than establishing a framework for interpretation of what follows, as in the following examples:

A native of Colorado. Vernon was the youngest of six children born to a state highway employee.

Reared in Flagstaff Arizona, she discovered an interest in real estate while working as a young secretary in a condo project there.

Downing (1991) identifies three types of themes, whether marked or unmarked: 1) participant themes, which set up individual frameworks, 2) spatial, temporal and situational themes, which set up circumstantial frameworks, and 3) discourse themes, which set up subjective and logical frameworks. Gosden (1992) provides a modified version of Davies’ (1989) classification of marked themes according to semantic function with nine major categories: location in time (real world entity and discourse entity); location in space (real world entity and discourse entity); addition (appositive and emphatic); contrast/concession; cause (reason/result and purpose); means; condition (real and hypothetical); validation (external and internal); and viewpoint. He classifies linguistic items functioning as context frames in marked themes into three main types: (1) conjunctions and conjunctive or modal adjuncts; (2) prepositional and adverbial phrases; (3) subordinate finite and nonfinite clauses.

Whether or not a context frame needs to be set up, and what type, is seen as influencing whether a marked or unmarked theme appears in initial position (Downing 1991, Lowe 1987b). The GS will be sentence-initial if it establishes a new time, location or participant for a span of text, whereas a marked theme may be used to set up a new framework if there is continuity of topic by means of the GS. Circumstantial elements will not be sentence-initial
unless they define a new span, perhaps a medial span within the greater span while topic continuity is preserved. If both the GS and adjunct set up new frameworks, the GS will take precedence and be sentence-initial. If a new framework has already been set up in a previous sentence, and there is topic continuity, most succeeding sentences will begin with GS, while a few will begin with conjunctive items. Downing (1991) also suggests a deciding factor in some cases might be the ‘weight’ of the spatio-temporal expression in comparison with the rest of the sentence, weighty items being postponed until the end of a sentence. Gosden (1992) notes that a greater use of CFs may occur where there is the greatest need for skilled rhetorical manipulation of discourse, indicating a writer’s attempts to overtly create a more cohesive text.

### 3.1.2 RHEMES

Most studies of theme-rheme structure and content have focused on theme and so far there has not been much attention to rheme, though rhemes are also considered important for coherence. Francis (1986) notes that inappropriate positioning of information in either position can lead to unintended emphasis, making it difficult for the reader to understand the points being made. Mauranen (1996) observes that what Enkvist (1973) calls rheme reiteration can be infelicitous, while Vande Kopple (1991) makes the point that adding widely varying rhemes to the same ideational theme can result in incoherent prose. Davies (1989) and Jordan (1985a) note that the placement of given information in the rheme can function as a cohesive device. One line of investigation which, in effect, looks at rhemes is that which compares the differing effects of initial and final placement of adverbial items, as with Thompson’s investigation of purpose clauses, which was referred to earlier in this chapter.

For Hallidayan linguists, the term rheme is generally held to refer to everything in the clause following the theme. But the functional sentence perspective model developed by the Prague school of linguists sees a three-part structure of theme-transition-rheme, with progression in communicative dynamism throughout the clause, culminating in end-focus at clause final position (Firbas 1986, 1974). Similarly, Fries (1994) suggests division of the clause into Theme-Other-N-Rheme, with Other usually being the finite verb but sometimes the finite verb together with the object complement, and N-Rheme being the most newsworthy part of the rheme, the unmarked location of new information. He associates N-
Rhemes with the goals not only of clauses and sentences but also of larger text segments and entire texts, the goals at these various levels being related in a hierarchy of relevance.

As with themes, a distinction has been made between marked and unmarked rhemes (Dubois, 1987; Taglicht 1985). For Dubois marked rhemes are those non-thematic constituents found to the left of their unmarked position, such as adverbs of manner which have been positioned before rather than after the verb, as in the following examples:

*The animal becomes progressively more alkaline as it crosses this line and then slowly returns...*

*It's relatively constant at about 15 and then only slowly comes back to normal as this animal warms up*

Mauranen (1996) finds contextually given propositional content in rhematic position rare in English writing, while one weakness of texts by Finnish academic writers writing in English is the use of rhemes which repeat much of the essential content of previous rhemes so that virtually nothing new is being said in the rhemes; native English writers make such rhematic links infrequently and never more than one at a time. But Jordan (1985) gives six reasons for re-entering information in rheme rather than theme position: 1) emphasis; 2) avoidance of a 'heavy' subject; 3) occurrence of catenative verbs making thematic re-entry difficult or impossible; 4) particle verbs or verbs without a passive form demanding non-thematic re-entry; 5) continuation of description of an associated topic; 6) inclusion of re-entry within a clause of purpose or means.

Lindeberg (1994) maintains some degree of rhematic linking is important for signalling the development of reasoning. Though associating method of development with links between themes and rheme with expression of a single point, Fries (1994, 1993, 1985), too, perceives a kind of linking between rhemes. In a text with a problem-solution structure in which each of several themes refers to a different aspect of the item with which there is a problem, their rhemes would be related if each indicates what is wrong (Fries, 1994). Martin (1993) notes that a clause or clause-complex at the end of a paragraph may be a retrospective summary or accumulation of the points made in the rhemes of preceding clauses or sentences.
3.1.3 THEMATIC PROGRESSION

Thematic progression is the term for patterns in the semantic links between the lexical content of themes and rhemes. Danes (1974) identifies three basic patterns: linear progression, where material in the rheme of the preceding clause is repeated in the theme of the following clause; constant progression, where the same material is repeated in each of the themes of successive clauses; and hypertheme/derived theme progression, where there is a sequence of themes, each of which is derived from an initial more general theme by association, as in relations of hyponymy. However, this three-part classification is complicated by phenomena such as insertions, incomplete or modified forms, and combinations resulting from co-ordination, apposition, nominalisation, and relative clauses. Backlund and Francis (cited in Fries 1995a:323) note the need to explore chains of thematic progression interrupted by other material.

Dubois (1987) proposes a reformulation of Danes's (1974) thematic progression typology. Themes can contain either new or recoverable (given) material. In the latter type, the material may be recoverable from either a previous theme or themes (as in constant progression) or a previous theme or rhemes (as in linear progression). The progression can be labelled simple if there is a single source and multiple if there is more than one source. The progression can be either contiguous or gapped. Two subtypes of multiple progression are integration, where material recoverable from more than one source is brought together within the same theme, and separation where material recoverable from a single source is separated into more than one theme. Within this typology, Danes's hypertheme is treated as a case of separation within multiple progression. Thus, Danes’s three-part analysis is reduced to a two-part categorisation which includes the sub-categories gapped and multiple progressions, the latter being further subdivided into types involving either integration or separation. In her sample of biomedical discourse, Dubois found that cases of linear gapped progression were more numerous than those of constant gapped progression and that multiple rather than simple progression, whether contiguous or gapped, was the most common means of development.

Danes (1974:127) suggested there may exist standardised types of thematic sequences as well. Mauranen (1996:216) observes that relationships involving rhemes tend to be more complicated than those involving thematic elements only, while Fries (1995a:335) notes that themes and rhemes contain different sorts of information and respond to different forces as
the text progresses. Cloran (1995:392-393) looks at relations between rhemes, as well as those between themes, in examining how thematic progression reflects relations between the rhetorical activities realised by chunks of text. She finds embedding of rhetorical activity within larger rhetorical activity associated with theme-theme or rheme-theme progression and expanding rhetorical relations associated with theme-rheme or rheme-rheme progression. Mauranen (1996:214) finds the theme in the second sentence of a paragraph can be either identical to or derived from the theme in the first sentence, identical to or derived from the previous rheme, or pick up on the entire proposition in the preceding sentence. Francis (1996) observes there are many ways in which a theme may derive from a preceding rheme and that further exploration of thematic progression depends on knowing more about rheme.

Correlations have been found between various patterns in the sequencing of themes and different types of text: with regard to signalling the general-particular relation in professional argumentative text (Tirkkonen-Condit 1985); between linear thematic progression and a dynamic style and sustained logical argument (McCarthy & Carter, 1994; Enkvist 1973, cited in Vande Kopple 1986:92); between constant progression and demagogic rhetoric, and between derived progression and the indirect style of persuasion of the academic (Hawes and Thomas 1996). Francis (1996) finds stretches of text with constant theme much more frequent in newspaper news articles than in editorials and letters to the editor, which do not conform neatly to any pattern but exhibit great complexity and diversity.

3.1.4 METHOD OF DEVELOPMENT

While thematic progression is to do with the ways themes and rhemes link up with themes and rhemes in adjacent or neighbouring sentences, method of development is to do with the reoccurrence of types of themes. Frequent occurrence of the same types of themes has been related to particular ways in which information is developed throughout a text (e.g. Fries 1995, Thompson and Longacre 1985), and particular methods of development have been associated with particular genres (e.g. Gosden 1992). But Fries (1995a:323) points out that since most texts achieve several purposes, it should be expected that theme choices should change as one or another purpose is addressed, so the same text may exhibit different methods of development in different segments of text..
As has been seen, an important method of development associated with academic texts is contrastiveness (Gosden 1992; Fries 1983; Chafe 1976), and thematisation of logical or attitudinal elements has been particularly associated with argument (McCarthy & Carter, 1994). Adverbials of location as themes are predicted to be frequent in descriptions of place, as in travel guides (McCarthy and Carter, 1994; Thompson and Longacre 1985; Fries 1983); purpose clauses in procedural texts (Thompson 1985), adverbials of condition and nouns referring to things in science texts, and adverbials of circumstance and nouns referring to people in history texts (Eiler, 1986; Vande Kopple 1991; Taylor 1983, cited in Vande Kopple 1991).

Correlations have been found between text structure and types of themes (MacDonald 1994, 1992; Gosden 1993, 1992). Fries (1995a:338) and Prideaux and Hogan (1993) note a tendency towards signalling that a new segment of text structure has begun by means of the theme of the first clause in that segment. Gosden (1992) claims marked thematic choices can signal movement from general context to particular then back to general as opposed to a more linear, checklist approach to information. Hawes and Thomas (1996) find an increase in density of marked themes in the solution and evaluation sections of newspaper texts with problem-solution text structure. Gosden (1992) associates increased incidence of marked theme with greater rhetorical multifunctionality and the higher frequency of topic shifting in certain sections of scientific research articles, such as introduction sections. With regard to unmarked theme, he shows (1993) how the degree of impersonality varies across the various sections of a research article in accordance with the type of material functioning as GS. Hawes and Thomas (1996) find specific unmarked themes in newspaper articles are densest near the start and non-specific themes densest near the end, while proper names of participants are most common in the situation section of problem-solution text structure and discourse participants in evaluation, associated with editorial comment.

Correlations have also been found between types of content frequently occurring in theme and the methodology of particular discourse communities or the styles of particular genres. MacDonald (1994) finds reference in GS to groups of people rather than individuals distinguishes a historian’s academic writing from that in the field of literary studies. In newspaper texts, Hawes and Thomas (1996) find thematic mention of discourse participants, such as the name of the newspaper, associated with outspokenness as opposed to impartiality; frequent thematic reference to institutions associated with emphasising the establishment over private individuals; and more frequent mention of one class of individual,
such as men, associated with giving prominence to favoured groups within society. Complex noun phrases as theme reflect targeting of a middle class readership as opposed to a working class readership. Interrogatives tend to be used rhetorically for evaluation in a tabloid newspaper rather than for asking for information.

Eiler (1986) suggests that the thematic occurrence of unmarked themes be studied more delicately for lexical semantic relations and cohesive patterns which might indicate generic distinctions. Francis (1996) has done this to some extent in examining the lexico-grammatical chains linking themes in newspaper texts. Comparing news articles with editorials and letters (expository genres), she finds in the former, as in narrative, a far higher percentage of themes involved in chains and ones which are longer and more spread out over the text, with a higher average number of tokens per chain, while in the latter there are far more similarity chains and fewer identity chains. She finds thematic entities to be more consistent in narrative and related genres than in arguments.

### 3.2 OTHER PERSPECTIVES ON SENTENCE STRUCTURE

#### 3.2.1 GIVEN VERSUS NEW INFORMATION

In interaction with the theme-rheme structure of the clause is the given-new structure of information packaging. Allwright et al (1988) comment that texts exhibit a balance between already known elements, which ensure topic continuity and hold the text together, and new elements, which ensure topic development. Prince (1992) has identified five ways in which information may be either old or new. What she calls Hearer-new and Discourse-new have also been termed knowledge-new and textually new respectively (Kieras 1985).

1. **Brand new** (Hearer-new, Discourse-new)
2. **Unused** (Hearer-old, Discourse-new)
3. **Evoked** (Hearer-old, Discourse-old)
   - technically Hearer-new, Discourse-new but treated as hearer-old and presumably Discourse-old because depend on presumed Hearer-old beliefs and Discourse-old trigger entity
4. **Inferrable**
   - similar to Inferrables but trigger entity contained within their description
5. **Containing Inferrables**

Prince distinguishes information status from marking of the noun phrase for formal definiteness: both definite and indefinite noun phrases can sometimes represent Hearer-new,
Hearer-old or Inferrable referents. For instance, Hearer-new noun phrases in existential there constructions are not always indefinite and generic indefinite noun phrases can represent Hearer-old entities. Ushie (1986) shows how indefinite expressions can present an already mentioned referent in a new light; the newness arises from presentation as either a new interpretation or a shift in point of view. Modification in a noun phrase might carry new information while the head is given, or it might carry given information which relates new information in the head to what is already known. Jordan (1985a) calls this triggered associated re-entry and shows how such re-entry of noun phrases, in either theme or rheme, can enable the writer to convey more meaning and subtlety.

As noted by Allwright et al (1988), inferrable noun phrases are an economical way of maintaining linking with what has gone before while moving the text forward, since while referring back to a previous idea, they introduce a related aspect and thus add something new without the necessity of using a clause to do so. Greater use of inferrable subjects has been found to be the significant factor distinguishing writing from speaking (Prince 1981) and a discriminator between skilled and poor writing (Allwright et al 1988, Chafe 1991). Containing Inferrables are definite noun phrases with esphoric reference. Like Jacobs (1989), Prince observes that these noun phrases are suitable for multi-receiver discourse, particularly in formal written prose, since what is a Containing Inferrable for one hearer can serve as a Hearer-old, Discourse-new entity for another.

3.2.2 FREE MODIFIERS

Marked themes may be viewed in terms of two types of dependency, termed bound and free by Chafe (1984) and non-detached and detached by Thompson (1983). Non-peripheral/bound/restrictive elements are dependent elements such as subject and noun complements, restrictive relative clauses and other noun phrase modifiers, which are obligatory, being part of the nucleus of the sentence and grammatically determined in constituency with some noun, verb or preposition. The process of integrating them into clause-complexes is known as embedding (Matthiessen and Thompson 1988).

Peripheral/free/non-restrictive elements, such as noun phrase appositions, adverbial clauses, participial clauses and non-restrictive relative clauses, are typically separate 'idea units', realised as 'intonation units' or 'punctuation units' in writing (Chafe, cited in Thompson 1984), and are integrated by means of hypotaxis. Thompson (1984) suggests the two types of dependency do different types of work, with non-obligatory dependent elements
representing organisational options available to the language user.

Integration by means of peripheral elements was investigated in the 1960s and 1970s under the label **free modifiers**. Hunt (1971) regards nominalisation and relative clause embedding as the most important ways of increasing the length of T-units (minimal terminal units: main clauses together with their subordinate elements), a measure of maturity in writing. But Christensen (1968), points out this could have an adverse effect on readability; a skilled writer would facilitate ease of processing by avoiding long noun phrases and keeping the main or base clause relatively short by packing additional information content into peripheral dependent items, that is, *free/non-restrictive modifiers* realising separate idea units or punctuation units, such as appositions; prepositional, noun, verb and adjective phrases; subordinate clauses; non-finite clauses.

According to Christensen, Hunt fails to distinguish between bound/restrictive modifiers and free/non-restrictive modifiers, but they appear to differ over syntactic demarcation. Whereas Hunt viewed a non-restrictive, appositive phrase as postmodification within a noun phrase in the base clause, Christensen treats only the antecedent noun phrase as part of the base clause and the appositive phrase as an optional element, or free modifier, which served to keep the noun phrase, and therefore the base clause in the T-unit, short and thus easier to decode. In contrast, packaging the same content by embedding it within a noun phrase as a bound modifier would result in a complex noun phrase which would be more difficult to process.

Christensen characterises free modifiers as 'modifiers not of words but of constructions, from which they are set off by junctures or punctuation... Grammatically, they are loose or additive or nonessential or nonrestrictive'. They can be initial, medial or final in the sentence. Initial free modifiers are items which precede the subject of the clause, whether marked off by punctuation or not - what are nowadays called marked themes or context frames. Final free modifiers, always marked off by commas, are part of the rheme in a theme-rheme structure perspective on the sentence, and yield what has been called a cumulative sentence (Wolk 1970; Christensen 1968). The frequency and placement of these optional elements, particularly of final free modifiers, is held to be the most significant measure of a mature style (Wolk 1970; Christensen 1968), constituting the most important syntactic difference between professional writing and student writing. Together with a relatively high frequency of co-ordinated structures within the T-unit, they generate the supporting detail typically absent from the latter (Christensen 1968). Variations in the kinds,
positions and frequency of these free modifiers also differentiate individual styles.

This view of sentence structure presaged the current interest in variations in the kinds, positions and frequency of marked themes as indicators of generic differences and of text structure. It can also be related to studies of the differing effects of initial or final placement of items such as time, place and purpose clauses, reported later in this chapter. But it is particularly free modifiers in final position, Christensen suggests, which are most useful to skilled writers. Investigation of final free modifiers would in effect be analysis of an aspect of rhemes, which have received so little attention up to now. The present study hopes to contribute to such analysis by examining the rhetorical goals achieved by certain items occurring as final free modifiers.

3.2.3 TRIPARTITE STRUCTURE

Hannay and Mackenzie (1990) view thematisation phenomena at various levels of text in terms of a tripartite structure which consists of a beginning, a middle and an end: ‘the first part creates a discourse domain, within which what follows is to be understood, and the last part comments on what has gone before or constitutes the point or climax of the unit...(while)...the middle has above all an information-bearing role, contributing little to the organisation of the discourse’. At the paragraph level and above, this tripartite structure view is consistent with Martin’s (1993b) concepts of Hyper-Theme, Hyper-New, Macro-Theme and Macro-New. At clause level the first constituent of the tripartite structure corresponds to theme in theme-rheme structure, the middle and end constituents to the transition and rheme respectively in the Functional Sentence Perspective model of the clause. Hannay and Mackenzie note the discourse-organising functions of initial and final constituents at each of these various levels of text, such as when the discourse topic of a new paragraph is introduced at the end of the final sentence of the preceding paragraph.

But their main interest is in complex sentences, particularly those which end with peripheral subordinate clauses. When tripartite structure is applied to complex sentences, the function of the first part is described in terms which echo those used to describe the function of context frames, or marked themes, within theme-rheme structure. The middle part comprises the nucleus of the sentence, in other words both unmarked theme and that part of the main clause which is rheme, and has a primarily information bearing role; it develops the topic of the paragraph, contributing little to the organisation of the discourse. The last part is a final
subordinate element, constituting an additional constituent of rheme. Hannay and Mackenzie describe the beginning and the end as 'elements attracted to the core message unit for discourse organisation purposes'.

They see right subordination - the inclusion of final subordinate elements in the last part of the tripartite structure of complex sentences - as a remedy for inappropriate foregrounding of information in new independent clauses in student writing. This is usually information elaborating on the new information in the previous sentence and so properly belongs in a peripheral element to the right of the main clause in the previous sentence, such as a relative, adverbial or -ing clause. As indicated below, the phenomenon of providing background information for a main clause by means of final detached participial clauses had been investigated by Thompson (1983), and Granger (cited in Flowerdew 1998) has also pointed out that -ed and -ing clauses play an important role in the foregrounding and backgrounding of information.

Hannay and Mackenzie observe that the function of the final clause is difficult to formulate explicitly and there has been little research on it in discourse linguistics. Analysis of thematisation and information structure at the sentence level has been mainly concerned with main clauses without peripheral 'add-ons' to their right. As already noted, rhemes are usually associated with making points about topics, and with an increase in communicative dynamism with progress towards the end of the sentence, culminating in end-focus on new information. However, the fact that many sentences end with a hypotactic element would appear to undermine the strength of this association if hypotaxis is associated with subordination and with presupposition. Hannay and Mackenzie claim that the use of subordination combined with final position allows the writer both to lend prominence to information and to recognise that it is totally expectable and therefore not 'inherently' new. On the other hand, they also appear to allow for the opposite - a combination of new information with non-prominence, in saying that, generally speaking, sentence-final clauses present information that elaborates upon the core message unit, usually in the form of a specification or further narrowing down of the new information in that unit.

It would seem that when there is an optional element at the end of a T-unit, analysis of rhemes needs to distinguish between cases of hypotaxis in end position which downplays information and those where hypotaxis in end position results in prominence more readily associated with parataxis. Analysis of theme-rheme structure should also be delicate enough
to take into account the provision of additional information by means of elements which are peripheral to host clauses which are themselves subordinate. Most analysis, even of complex or multiple themes, has been restricted to comparing elements of equal rank. Yet peripheral 'add-ons' can occur at various levels within the syntax and within a top-ranking element in theme there may be expansion by means of an optional modifier at a lower rank. A comprehensive treatment of theme-rheme structure and associated functions would take such phenomena into account. Unfortunately, it has not been practicable in the present study, because of time and space constraints, to extend the analysis to this level.

3.2.4 HYPOTAXIS, END-PLACEMENT AND THE BACKGROUNDING-FOREGROUNDING CONTINUUM

Following Halliday, Matthiessen and Thompson (1988) distinguish embedding of dependent clauses within a main clause from clause-combining by means of hypotaxis and parataxis, pointing out that the traditional term subordinate fails to make this distinction and is used for clause types which have quite different grammatical properties and functions, such as relative clauses and adverbial clauses (Biber 1986:409). Hannay and Mackenzie (1990) note lack of agreement as to whether adverbial clauses are embedded within a main clause or are constituents of the sentence as a whole, often having scope over more than one clause. They view a clause as embedded if the core message unit realised by the main clause would be incomplete without it, and combined if it constitutes a separate message unit appended to the core message unit. This is a distinction between what Chafe (1984) calls a bound adverbial clause, one included with the main clause in the same intonation unit, and what Longacre (1985) refers to as a sentence margin.

For Hannay and Mackenzie, clause combining is a means of grouping message units realised by subordinate structures around a core message unit, which they usually elaborate on with further narrowing down or specification of the new information. But though there is a correlation between dependent status and subordinate or background information status, there are many exceptions (Matthiessen and Thompson 1988, Tomlin 1985, Kroll 1977, Kruisinga 1932:501, Jespersen 1924:105), and Matthiessen and Thompson (1988) distinguish grammatical relations from rhetorical relations between nuclear and satellite information. The same type of dependent clause can have a background reading in initial position and a foreground reading in final position, where its content, given full weight by end position, can be just as important as or even more important than that of the main clause.
(Downing 1991, Longacre 1989, Lowe 1987a, Giora 1983). Such cases have been viewed as very much like co-ordination (Schleppegrell 1992, Matthiessen and Thompson 1988, Quirk et al 1985).

Thus, the backgrounding effect of dependency has to be balanced against the foregrounding effect of being in end position. Indeed, Giora (1983) claims that, all other things being equal, sentence-final position rather than the syntactic parameter determines the information status of subordinate clauses, and that syntactic subordination only entails informational subordination in initial position. Additional factors are the foregrounding effect of semantic and grammatical complexity in the dependent clause. Degrees of foregrounding and backgrounding can be achieved by manipulating the interaction between syntactic subordination, grammatical and semantic complexity and linear position within theme-rheme structure.

### 3.2.5 INITIAL VERSUS FINAL PLACEMENT

#### 3.2.5.1 ADVERBIAL CLAUSES

The phenomenon of right-subordination has received attention in studies of the discourse-level consequences of initial or final placement of adverbial clauses; adverbial clauses of the same semantic type have been shown to differ in discourse function according to their position in the sentence (e.g. Lowe 1987a, Thompson 1985, Giora 1983), such as when-clauses, which contain backgrounded information in initial position but can often encode nuclear information in final position (Longacre 1989, Mathiessen and Thompson 1988).

These are, in effect, studies of the pragmatic functions of free modifiers in theme position and final free modifiers in rheme. Such studies address the need noted by Fries (1995b) to develop a better semantic description of theme, with illustrations from a variety of contexts, while also shedding some light on a more neglected area, analysis of rheme.

Chafe (1984) and Greenbaum and Nelson (1996) have examined the placement of adverbial clauses in spoken and written English. Chafe compared academic writing with dinner table conversation, and distinguished between bound and free adverbial clauses, the latter being separated by commas when in final position. Greenbaum and Nelson analysed a corpus comprising a variety of genres, including academic writing. Though they excluded adverbial clauses functioning as complements, they did not restrict their analysis to clauses in final
position separated by commas, and so included adverbial clauses Hannay and Mackenzie would consider were required to complete the core message. Chafe found more than twice as many adverbial clauses in the academic writing sample as in the conversation sample, but only 62% of the former were free rather than bound, as opposed to 71% of the latter. On the other hand, Thompson (1984) found adverbial clauses constituted a higher proportion of free dependent items, including participial and non-restrictive relative clauses, in spoken English (82%) than in formal written English (68%).

In Greenbaum and Nelson’s data, 31% of the adverbial clauses in the total sample were initial, 3% medial, and 66% final. In academic writing in particular, 30.7% preceded the subject while 69.2% occurred in end position, slightly less than occurred in end position in non-academic writing. In Chafe’s data, 39% of the adverbial clauses in the academic writing were free and preposed and 23% free and postposed, as opposed to 1% bound and preposed and 37% bound and postposed. Greenbaum and Nelson found medial position tended to be selected only when the intruding clause was relatively short, unless there was a close logical connection with the subject, but, contrary to expectations based on the principle of end-weight, clauses in initial position were not found to be shorter than clauses in end position. But semantic type was found to be an important factor in placement: the dominant position for if-clauses was initial, with only 35.2% occurring in end position, whereas that for when-clauses was final; end position was also preferred for purpose (96.4%), manner (93.9%), reason (91.6%), time (61.2%), and, but only marginally, concessive clauses (54.7%). However, the fact that Longacre (1989) and Ramsay (1987) found the majority of when clauses in narrative to be preposed, contrary to Greenbaum and Nelson’s finding for a heterogeneous sample of texts, illustrates the need to take genre into account in seeking to understand the discourse consequences of the positioning of adverbial clauses.

The capacity of hypotactic clauses, including adverbial clauses, to perform cohesive functions, such as repeating or summarising prior text, has been noted by Longacre (1989), Mathiessen and Thompson (1988) and Thompson and Longacre (1985). According to Winter (1982), the primary contextual function of adverbial clauses is to mediate between the main clause and the adjoining context in a change of topic: in front position, they pick up and conclude the topic of the preceding clause(s) while the main clause introduces the change of topic; in end position, they introduce the change of topic while the main clause picks up and concludes the topic of the preceding clause(s). In the former case, the emphasis is on the ‘not hitherto assumed known’ aspect of the main clause, while in the latter it is on
the ‘assumed known’ of the adverbial clause. But Mathiessen and Thompson (1988) point out that given or known hypotactic clauses are only one specific discourse use of this type of clause: a thematic hypotactic clause is not necessarily known or given in the sense of repeating or summarising information presented in prior text. Although satellite information and the hypotactic clauses which realise it are especially likely to be unchallengeable when these clauses precede the nucleus, this is not necessarily the case. Such clauses may function to re-orient the reader by introducing new information, introducing a new frame for the information which follows.

Fries (1995) and Thompson (1984) show how adverbial clauses are often relevant to larger discourse units than the sentences in which they occur, and can reflect the larger rhetorical structure of the discourse, helping to maintain cohesion. They analysed the effects of placement of clauses of time, place and purpose, and found that in initial position they can have an orienting function by setting up a context frame for what follows, often with a scope which extends beyond the current sentence, whereas in final position their scope does not extend beyond the current sentence. Givón (1987, cited in Prideaux and Hogan 1993) observed that preposed adverbial clauses tend to occur at major thematic boundaries and depend for their interpretation on the preceding thematic material, whereas postposed adverbial clauses tend to occur in the midst of a thematic unit. Similarly, Prideaux and Hogan (1993) found preposed adverbial clauses in written narratives tended to occur initially in episodes or even more often to mark the end of an episode, but more markedly so in spoken-like written narrative than in formal written language. They thus illustrated a more general phenomenon whereby marked structures slow down processing and attract attention, primarily towards a shift in discourse direction, but also towards important events within the overall narrative. Ramsay (1987) suggests that further research on the behaviour of different types of adverbial clauses might require a combined analysis of their functions both at the discourse and at the semantic level. He also notes the need for much more empirical work on different types of discourse to account for how a writer adjusts the connecting and sequencing of information, including the positioning of adverbial clauses, with various factors in mind such as the achievement of a particular style.

### 3.2.5.2 PARTICIPIAL CLAUSES AS FINAL FREE MODIFIERS

The corollary of Thompson’s (1984) findings for adverbial clauses is that formal written English had a greater proportion of non-finite clauses and non-restrictive relative clauses as
free modifiers, which is consistent with Hannay and Mackenzie's (1990) observation that the elaboration relation (further specification of new information) realised by right-subordination requires complex relative clauses and non-finite constructions with the -ing form. An earlier paper by Thompson (1983) on the functions of one of these other types of detached items, -ing clauses, is an early example of a study which examined the pragmatic motivations for the use of a particular grammatical device and related these to genre.

Thompson found non-restrictive -ing clauses in final position to be typical of depictive writing (74 per 10,000 words), which she defines as discourse that attempts to describe by creating an image which sparks the visual imagination. They are a device used to present certain material as background against which material in the main clause can be put forward as 'figure' in the Gestalt sense. This background material further explicates, amplifies or elaborates what is in the main clause; or represents an event as occurring simultaneously with that referred to in the main clause; or provides a comment on or motivation for the event referred to in the main clause. It does not explicitly express any logical or temporal relationship with the material for which it is the background. Where these detached participles have their own subject, it is usually in a part-whole relationship with the main clause subject.

Thompson finds the indeterminate relationship such clauses have with the main clause is rare in non-depictive exposition (5 per 10,000 words), such as writing in the sciences and social sciences, where background information must be much more explicitly related to the figure material, and the communicative goals are not conducive to 'the leisurely scene-painting for which the highly durative, temporally noncommittal detached participle is so well suited'. The detached participles that do occur in non-depictive writing tend to be stylistic alternatives to other co-ordinate or subordinate clauses in a way in which the detached participles in depictive writing are not. They also tend to be being clauses. Only in the non-depictive writing data were there occasionally detached participles with subjects which were co-referential with a main clause non-subject noun phrase, or with no noun phrase at all.

3.3 THEMATISATION ABOVE THE SENTENCE LEVEL

Thematisation operates not only at the phrase, clause or sentence levels, but also at higher levels of text (e.g. Fries 1995, Martin 1993b, Duszac 1994, Brown and Yule 1983:133; Giora 1983). Fries (1995a) notes the lack of empirical study of the use of hyper-theme and macro-
theme, which mirrors at a higher level the thematic structure at clause and clause-complex level. But Martin (1993b) has discussed the functions of hyper-theme at paragraph level and macro-theme at text level in providing points of departure and predictions of method of development in the way clause and clause-complex level themes do, and has also applied the association of end position with making points at these levels, using the terms Hyper-new and Macro-New. Hannay and Mackenzie (1990) also apply their tripartite structure model to the paragraph level and above as well as the sentence level, with a particular focus on the discourse functions of beginnings and endings.

Martin (1993b) adopts Danes's term Hyper Theme but uses it in a different sense. Whereas Danes uses the term to refer only to the theme of a paragraph-initial sentence, Martin considers this notion to be too restrictive as regards the ability of an initial sentence to predict the method of development in the paragraph, since material in either the theme or the rheme, or indeed in both, that is in the entire sentence, may be picked up in the themes, or even the rhemes of subsequent sentences. He proposes the notion of paragraph theme, redefining Hyper Theme as a clause (or combination of clauses) predicting a pattern of clause themes constituting a text's method of development. He uses the term Hyper-New for a clause or clause-complex in a paragraph which is a retrospective summary or accumulation of the points made in the rhemes of preceding clauses or sentences. For higher levels of text structure, he uses the terms Macro-Theme, defined as a clause or combination of clauses predicting one or more Hyper-Themes, and Macro-New, defined as a clause or combination of clauses collecting together one or more Hyper-News. He notes that there is in principle no limit to the number of layers of Macro-Themes in text, and that the conscious constructing of Hyper-Themes and Hyper-News, and multiple layers of Macro-Themes and Macro-News, through planning and editing, is a very important aspect of learning to write.

Martin believes that a common failing in academic writing, as elsewhere, is the summing up of a paper or chapter by means of a Macro-Theme instead of a more appropriate macro-New. However, the distinction is not clear in his account of how these notions relate to the text structure of expository texts, according to which the Macro-Theme introduces a Thesis which is rearticulated in a reiteration stage which functions simultaneously as the text’s Macro-New. An indefinite number of Arguments are advanced for the Thesis, each of which has its own potential Assertion\-Elaboration\-Re-assertion structure, with Assertion as Hyper-Theme and Re-assertion as Hyper-New. Although he notes that the labels Reiteration and Re-assertion can be misleading unless the difference between method of development and
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point is taken into account, he does not explicitly show how a reiteration of a Macro-Theme which functions simultaneously as Macro-New is different from simply repeating the Macro-Theme in place of providing a Macro-New, which he says is a failing.

The literature on topic sentences has long been concerned with similar notions. The difference between the concept of Hyper-Theme and the more traditional notion of topic sentence is the classification of the specific location, in theme, of the reoccurrence of material from the initial sentence in later sentences, and the association of this with method of development, which can reflect a text's genre. This is more restrictive than the term topic sentence, which makes no commitment as to whether material will reoccur in theme or rheme position in subsequent sentences. Popken (1987) and Shaughnessy (1977:245) view topic sentences - "rhetorically dominant clause or clause-complexes" which can "help draw together complex propositions whose relationship might otherwise only be inferred" (Popken 1987:224) - as particularly helpful signals in academic writing, with its dense content and multilevel structure. They are especially helpful in disciplines such as history where texts consist of lengthy sections without section headings, often with long paragraphs.

3.4 CONCLUSION

It can be seen from this survey of the literature on thematisation that recent work in this area has tended to focus on narrative or descriptive writing, or on academic discourse in general. However, several claims relevant to academic writing by historians have emerged. History texts are said to be characterised by the frequent occurrence in theme position of nouns referring to people, and adverbials of circumstance, particularly time. Insofar as argument is employed in writing by historians, these texts are also expected to feature thematisation of logical and attitudinal connectives and to demonstrate the crucial role of theme and rheme choices in the signalling of the general-to-particular relation, but there appears to be disagreement as to whether linear or derived thematic progression is the more characteristic of academic argument. It is hoped that the examination of history journal articles in the present study provides additional insights into the pragmatic consequences of positioning lexicogrammatical items as either marked themes or in final position in rheme.
PART 2 ANALYSIS OF THE SAMPLE
CHAPTER 4  METHOD OF ANALYSIS AND GENERAL FINDINGS

4.1  METHOD OF ANALYSIS

4.1.1  THE CORPUS

The corpus, reproduced in Appendix 1, consists of four articles: two by medieval historians (Harriss and Walker) and two by modern historians (MacKenzie and Whiting). The only criteria used in the selection of the texts were that there should be equal numbers of medieval and modern history articles, they should each be from a different journal, and each should feature a summary of the argument in the conclusion section. Excluding footnotes, the texts provide a total of 41,445 words, 1,523 independent clauses, 1,203 sentences and 188 paragraphs. A breakdown of the figures for each article and each section of each article is given in Table 1 in Appendix 2.

The modern history articles make much use of quoted material from primary sources, especially the Whiting article, which has many lengthy quotes set apart by line spacing. This posed the problem of how much of the text should be included in the analysis. It was decided for the purpose of the word and sentence count not to include stretches of material not of the author's creation which were so extensive as to be set apart by line spacing, as in the Whiting text, but to include shorter quoted material not longer than a sentence in both the Whiting and the MacKenzie texts which was integrated within paragraphs. Where a sentence otherwise consisting of quoted material began with an introductory phrase in the words of the author, such as According to Harry Gosling, this phrase was included in the classification of marked themes according to semantic function. Where the sentence began with material in someone else's words but the quote was interrupted by a grammatical subject and reporting verb provided by the author, it was treated as fronting of quoted material and the grammatical subject was included in the analysis of grammatical subjects. Two sentences consisting entirely of quoted material were treated as a separate category from the classification of themes into marked, unmarked and non-prototypical. Quoted material following colons was not included in the count of independent clauses.
4.1.2 UNIT OF ANALYSIS

The independent clause, whether constituting a sentence or a constituent of a co-ordination relation within a sentence, is the most commonly stated unit of analysis in studies of themes, but most illustrations given by researchers are of sentence-initial elements. The term sentence is sometimes stretched to include any independent clause: Eiler (1986), for instance, states that in her method of analysis ‘all sentence level themes were analysed and coded’ but also that ‘independent clauses were treated as separate sentences’. In his study of marked themes (1992), Gosden states that his analysis and description is limited to marked sentence-initial elements, but in his later study of subject roles (1993), he says he examines subjects in main clauses. However, the rubric for his first table in the latter study indicates analysis of sentence-initial elements and all of his illustrations in both studies are of sentence-level initial themes or subjects following sentence-initial marked themes.

The present research takes the sentence as the primary unit of analysis, so the initial investigation of the relative proportions of marked and unmarked themes reported in this chapter is based on a count of sentence-initial elements, with the sentence defined as a unit of text beginning with a capital letter and ending with a full stop. However, for the analysis of how particular grammatical forms function in the texts, dealt with in subsequent chapters, the count was widened to include items at lower levels. Three levels were identified: the sentence, defined as above; any independent clause beginning with a capital letter or co-ordinated by a colon or semi-colon; and any independent clause, whether beginning with a capital letter or a co-ordinating conjunction or following a colon, semi-colon, dash or comma. One reason it is useful to distinguish sentence-initial themes from other main clause themes is that they usually have a greater context-framing span. A good reason for having an intermediary level, of clauses co-ordinated by either a colon or semi-colon, is that these punctuation items mark co-ordination at a higher level than that by co-ordinating conjunctions. Units of text co-ordinated in this way may themselves comprise finite clauses linked by co-ordinators; indeed Longacre (1989:449) has observed that ‘The function of the semi-colon in English is to join the sentences of a low-level embedded paragraph’. Colons and semi-colons are used particularly frequently in the Walker article.
4.1.3 DEFINITION OF THEME AND TYPES OF THEMES

The analysis takes theme to include the grammatical subject (GS) and, like Gosden’s, uses a three-way categorisation, though it differs somewhat from his in the allocation of items to these categories. The marked theme category corresponds with his CF/GS category. Contrary to Halliday but following Davies, minimal adjuncts such as conjuncts are included in this category, along with adjuncts with ideational content, such as clauses and prepositional phrases: thus non-GS initial signals of concession are counted as marked themes whether realised by clauses, prepositional phrases or conjunctive adjuncts. The analysis follows Eiler in including both weakly thematic elements such as and and but and the more strongly thematic elements such as however and therefore, so even co-ordinators beginning non-initial independent clauses are treated as marked themes.

The unmarked themes category is equivalent to Gosden’s GS category except that it does not include existential there, clefts and extraposition. In contrast with Davies’s analysis, nominalisations, objectivised viewpoint GS and GS referring to discourse goals are included in this category. Noun phrases with nouns, pronouns, derived nouns and -ing forms as heads are considered prototypical unmarked themes whereas clauses other than -ing clauses are considered non-prototypical. Initial elements which Mauranen and Hasan have called projecting or preface clauses, such as reporting clauses, are not treated as constituting theme in their entirety; the GS of the projecting clause has, instead, been treated as a regular unmarked theme.

The third category, labelled non-prototypical, includes forms whose analysis is problematic and which are marked in some way. Besides imperatives and question forms, which Gosden also places in a separate category, his Non CF/GSm it includes forms with non-referential GS - existential there, clefts and extraposition - which Gosden and others (e.g. Martin et al) have treated as unmarked themes. And it includes pseudoclefts, though they satisfy the criteria for unmarked themes in having a GS with ideational content in strict initial position, and though other embedded clauses functioning as GS have been treated as unmarked themes. The reason for placing them in this third category is that they are marked forms and they are also more easily discussed in relation to clefts.
4.1.4 SEMANTIC CATEGORISATION OF THEMES AND FINAL FREE MODIFIERS

Following Gosden and Davies, final free modifiers and marked themes have been sub-classified functionally according to whether they realise semantic notions such as time, space or concession. The analysis adopts Davies’s view of complex marked themes as being of three types according to whether the various elements 1) realise a constant semantic category, 2) realise mixed semantic categories, or 3) simultaneously realise multiple semantic categories. The preliminary analysis of sentence-initial themes according to semantic function in 4.2.2.2 below takes into account only the very first component of a complex marked theme, in the interest of seeing what the author has chosen to position first, which also permits comparison with Gosden’s findings, but the discussion in later chapters also looks at other, non-initial components of multiple marked themes in order to include a greater number of data on which to base conclusions about the pragmatic functions of forms with a particular semantic function. Thus, in the following example, only the signal of additive meaning in strict initial position is included in the preliminary categorisation of themes according to semantic function, but the following if-clause is included in the data discussed in Chapter 8.

H/B/1/5/8 And, if it was “subverted” in their interests, it was also refined and developed by them.

Where one element simultaneously realises more than one semantic category, as with a when-clause which realises both time and reason, or a clause of condition which also realises concession, one meaning is taken to be primary so that it is counted once for the initial analysis of items in strict initial position, but the other meanings are taken into account in discussion elsewhere.

Clauses appearing as marked themes are compared with clauses of the same semantic type occurring as final free modifiers in rheme in order to determine the effect of initial or final placement on discourse functions. Had time and space permitted, it would have been useful to undertake a more comprehensive analysis of items appearing as final free modifiers, including many which do not have equivalents in Theme. This is an area which could usefully be explored further in future studies along the lines of Thompson’s (1983) analysis of final -ing clauses.
First of all, each section of each article was identified with the letter I for introduction, B for body or C for conclusion, then each paragraph and each sentence was numbered. Thus, H/B/2/4/3 refers to the third sentence of the fourth paragraph of the second sub-section of the body of the Harriss article. A manual count was made of the number of paragraphs, sentences, words, independent clauses beginning with a capital letter or preceded by a colon or semi-colon, and independent clauses preceded by any of these or a medial co-ordinator or a comma. Then the average number of sentences per paragraph, and words per paragraph and per sentence was determined. The results are shown in Table 1 in Appendix 2.

The clause-initial themes were then categorised according to whether they were marked themes, unmarked themes (GS), non-prototypical themes (anticipatory-it, existential-there, pseudoclefts, interrogative markers and fronted elements), or themes in sentences consisting entirely of quoted material. Within the first three broad categories, themes were further classified into semantic categories in the case of marked and unmarked themes, and according to type of structure in the case of non-prototypical themes. Within these sub-categories, themes were sub-classified according to whether they occurred sentence-initially, were initial in independent clauses preceded by a colon or semi-colon, or were initial in independent clauses preceded by either a medial co-ordinator or a comma. In the case of complex marked themes, at each of these levels the separate elements of meaning were allocated to the appropriate semantic category, with an indication of whether each occurred in strict initial position or in second, third, or even fourth position in the complex theme. Marked themes were further subdivided according to linguistic form, whether clause, prepositional phrase, adverb or conjunction. Finally, all dependent clauses and phrases in final position which were separated by punctuation from the rest of the sentence were recorded and classified so that a comparison could be made between the pragmatic uses of these clauses in both sentence-initial and sentence-final position.

Initially, a delicate analysis of the distribution of various types of theme at each of the three levels of text had been planned, but time constraints prevented a rigorous multilevel analysis, and it was not necessary for comparison with the findings of Gosden, Davies and MacDonald. However, analysis of marked themes at the two lower levels provided additional data for Chapters 7, 8 and 9, which focus on the pragmatic functions of different semantic types of, mainly, marked themes and final free modifiers. Thus, while the
preliminary findings reported in 4.2 below and the findings for unmarked themes reported in Chapter 5 are based on analysis of sentence-initial themes only, the later chapters also include illustrations of the use of particular lexicogrammatical forms from lower levels.

Only sentence-level themes were taken into account for comparison with Gosden and MacDonald's findings. All grammatical subjects were counted and classified semantically but were grouped separately according to whether they were preceded by marked themes or not. Only those not preceded by marked themes, that is those functioning as unmarked themes, were taken into account for comparison with Gosden's (1992) findings for the relative distributions of marked and unmarked themes. But for comparison with the findings for grammatical subjects in both Gosden (1993) and MacDonald (1994) all grammatical subjects were taken into account, whether or not preceded by marked themes. For purposes of comparison with their findings, the items treated as non-prototypical in the present research were redistributed to match the categorisations of these researchers.

Chapter 5 presents the analysis of unmarked themes, Chapter 6 that of non-prototypical themes, and Chapters 7, 8 and 9, that of marked themes. The primary organisation of the analysis in Chapter 6 is according to formal distinctions between non-prototypical themes, within which there is discussion of the pragmatic uses of each type. In contrast, marked themes are first grouped according to semantic criteria for discussion in three separate chapters. Within each chapter, they are first organised according into semantic categories and then, within these categories, into formal categories.

**4.1.6 SPECIFIC RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. What are the relative proportions of marked, unmarked and non-prototypical themes in these texts?

2. What are the relative proportions of themes of different semantic categories?

3. What are the discourse functions of different types of themes and final free modifiers?

4. How do the discourse functions of particular types of clauses vary according to whether they occur in theme or as final free modifiers?
How do the four authors differ in their use of items in theme or as final free modifiers; can they function as style markers or as discriminators of more or less effective text?

Are there any aspects of the deployment of items in theme or as final free modifiers which might be said to characterise academic history discourse? In particular, how frequent is the occurrence in theme of the following items, said to characterise either academic exposition in general or academic history discourse in particular?

- contrast markers
- time signals
- reference to human participants in historical events

Does the relative frequency of occurrence of these items in theme throw any light on the question of the relative importance of argument and narrative in history discourse?

4.2 GENERAL FINDINGS

4.2.1 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE CORPUS

The period and broad topic of investigation is almost the same in both medieval history articles: both examine the implications for royal authority of the involvement of political society in government in late medieval England. Harriss focuses on government institutions, finance and law enforcement throughout the country during a period of two hundred years or so, while Walker focuses on the personnel of one institution, the commission of the peace, in one county, Yorkshire, in a narrower period, comprising the reigns of two successive kings. Both modern history articles are concerned with the first half of the twentieth century. The MacKenzie modern history article compares the treatment of prisoners of war in the three different theatres of the Second World War, while the Whiting article deals with taxation of the working class in the aftermath of the First World War.
One difference between the medieval and the modern history articles is that the latter incorporate many quotes from participants in the events they report. Much of the data a modern historian deals with is extensive recorded oral or written utterances by people involved in the historical events under study, whereas the historian of more distant periods of time relies on more limited and fragmentary data, for instance contemporary chronicles and records such as statutes and Exchequer lists of payments and land grants. What few quotes there are in the Harriss and Walker medieval history articles tend to be brief phrases closely integrated within the writer's own sentences, and taken from the secondary literature rather than from primary sources. In contrast, in the MacKenzie and the Whiting modern history articles, sentences consisting entirely or almost entirely of quoted material are frequently integrated within paragraphs. In addition, the Whiting text makes very marked use of extended quotes from what was said by government, trade union and other figures at the time, which are set apart by line spacing and constitute a substantial proportion of the text.

Another difference is in the greater length of paragraphs in the medieval history articles, as indicated in Table 1 in Appendix 2. The paragraphs in the MacKenzie article are generally much shorter, with, on average, only slightly more than half the number of sentences of those in the medieval history articles. There is much more inconsistency in the size of paragraphs in the Whiting article; there are many very short paragraphs but also much lengthier paragraphs, though the average number of sentences per paragraph is still a good deal below that for the two medieval history texts. The Walker article has the lowest number of paragraphs but also the longest. The number of sentences per paragraph is about the same as in the Harriss text, if a sentence is defined as starting with a capital letter and ending with a full stop, but Walker's paragraphs are much longer, partly because he makes much more use of colons and semi-colons for co-ordinating clauses than the other writers. If independent clauses co-ordinated by colons and semi-colons are treated as sentences there is an increase in the total number of sentences of 62 in the Walker article, compared with 22, 18 and 6 in the Harriss, Whiting and MacKenzie articles respectively. Walker also uses a far greater number of words per sentence than the other authors.

The Whiting article differs from the other three in making minimal reference to the interpretations of other historians and exhibiting no 'contending rhetoric', even in the introduction. Though making less reference to the research of others in the body of the text
than the two medieval history articles, the other modern history article, by Mackenzie, does follow convention in the introduction section by providing a literature review and indicating a gap to be filled, and does so by indicating at the outset that other scholars are mistaken in their views, as does the Harriss article. The Walker article is more impartial at this point, presenting points of disagreement among other historians in the introduction without indicating the author’s own view. Both Walker and MacKenzie reveal their own positions in the body of the article, while Harriss and Whiting state theirs in their introduction sections. However, all four historians reiterate their own theses in summary form in a foregrounded way in their conclusion sections.

The four articles represent a range of styles, with the Harris medieval history text at the most rhetorical and argumentative extreme and the Whiting modern history text at the most prosaic and least contentious extreme. It is possible that medieval historians are open to influence by exposure to the texts of their nineteenth century predecessors, who were writing when the convention was for historical writing to be more literary in style.

4.2.1.1 TEXT STRUCTURE

A major difference between these history journal articles and the scientific journal articles analysed by Gosden is the fact that they do not have the four-part IMRAD structure: Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion. Instead, they are divided into three main parts: Introduction, Body and Conclusion, with the Body itself divided orthographically into three parts, each normally corresponding to a conceptual sub-section, though the Walker article combines two conceptual sub-sections within one orthographical sub-section, presumably bot to conform to the convention of three sections to the body and because one of these two conceptual sections is much shorter than the others. Material corresponding to that distributed across the Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion sections in science research articles is, in history articles, integrated within the Body of the article.

Another difference between science and history articles is the fact that history journal articles do not make much use of section and sub-section headings. In the present corpus, only the Harriss and MacKenzie articles use headings and only for each of the three major sections in the body of the text, not to indicate the function of the section, as in science
articles, but to indicate which aspect of the subject is to be discussed. A third difference between history journal articles and those in various other disciplines, including Applied Linguistics, is that references and notes are indicated by superscript numbers rather than author surname and publication date in brackets, and the references and notes referred to occur on the same pages as these numbers; that is, they are distributed throughout the text rather than appearing in a list at the end of the article. These notes can sometimes take up more of the page than the main text itself and, as they are in a smaller font, were an obstacle to scanning the articles for inclusion in the appendices to this thesis. They have not been included in the analysis.

Harriss has a much longer introduction section than the other authors: eleven paragraphs, as opposed to two, three and four in the Whiting, MacKenzie and Walker articles respectively. Three of the articles have very short opening paragraphs - two sentences in the MacKenzie text and four in the Harriss and Walker texts - all three with very similar opening sentences, starting with a marked theme consisting of a prepositional phrase introduced by in. The Harriss opening paragraph serves as an introduction to both the introduction section itself, indicating its structure and content, and to the entire article, and not only establishes the period and broad topic but also gives a preview of the literature review and the author’s own contrasting stance. In contrast, the Whiting introduction consists of two paragraphs of approximately equal length, both including elaboration at a level of detail which the other articles present in medial paragraphs rather than the opening and closing ones.

A breakdown of the move structure in the four introductions in terms of Swales’s (1990) CARS (Creating a Research Space) model of academic journal article introductions is given in Table 2 in Appendix 2: The Whiting introduction deviates from the order followed by the other three articles, which each provide a general statement of topic, followed by a literature review and then a more precise indication of the scope and organisation of the article at the end of the introduction section. Although the Whiting introduction also states the broad topic - the working class’s experience with the tax system - in the opening sentence, unlike the other three, it does not state the historical period until the second sentence, where it is indicated by means of a prepositional phrase in medial position. The first statement of the purpose of the article also occurs in this second sentence of the opening paragraph, rather than, as in the other articles, in final position, either at the end of the first paragraph or at the end of the entire introduction section. The second statement of the scope of the article, as
well as an indication of the structure of the article, is buried half way through the second of the two paragraphs in the introduction, rather than being foregrounded at the end of the final paragraph, as in the other three articles. As already mentioned, the Whiting article also differs from the other three articles in making no reference to the views of other historians in the introduction section, not even by means of footnotes. In reading the Whiting article it is not possible to rely on conventional text structure as compensation for the lack of an obvious topic sentence; neither of the two paragraphs comply with the anticipated sequencing of information, which builds to a climax at the end of the section. This means that the introduction section in this article is less easily readable than the introduction sections in the other three articles.

These introductions to research articles obviously differ from school history textbook introductions in their complexity. Eggins et al (1993) describe the latter as a variety of Report which indicates the general questions the chapter is going to address, giving a precis of the relevant facts. Like school history textbooks, these journal article introductions give a precis of relevant facts, and indicate the various aspects of the subject and what will be done in the body of the article, but the precis is not of the new data which is the focus of the article; but a precis of background information in the form of a summary of the work of other scholars in the field.

Because of the need to justify the usefulness of the paper, the introductions incorporate stretches of what Eggins et al call Argument. In the Harriss introduction the argument has a fully-fledged text structure in that it incorporates Thesis, Argument and Conclusion (Hyland, 1990); and lacks only the fully elaborated evidence, which will be provided in the body of the article. The Walker introduction exhibits a partial Argument, in that it provides a Thesis and arguments against the Thesis but at this point the author himself does not take a stance or arrive at a Conclusion. This is deferred until the body and conclusion sections of the paper.

As with Swales's work on introduction sections of research articles, it would be useful to be able to establish moves for discussion sections, as proposed by Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995, cited in Skelton 1996), or, in the case of history journal articles, for the body of an article. The body consists of three parts set off from one another orthographically by double line spacing, and, in two of the four history articles each with a sub-heading indicating
which aspect of the topic is to be covered. Conceptually, the body of the Walker article divides into four parts as he considers each of four groups of justices on the commissions of the peace in turn, but the second part, consisting of only three paragraphs, is combined with the third to form the middle one of the three orthographic sub-sections. Within each subsection of the body of the text, Walker usually has an organisation based on the geographical division of Yorkshire into three Ridings. The three sections in the body of the Harriss article deal with three aspects of late medieval government: the development of central institutions, the financial viability of the state, and the effectiveness of the judicial system and peace-keeping. Both Whiting and MacKenzie have a first section in the body of the text which is very much longer than the other two sections. Each section of the body of the MacKenzie article deals with a different theatre of war: in the West, on the Russian front, and in Asia. The first section of the body of the Whiting article deals with direct taxation and each of the other two with an aspect of indirect taxation.

Walker has a much longer conclusion section than the other three - six paragraphs, most quite lengthy, as opposed to three, two and one for MacKenzie, Harriss and Whiting respectively. Skelton (1996) suggests that speculation beyond the research itself sometimes means that papers conclude with a demand for further investigation or new lines of enquiry that looks like a rhetorical flourish because it is too vague to be operationalised or too big to be realistic. This is not really the case with these history articles, but all four conclusion sections do exhibit a widening of focus, after an initial summary of the content of the body of the article. This is most pronounced in the Walker conclusion, where a short opening paragraph summarising the author’s thesis and the evidence for it presented in the body of the text is followed by five lengthy paragraphs in which the focus is widened to a consideration of whether the findings for Yorkshire hold true for the rest of the country, accompanied by fragmentary evidence suggesting an answer to this question. MacKenzie and Whiting mainly confine themselves to summarising the content of the body of the text and reiterating the thesis, but the last of MacKenzie’s three paragraphs sets the period under study in a wider context, characterising the Second World War as a transitional period between preceding wars and later wars as regards philosophies of warfare, while the last sentence in the one-paragraph Whiting conclusion looks forward to the consequences of policy in the period under study for subsequent periods. Harriss also broadens the time scale to comment on the longer term consequences of developments in the period under study.
Skelton (1996) sees a scientific research paper typically moving from the known to the new, to a recontextualisation of the new, and finally to speculation about what the new information means. The introduction presents contextually truth (shared/given knowledge), the results section evidential truth (derived from the findings of the current study), and the discussion section interpreted truth (judgement about the value of the findings and speculation about what they mean), giving rise to a tentative and provisional new truth. In these history journal articles, as already indicated above, evidential truth and interpreted truth are integrated within the body of the article. Rather than the latter following the former, the interpretation is generally stated first, in the opening paragraphs of sub-sections of the body of the article and in topic sentences usually occurring at or near the beginnings of paragraphs. It is then generally reiterated at the end of the sub-sections but also often echoed at the ends of paragraphs too. In between, the evidential truth is threaded into the argument, with much of the detail packed into subordinate constructions. Finally, the conclusion section foregrounds the interpreted truth by summarising the argument, condensing it into the space of one or two paragraphs.

4.2.2 ANALYSIS OF THEMES

4.2.2.1 RELATIVE PROPORTIONS OF MARKED, UNMARKED AND NON-PROTOTYPICAL THEMES

Table 4.1 shows the relative percentages of marked, unmarked and non-prototypical sentence themes in the entire corpus of history texts, as well as for each section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unmarked Themes</th>
<th>Marked Themes</th>
<th>Non-Prot Themes</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire text</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to compare these findings with Gosden's for science research articles, it is necessary to transfer cleft, extraposed and existential-there constructions from the non-
prototypical to the unmarked theme category, which gives the results in Table 4.2. Gosden’s findings are shown in Table 4.3

**Table 4.2**
Relative percentages of categories of sentence-initial elements in the history research articles according to Gosden’s (1992) classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Context Frame</th>
<th>Non-GS/CF</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire text</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.3**
Relative percentages of sentence-initial Grammatical Subjects, Context Frames and other themes in Gosden’s (1992) corpus of science research articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GS</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>Non-GS/CF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is not a great deal of difference between Gosden’s science sample and the history sample as regards the relative proportions of GS and CF in the introduction section, though the balance is more in favour of GS in the history texts. The figure for the discussion section in the science articles is closest to that for the conclusion section in the history sample, but there are almost 4% more CFs in the history conclusion section than in the science discussion section. When the body and the conclusion sections of the history articles are compared, there is little difference between the percentages or balance between the two types of theme, while in the science articles there is a fairly significant difference between the results and the discussion sections, with the relative percentages in the results section being fairly close to those in the introduction, while the discussion section has a rather larger proportion of CFs than either. In the science articles it is the experimental section which stands out as most different, with a far lower proportion of CFs than GSs, but in the history sample it is the introduction section which has a much lower proportion of CFs than the other two sections.

If Gosden is right in associating a greater number of marked themes (context frames) with higher rhetorical multifunctionality, resulting in more frequent signalling of topic-shifting,
these findings suggest that history discourse is more rhetorically multifunctional than science, but that the introduction sections of history journal articles are considerably less so than the other sections, and the conclusion sections slightly less so than the body. This is surprising as it might be expected that the writer would argue his case more forcefully in the introduction and conclusion sections. Gosden associates the low number of CFs in the science experimental section with more matter-of-fact statements and a linear checklist approach to presenting information. However, it will be seen below that an important factor in the higher incidence of marked themes in the body section in the history sample is the higher incidence here of marked themes of one semantic type, namely real world time marked themes, which are associated with narrative rather than argument. Rather than contributing to more rhetorical use of language, they are most frequently associated with supporting detail. Moreover, in particularly foregrounded stretches of text, the points may be driven home more forcefully by a series of unmarked themes consisting of simple noun phrases. This is most noticeably the case in the seventh and tenth paragraphs of the Harriss introduction section.

*Table 3 in Appendix 2* gives the percentages for each type of theme in each section of each of the four texts according to the classification adopted in the present analysis. Only the MacKenzie article has a higher proportion of marked themes than unmarked themes in the body and the conclusion sections; the proportion is only slightly higher in the body but the ratio in the conclusion section is exactly the reverse of that in the introduction. The other three texts each have approximately the same proportion of marked themes overall as Gosden found only in the discussion section of his science articles, the section with the highest number of marked themes.

**4.2.2.2 RELATIVE PROPORTIONS OF MARKED THEMES ACCORDING TO SEMANTIC FUNCTION**

It can be seen from *Table 4 in Appendix 2* that when only marked themes and fronted themes are taken into account, the biggest semantic category is real world time reference (25.4%), confirming a prediction for history in the literature, and the common sense view that narrative is an important method of text development in history. The second largest category is concession (16.8%), and concession and other types of contrast (4.6%) together come fairly close (21.4%) to the proportion of time themes, confirming claims made for
academic exposition in general and suggesting that the methodology of history does indeed involve argument as well as narrative. Addition is the third largest category (9.6%), which is not surprising, since whether text progression is driven by contrast or some other engine, such as Reason, a mark of mature writing is the marshalling of supporting points, or elaborating 'specify' functional roles, to use Lindeberg's (1985) term. In fact, Reason (8.6%), when inclusive of purpose (0.8%), comes very close to addition in frequency (9.4%), though still very much less frequent than contrast, which is noteworthy in view of Stockton's (1995) finding that university history teachers require cause and effect analysis from their students rather than argument.

However, argument involves all three - contrast, reason and addition - as well as condition (6.1%). Together, these four semantic categories account for 46.5% of the marked themes, as opposed to 36.4% which fall into the categories of reference to real world time, people or place. If addition is kept separate, on the grounds that it probably occurs with the same frequency in many text types, the percentage of themes participating in logical relations is almost the same as that for those referring to either people, time or place: 36.9%. Reference to people is the fifth largest category of marked themes (though they could also be placed in other semantic categories, as discussed in Chapter 7). However, when both marked and unmarked themes are taken into account, it actually accounts for the second largest number of sentence-initial themes, even more than time themes, as will be seen below. Citing (2.3%) and quoting (1.9%) participants in the historical events under study account for 4.2% of the marked themes, more than location in real world space (3.4%); evaluating accounts for 2.7 and generalising for 2.5%; the remaining 5.8% is made up of miscellaneous marked themes discussed in Chapter 7. All of the quote and most of the evaluation marked themes are fronted items.

In order to compare findings with Gosden's, it is necessary to remove the fronted themes as he does not treat these as marked themes. Table 5 in Appendix 2 shows the adjustment and Table 6 sets out the findings alongside Gosden's. The most obvious difference is that overall the real world time themes in the history texts (26.4%) are double those in the science sample (11.2%), though the difference is not great between the history and science introduction sections, and there is a high number of time marked themes in the science experimental section, even higher than that in the body sections of the history articles. On the other hand, there is a much greater number of marked themes realising location in real
world space in the science sample: 14.9% as opposed to 3.7% for history, despite the fact that history deals with events in geographical space. But once the general location of historical events is established, for instance England or the Pacific, history has little need for reference to physical location in space. The equivalent of the category of reference to human participants in historical events in history would be reference to inanimate physical entities in the science sample, but this does not show up in marked theme in Gosden’s sample. In fact, the marked themes in the history sample which have been allocated to the category of reference to human participants would have been placed in other semantic categories by Gosden, such as condition, and several could be placed in the perspective class in the present analysis, but it is interesting to see just how often history makes mention of historical personages. This category is discussed further in Chapter 7.

The proportion of contrast/concession marked themes is smaller in the science sample, (18.3% vs. 22.8%) though only slightly so. But the proportion of themes realising reason or purpose is considerably higher: 18.3% as compared with 9.9% for history, which again tends to undermine the claim that establishing cause and effect relations is particularly characteristic of history. Reason themes are particularly numerous in the science discussion section because this is where the explanation of the results is provided, and purpose themes are particularly evident in the experimental section, as might be expected in the reporting of experiments. In the history sample, it is the conclusion section which has the highest proportion of reason themes. The science sample also realises condition by means of marked themes (11.0%) more often than the history sample (6.3%), though only half as frequently as history in the introduction section. Scientists are often concerned with outcomes in varying physical conditions, while historians relate what actually happened in specific circumstances. The figures for addition, however, are almost identical: 9.5% in science and 9.8% in history, supporting the suggestion made earlier that addition would be equally important in a wide variety of text types. But it is significantly more frequent in the science introduction sections than in the history introductions.

The picture is of course more complicated than these tables suggest because frequently the same form realises multiple semantic functions. A number of the marked themes which have been counted as instances of condition in Table 4 are actually used concessively but condition has been taken as the primary meaning. And time clauses never indicate time alone; at the very least they also indicate the real world conditions or circumstances in
which an event took place, and they frequently realise reason as well as other semantic
functions. More detailed discussion of these various semantic categories of marked themes
is provided in later chapters. Meanwhile, the next chapter examines unmarked themes. It
will be seen that when all sentence-initial themes are taken into account - marked, unmarked
and non-prototypical - the prominence of time reference in theme is reduced. Reference to
human participants, as individuals or classes or organised into institutions, is more
numerous. But by far the greatest number of themes realise reference to behaviour,
processes, attributes, states of affairs and mental states.
CHAPTER 5 SEMANTIC CATEGORISATION OF SUBJECTS

Analysis of unmarked themes is, essentially, analysis of noun phrases, and is therefore consistent with the recognition that academic writer is highly nominal in character. The general findings presented in the previous chapter were concerned with sentence-initial themes only but the discussion in this chapter takes account of all grammatical subjects, whether preceded by marked themes or not, in order to facilitate comparison with the findings of MacDonald (1994), Gosden (1993) and Davies (1988).

5.1 CLASSIFICATIONS OF UNMARKED THEMES

Sentence subjects have been classified according to the degree of writer visibility exhibited (Gosden 1993, Davies 1988) and according to whether they have epistemic or real world phenomenal reference (MacDonald 1994, 1992).

5.1.1 WRITER VISIBILITY

Davies (1988) ranges Subject Roles along a continuum, as follows, with most personally visible at the top and most invisible and impersonal at the bottom:

Discourse participant:
- *I propose to...*

Discourse Viewpoint:
- *My argument is...*

Interactive Participant:
- *You may wish to...The reader may be forgiven for... Sinclair (1983) proposes...*

Real-World Participant:
- *Many students in higher education suffer from...*

Discourse Entity:
- *This paper investigates...*

Real-World Entity:
- *The tooth consists of three regions...*

Hypothesised Entity:
- *The elements of structure in a dynamic model...*

Real-World Event Process:
- *The sinking of the trawler resulted in...*

Mental Process:
The separation of purposes that are recognised as being carried out
Objectivised Viewpoint:
The cause of this reaction... One consequence of these approaches is...
Invisible Subject:
There appear to be... It is now clear that...

Gosden (1993) adapts Davies’s classification as shown in Fig 1, so as to also take into account four domains of functional roles and a continuum between internal writer orientation and external research community orientation. He differs somewhat from Davies in his distribution of domains along a continuum from greater writer visibility to least writer visibility. Davies places Real-World reference midway whereas Gosden places it at the least visible extreme. She places empty subject themes at the least visible extreme, whereas he distributes them across three of his four domains. He treats subjects such as Previous studies as an Interactive Discourse Entity, while Davies provides a similar noun phrase as illustration of a Real-World Entity: The first anthology of essays on writing in non-academic texts. His illustrations, all of which feature non-specific nouns, suggest that his Objectivised Viewpoint category is narrower than hers, and with a greater focus on modification in the noun phrase rather than the head noun.

5.1.2 EPISTEMIC VERSUS PHENOMENAL REFERENCE

MacDonald (1992, 1994) is interested in how linguistic choices illustrate differences in ways of knowing in academic disciplines, particularly discipline-specific differences in degrees of particularism and explicit epistemic accounting. In order to investigate the type of conceptual work academic sentences do, she classifies sentence subjects in written texts from three disciplines according to the ways they realise either reference to the phenomena under study (phenomenal) or else to the research participants, methods and end-products of the disciplinary community (epistemic). Her choice of sentence subjects as the focus for linking syntactic and semantic analysis is based on the importance of the subject slot for indicating what a writer is writing about, which leads her to expect that the writer’s concern with indicating how knowledge is obtained and evaluated and relates to research by other scholars is likely to show up there. She identifies three phenomenal classes and four epistemic classes.
**Fig 5.1**
Categorisation of the discourse functions of subjects in scientific research articles (Gosden 1993)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More external community-oriented theme</th>
<th>More internal writer-oriented theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant Domain</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discourse Domain</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Interactive Participant 
*Smith 1987* | Interactive Discourse Entity 
*Previous Studies* | Hypothesised Entity 
*The model* | Real-World Entity 
*AIFcNi alloy* |
| Empty Discourse Theme 
*It is concluded, There are reports* | Empty H & O Theme 
*It was evident, There was evidence* | Empty Real-World Theme 
*It was found, There was a delay* | Real-World Event/Process 
*Annealing* |
| Micro Discourse Entity 
*Figure 1b* | Objectivised Viewpoint 
*One Factor* | Mental Process 
*Deductions* | |
| Macro Discourse Entity 
*This paper* | Hypothesised Viewpoint 
*The possibility* | | |
| Discourse Event/Process 
*The conclusion* | | | |

**More interactional theme**

**Greatest writer visibility**

**More topic-based theme**

**Least writer visibility**
Phenomenal classes (the material the researcher studies, i.e. real world)
   Class 1: Particulars (specific people, places, objects)
   Class 2: Groups (of people, places, objects)
   Class 3: Attributes (properties, action, behaviour, motivations, thoughts, of above noun referents)

Epistemic classes (methods, conceptual tools, previous research the researcher brings to bear on the real world material)
   Class 4: Reasons (abstractions used in reasoning (e.g. evidence, reasons, argument, findings, significance, longitudinal studies))
   Class 5: Research (scholars in the field)
   Class 6: Isms (schools of thought e.g. the new historicism)
   Class 7: Audience (generalised we, you, one)

5.1.3 COMPARISON OF THE THREE CLASSIFICATIONS

Writer visibility is not the focus of MacDonald’s study, but she touches on it in discussing how decisions about agency, realised by sentence subjects, reflect academics’ awareness of the constructedness of their accounts (p149), and there is a rough correspondence between her division between the phenomenal and epistemic categories and Gosden’s division between the Real World domain and the other domains. However, MacDonald would presumably include in her epistemic category the sort of reference to investigative procedures, processes and events which occurs in the Experimental section of a scientific research article, but which Gosden places in the Real World domain. His examples include *It was found that, The preparation of the amorphous sample, and deductions*, which he categorises as Empty Real World Theme, Real World Event/Process and Mental Process respectively, all in the real world domain. These examples resemble *findings, interviews* and *argument*, which MacDonald provides as illustrations of her Class 4 (reasons), defined as ‘all-purpose abstractions and words used in reasoning’. Gosden appears to be making a distinction between activities involved in the writing of the research article, allocated to his non-real world domains, and those, including mental processes (e.g. *calculation comparison, analysis, evaluation*) involved in collecting the information prior to its being reported on in the research article, which he considers real world activities. MacDonald, on the other hand, appears to blur this distinction between the text world and the outside world in the interest of distinguishing reference to research from reference to the subject matter which is being researched. Gosden’s distinction is less evident in analysis of humanities texts, where there is no reference to the physical aspects of collecting data and the reference to research methods is reference to thinking processes involved in analysis of data, which is indistinguishable from thinking processes involved in writing the research article; but it becomes more apparent with social science texts, where there may be reference to the
carrying out of interviews or surveys prior to the writing up of the results, similar to the scientist's performance of experiments.

5.1.3.1 MACDONALD'S EPISTEMIC/ATTRIBUTES DISTINCTION VIS-A-VIS GOSDEN AND DAVIES'S OBJECTIVISED/REAL WORLD DISTINCTION

The main difficulty is to establish where the boundary lies between MacDonald's phenomenal Class 3 (Attributes) and her epistemic Class 4 (Reasons), and how it relates to the boundary between Gosden's and Davies's Hypothesised or Objectivised domain and their Real World domain. The latter distribute subjects MacDonald would categorise as epistemic across several categories according to the degree of author visibility present. Davies uses the term Discourse Viewpoint for the combination of a first person pronoun with a noun indicating aspects of the author's reporting (my argument, my second point, our aim), while, for a similar noun phrase (our data) Gosden uses the term Participant Viewpoint, which he defines as 'use of our, with a focus on research outcomes/activities, i.e. our research rather than our reporting'. MacDonald would regard such noun phrases as falling into her Class 4 (Reasons). Both Gosden and Davies have Discourse Participant for first person pronoun reference to the author (we), and Interactive Participant for reference to another researcher, as in Smith, 1987, but no Interactive Participant Viewpoint, so Gosden would presumably treat Smith's objection as an Interactive Discourse Entity, which embraces reference to a process 'that relates to the current state of knowledge about a subject' and to an 'implied written mode of communication'; there is no indication how Davies would treat such a noun phrase. Again, MacDonald would place it in Class 4 (Reasons). Since she also includes Longitudinal studies in Class 4 (Reasons), she presumably treats only reference to human participants (e.g. historians, other researchers) as Class 5 (Research), defined as reference to scholars in the field, and would also place in Class 4 what Gosden labels a Macro-Discourse Entity (This paper, The present research) and an Interactive Discourse Entity (Previous studies). Davies also uses the term Discourse Entity for reference to entire texts, as in this paper.

Nouns such as analysis, assumption, comparison and idea, unaccompanied by possessive modification and referring to the illocutionary force of segments of text are called Discourse Event/Process by Gosden. Where they do not refer to the illocutionary force of discourse segments but to investigative processes which take place before research is written up, he
and Davies use the label Mental Process, which he allocates to the Real-World domain, whereas MacDonald treats them as as epistemic subjects. Both Gosden and Davies use the term Hypothesised Entity for ‘modes of testing and carrying out research and their means of expression’ (Gosden p67), as in the elements of structure in a dynamic model, and the term Objectivised Viewpoint for subjects which present the author’s viewpoint as having acknowledged or given status while the author remains invisible (Davies p196), as in one consequence of these approaches, one of the factors. But Davies does not have the category Hypothesised Viewpoint, which Gosden uses for degrees of uncertainty or explicit hedging, realised through modality, as in the possibility of variations, the most probable cause. She would presumably also treat these as Objectivised Viewpoint.

It is this hypothesised and objectivised domain which is particularly interesting as regards how unmarked themes are involved in arguing a case, and also the role played by nominalisation. The term Objectivised Viewpoint seems to be used by Davies to embrace both subjects which MacDonald would consider epistemic and subjects she would consider phenomenal. Davies (p181) provides the cause of this reaction and one consequence of these approaches as illustrations. MacDonald would presumably place these and other nouns of Winter’s Vocabulary 3 class in her epistemic Class 4 (Reasons) since she provides the noun reasons as an illustration of this class. But two other illustrations of Objectivised Viewpoint provided by Davies do not involve such nouns:

The evident inability of the higher education authorities to honour the principles laid down under the Freedom of Speech Act gives serious cause for concern.

Inadequate representation of the rhetorical situation eventually led this writer into such serious difficulties with framing and translating that she begins to abandon the content...

The subject of the first sentence could be viewed as indicating either an attribute or behaviour of people who are the object of study, and therefore as a candidate for MacDonald’s phenomenal Class 3 (Attributes). It is not clear whether Davies treats it as Objectivised Viewpoint because the modifier evident makes the research perspective more visible or because the word inability indicates a judgement imposed on the facts by the author. One question is whether an epistemic signal as modification rather than as head noun is sufficient qualification for inclusion in MacDonald’s epistemic category; Gosden uses signalling of hedging by means of modal pre-modification as sufficient reason for
treating a noun phrase as hypothesised viewpoint rather than objectivised viewpoint but MacDonald provides only nouns as illustrations. The second example does not have an overt signal of a research perspective as modification, though it does have evaluative modification.

Another question is whether MacDonald would view the noun *inability* as having an epistemic use here or as merely reference to a property, attribute or behaviour of the phenomena under study. The latter seems to be the case; she does not use the term epistemic for all subjects which realise a judgement imposed on the facts by the author, but only for those where the author explicitly presents content as a judgement or finding by the author rather than as fact. For instance, she categorises *Queen Elizabeth's desires* as Class 3 (Attributes) ‘because the desires are represented as belonging to Queen Elizabeth even though it is the academic who has characterised them as belonging there’ (p158). She explains the absence of Class 4 (Reasons) subjects in a literary studies article as partly owing to the fact that the writer tends to present his hypotheses without explicit epistemic accounting, or epistemic foregrounding (p166) by embedding them within Class 3 (Attributes) phenomena. Davies herself (p196) views nominalisation of mental process in subject role as necessarily objectifying the hypotheses of writers and reducing their visibility, treating writer hypotheses as real-world processes. MacDonald (p162) illustrates the difference between presenting content as fact, and therefore not in the epistemic domain, rather than as a finding by comparing *Boys are particularly susceptible to nonmaternal care*, as illustration of the former, with *The findings of Chase-Lansdale and Owen.....indicate that boys might be particularly susceptible to...*, as illustration of the latter.

This blurring of the distinction between epistemic and non-epistemic use of language applies not just to sentence subjects but to entire sentences, as illustrated by the following three sentences from the Harriss medieval history article.

H/B/3/2/6 *When Edward left England for Brabant in 1338 he included lords and gentry, along with royal justices, in commissions of the peace with power to try felonies.*

H/C/2/9-10 *He would not have been disappointed, for what survived the Wars of the Roses, and the harsh legalism of the early Tudor state, was what had been shaping over the two preceding centuries: a political society deeply versed in government, and a system of government in which crown and subjects shared responsibility. This made England governable until the Civil War.*
Two views of the development of late medieval government thus stand in opposition to each other.

The first of these sentences is straight reporting of fact and the last is explicitly a statement about research, as signalled by the label views, which here has both anaphoric and cataphoric reference. The middle two sentences are the very last sentences of the entire article and clearly provide the author’s interpretation of the facts, but, apart from the hypotheticality expressed by He would not have been disappointed, there is no explicit signal of author viewpoint which distinguishes them linguistically from the first sentence. They would thus not be categorised as epistemic by MacDonald.

Non-specific nouns such as factor, feature, difference, contribution, cause and reason are also problematic. All of Gosden’s illustrations of H and O Viewpoint feature non-specific nouns, suggesting that his H and O Viewpoint category is more restricted than Davies’s Objectivised viewpoint category, though his commentary draws attention to the noun phrase modification qualifying them for inclusion in this category rather than the nouns which are Heads of these noun phrases. Though more obviously writer projections which organise the real world data, such nouns do not indicate concern with scholarly interpretation as explicitly as subject choices such as my argument, previous studies, the issues in debate, but, rather, indicate aspects of or relationships between real world phenomena. Although MacDonald defines epistemic Class 4 (Reasons) as containing all-purpose abstractions and words used in the reasoning of academics and provides the word reasons as an example, her other illustrations of this class all refer to the illocutions, tools or findings of scholars, or, in the case of evidence and significance, the role the real world phenomena play in scholarly interpretation. And there is no indication whether she intends the word reasons as an example of metadiscourse, labelling the function of a text segment, or also to indicate a relation between phenomena in the real world.

5.2 THE ANALYSIS

The following analysis examines GS choices in the history texts first according to Gosden’s classification, then according to MacDonald’s, and, finally, proposes and applies a new classification.
5.2.1 COMPARISON WITH GOSDEN’S FINDINGS

Table 7 in Appendix 2 shows Gosden’s findings for the relative proportions of different subject roles in each section of his science article sample, and, for comparison, Table 8 shows the findings for the history sample according to Gosden’s classification. Table 5.1 below provides a summary.

Table 5.1
Summary comparison of findings for Gosden’s (1992) science sample and the history sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Gosden Exp</th>
<th>Gosden Res</th>
<th>Gosden Disc</th>
<th>History Body</th>
<th>History Conc</th>
<th>Totals G</th>
<th>Totals H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant domain</td>
<td>G: 16.9</td>
<td>H: 13.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse domain</td>
<td>G: 9.9</td>
<td>H: 24.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H &amp; O domain</td>
<td>G: 6.8</td>
<td>H: 23.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real world domain</td>
<td>G: 66.4</td>
<td>H: 38.5</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most obvious difference is the much greater proportion of hypothesised and objectivised viewpoint in the history sample. There is also a significantly lesser proportion of real world subjects. It is likely that the H and O viewpoint category has been more inclusive in the analysis of the history sample. In the absence of illustrations from Gosden of subject noun phrases which do not feature non-specific nouns but are also not unambiguously objective reference to real world phenomena, the analysis has followed the example of the two Davies objectivised viewpoint illustrations discussed earlier and included noun phrases with evaluative content. However, if the scope of H and O viewpoint is restricted to non-specific nouns, the proportion of subjects in this category is still higher, as shown in Table 5.2. It is possible that Gosden’s category of non-specific nouns is restricted to the type of nouns included in Winter’s Vocabulary 3 category, i.e. mainly nouns such as cause, reason effect and consequence, which can be paraphrased by means of a conjunct such as because or as a result.
Table 5.2
Hypothesised and Objectivised viewpoint GS realised by non-specific nouns in the history sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H Wa M Wh T</td>
<td>H Wa M Wh T</td>
<td>H Wa M Wh T</td>
<td>H Wa M Wh T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H &amp; O domain</td>
<td>8.9 4.8 0.0 25.0 <strong>9.2</strong></td>
<td>11.3 24.7 18.5 <strong>17.7</strong></td>
<td>10.5 25.0 20.0 30.0 <strong>20.7</strong></td>
<td>11.0 23.1 17.1 18.6 <strong>17.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.2 COMPARISON WITH MACDONALD’S FINDINGS

MacDonald’s findings support a common perception that humanities fields are more particularistic than sciences and social sciences in the way they define problems. The psychology research articles in her sample are less particularistic than the history and literature research articles, and more concerned with reference to validation by other scholars, and with presenting content as findings rather than straightforward reporting of external phenomena. Citing Price’s distinction between fields that have a high percentage of reference to the current research front (science and, to a lesser degree, social science) and fields that are more archival (humanities), she suggests that academic fields which focus on more particularistic phenomena are constrained from building elaborate epistemic frameworks for negotiating knowledge claims by lack of generalizable patterns, and that scholars in those fields might find it important not to generalise in such a way as to erase particulars.

The history discourse in MacDonald’s sample comes midway between psychology and literature as regards degree of particularism and foregrounding negotiation of knowledge claims within a research community, as shown in Table 5.3, which compares her findings for these three disciplines with those for the present sample of four history journal articles, taking account of all notional sentence subjects and predicated themes, whether preceded by marked themes or not.

Table 5.3

Comparison of MacDonald’s (1994) findings with those for the present sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomenal Classes</th>
<th>Peck</th>
<th>MacDonald</th>
<th>Disciplinary Samples</th>
<th>Present sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenal Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1: Particulars</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2: Groups</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3: Attributes</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4: Reasons</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 5: Research</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 6: Isms</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 7: Audience</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 compares MacDonald’s findings for the introduction and body sections (she does not provide figures for the conclusion section) of one of her history articles with the
aggregate findings for the introduction, body and conclusion sections of the four history articles in the present sample.

Table 5.4
Comparison of MacDonald’s (1994) findings for each section of one history journal article with those for the four history journal articles in the present sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomenal Classes</th>
<th>MacDonald (one article)</th>
<th>Present sample (four articles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1: Particulars</td>
<td>5.0/12.0/6.0</td>
<td>Intro/Body/Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2: Groups</td>
<td>27.0/51.0/44.0</td>
<td>20.1/25.8/13.5/24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3: Attributes</td>
<td>17.0/21.0/26.0</td>
<td>40.3/57.9/56.2/55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.0/84.0/76.0</td>
<td>62.6/93.8/79.8/89.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistemic Classes</th>
<th>MacDonald (one article)</th>
<th>Present sample (four articles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 4: Reasons</td>
<td>23.0/9.0/15.0</td>
<td>Intro/Body/Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 5: Research</td>
<td>23.0/2.0/6.0</td>
<td>11.2/0.3/0.0/1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 6: Isms</td>
<td>0.0/0.5/0.0</td>
<td>0.0/0.0/0.0/0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 7: Audience</td>
<td>6.0/4.0/3.0</td>
<td>2.2/0.2/2.2/0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52.0/15.5/24.0</td>
<td>37.3/6.2/20.2/10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Groups is the most prominent subject choice in MacDonald’s history articles, occurring much more frequently in history than in either psychology or literature, whereas particular individual subjects occur only slightly more often than in psychology and much less often than in literary studies. This supports Eggins et al.’s (1993) claim about the importance of generalisation in history discourse and indicates that history is not predominantly concerned with individuals. The next most frequent subject choice in history is Attributes, followed by Reasons, Particulars and Research, and Audience. Predictably, Reasons and Research subjects figure more prominently in the introduction section than the body, while Groups, though accounting for the largest proportion of subjects in both sections, are much more numerous in the body, with Attributes next in frequency of occurrence, followed by Particulars.

The most obvious difference between MacDonald’s history texts and those in the present sample is the inverse relation between Groups and Attributes in the latter. A second difference is the significantly lower proportion of epistemic subjects in the present sample. Thus, the texts in the present sample appear less concerned with epistemic accounting yet also more abstract. Such differences may suggest that basing conclusions on samples of limited size is unreliable. But it is also the case that MacDonald’s sample is much more homogeneous, all four articles being demographic studies of seventeenth century New England, three from the same journal. Yet, all four texts in the present sample, both
medieval history and modern history, have much higher proportions of Attributes than Groups and comparatively low proportions of epistemic subjects. The figures for each section of each of the four articles are given in Table 9 in Appendix 2. The number of classes has been reduced to six as there were no instances of the 'isms' class in the sample.

The Whiting article has the highest proportion of Attributes, followed by MacKenzie, Harriss, then Walker. Conversely, the Whiting article has the lowest proportion of Groups, closely followed by the Walker text, while the MacKenzie article is similar to the Harriss article, both having a significantly higher number. The Walker article, which is concerned with the personnel of the peace commissions, has a significantly higher proportion of subjects in the particulars class than the other three articles. Harriss has the lowest, being concerned with institutions and government procedures rather than individuals, while the figures for the two modern history articles are not very different since both frequently name individuals in public life at the national level. Harriss, who gives the impression of having the most adversarial style, at least in his introduction section, comes third as regards the proportion of subjects in the epistemic Reasons class; he has the lowest number in his introduction section and none at all in his conclusion. The highest figure is for the Walker text, the lengthy conclusion section of which accounts for a good number of the instances of this class. The Whiting text, which gives the impression of being the least overtly engaged in dialogue with the disciplinary community, has the second highest proportion of Reasons subjects, though not much more than Harriss. This is largely because they make up 40% of the subjects in his one-paragraph conclusion. But all of the Reasons subjects in his text are text-reflective, five of the six realising reference to the article as a whole, twice with the label This article, twice with the pronoun it in co-referential relation with this label, and once with the phrase The first part of this article. The Whiting text is extremely internal writer-oriented, to use Gosden's term. MacKenzie has the lowest proportion overall of Reasons subjects of the four texts, yet the highest proportion in his introduction section. Harriss has the highest proportion of references to members of the disciplinary community, with most instances in his comparatively lengthy introduction.

5.2.3 A NEW CLASSIFICATION

A new classification is proposed which maintains a distinction between explicit reference to research methods on the one hand and both reporting without interpretation of real world
phenomena which are the object of investigation and relationships projected onto real world phenomena by the author on the other hand. Gosden and Davies’s hypothesised and objectivised viewpoint is therefore allocated to the phenomenal domain, including words like factor, feature, aspect, difference, cause, effect and reason, which do not make explicit reference to research. However, within the phenomenal domain a distinction is made between noun phrases which report without interpretation and those which project interpretation upon the subject matter, and the latter are termed evaluation. Because of possible confusion between MacDonald’s use of the term epistemic and the meaning of this term in other contexts, here the word research is used for explicit reference to research. Thus, there are two primary divisions of subjects into those making visible what the historian is doing, termed research, and those referring to the phenomena under study, the latter being subdivided into evaluation and report.

Identification of research noun phrases is relatively straightforward. Those in the history sample fall into five classes:

Research participants
- author (I)
- author and reader (we)
- other (Ormrod, one writer, he, late medieval historians)

Discourse entity
- author (this paper, the first part of this article)
- other (some recent writing, the historical literature)

Discourse process
- author (this discussion, these conclusions)
- other internal (such consensus, such moral-cum-racial comparisons)
- external (moral judgements)

Discourse viewpoint
- author (some understanding, the significance of...)
- other internal (this view, the issues in debate)
- external (late medieval England’s reputation for violence)

Research data/procedure/tools
- author (the best measure, calculation of actual earnings, a further indication)
- other (the most frequently cited evidence, what analysis there has been)

The distinction between author and other research participant or data/procedure/tools, discourse entity, process or viewpoint, corresponds with Gosden’s distinction between internal writer orientation and external research community orientation. The distinction between other internal and other external discourse process or viewpoint takes into account that, for instance, the views of some historians are summarised in the article and then referred to later, as happens in the seventh paragraph of the Harriss introduction, while others are merely mentioned once, so that all reference to them is exophoric. It is sometimes
possible to apply MacDonald's distinction between particulars (Ormrod, he, this paper) and groups (late medieval historians, the historical literature) to these subject roles.

The distinction between evaluation and report without interpretation is less easily established and difficult to be objective about. Clear-cut examples of the latter are references to individuals by name without any modification in the noun phrase (Richard II, Herbert Samuel, he) and, by means of simple noun phrases, to groups (Italian POWs, the miners, subjects, kings). Evaluation appears to be involved in the chief instruments of this marriage of sentiment and convenience, the Gascoigne brothers and the odd man out. But it is difficult to know where to draw the line between the two when it comes to neutral head nouns with minimal modification, such as the active gentry justices, nine Yorkshire JPs, most magnates, over 6,000 POWs. In the end it was decided to adopt a wide view and consider any quantifier (most magnates) or numeral (nine Yorkshire JPs) and any epithet (the active gentry justices), as opposed to classifier (the gentry justices, the county gentry) as a case of evaluation. On the other hand, peripheral post-modifiers were not taken into account, for example Alexander Neville, Archbishop of York, who managed to create a dangerously dominant role for his affinity in the North and East Ridings in 1385,... In the case of what MacDonald refers to as attributes, either modification (such sectional application, the unusually extensive involvement of local elites in the exercise of government required by such commissions) or a head noun with non-neutral connotation (the ease and profitability of wool taxation, the prominence of estate stewards and men of law in the work of the Riding benches), or a combination of both (its very effectiveness in financing war, the extreme brutality with which enemy captives were treated by the Japanese), was treated as evaluation, as well as any non-specific head noun (such considerations, the institutional innovations). A distinction is made between a noun phrase referring to something which may be assumed to obtain irrespective of interpretation, classed as report, and reference which reflects a judgement by the author. Thus the reputation of kingship (H/I/2/8) and the capacity of the state to finance the needs of internal government (H/B/2/1/1) imply no judgement of the extent or nature of the reputation or capacity, whereas the volume and technicality of royal business (H/B/1/6/7) realises a judgement that there was a great deal of royal business and it involved technicality.

Within the evaluation and report domains, MacDonald's distinction between particulars, groups and attributes is maintained. Specific time (this historical reference point) and place
(South Wales, both Ridings) reference is aligned with particulars and more general time (the late middle ages, the early Tudor period) and place (late medieval England) reference with groups. This distinction is dependent on the scope of a particular article. The Walker article, for instance, is mainly concerned only with the county of Yorkshire rather than the entire country England, so reference to Yorkshire is treated as general place reference while reference to a particular Riding of Yorkshire is treated as reference to particulars. Reference to institutions, which is frequent in the history sample, is treated as reference to groups of people. The general class of attributes includes reference to behaviour, procedures, processes, states of affairs, states of mind, concepts and attributes in the sense of characteristics or qualities.

**Evaluation**
- particulars (only the experienced William Holme, this historical reference point)
- groups (the principal workers involved, the major new institutions of government, the late Middle Ages, a few shires)
- attributes (the greater part of the work of the writing offices, the powerful influence exercised by the justices and sergeants of the Westminster courts on the quorum of the Yorkshire commissions)

**Report**
- particulars (Edward III, the ruler's sword, South Wales)
- groups (prisoners, parliament, these prisoners' days, England)
- attributes (the accession of Henry IV, appointment as a justice of the peace, military regulations)

*Table 10 in Appendix 2* shows the relative proportions of subjects in the three broad categories in the four history articles. Predictably, research subjects are most numerous in the introduction section, and particularly in the MacKenzie three-paragraph introduction. They are very infrequent in the body of the article, but increase in number again in the conclusion section, though to less than two thirds those in the introduction section. MacKenzie, however, has no research subjects in his three-paragraph conclusion section. Whiting is the only author to have more subjects from this category in his conclusion section than in his introduction section. These are all text-reference subjects and his conclusion section consists of only one paragraph. He is also the only author to have a much higher proportion of direct report subjects than those of subjects in either of the other categories in his introduction.

Overall, in the total sample, research and evaluation subjects account for 52.5% of the subjects, as opposed to 46.6% for report. However, it must be remembered that the report category includes groups and attributes, which account for 39.5% and 46% of the report subjects, making a total of 85.5%. This accords with Martin’s and Eggins et al.’s claims that
history discourse generalises and is characterised by abstraction. If the report groups and attributes subjects are added to the evaluation and research subjects, only 6.7% of the subjects in the sample are concerned with particulars referred to without interpretation by the historian.

5.2.4 RELATIVE PROPORTIONS OF ALL THEMES, MARKED AND UNMARKED, ACCORDING TO SEMANTIC FUNCTION

When the subjects which constitute unmarked themes are separated from those preceded by marked themes, and ranged alongside sentence-initial marked themes, as shown in Table 11 (and Table 12, where reference to research is separated from phenomenal reference) in Appendix 2, it emerges that reference to real world time, which is almost always realised by marked themes, no longer accounts for the greatest number of sentence-initial themes in the sample but is demoted to third place (11.6%). By far the largest number of themes (33.1%) are unmarked real world themes of the class MacDonald calls attributes. The second largest category is reference to human participants in historical events, mostly as classes of people or institutions (17.6%), and again, mostly, by unmarked themes. The fourth largest category is contrast/concession (9.3%) - including its use in conjunction with reference to research - realised by marked themes. Reason, including purpose, both with and without reference to research (4.1%), also realised by marked themes, accounts for fewer than half as many themes as contrast and concession, constituting the sixth largest category, almost exactly equal with addition (4.2%)

The high number of themes realising time and reference to people was predicted for history discourse in the literature, but it is useful to know the balance between the two. The importance of contrast was also predicted, but it will become clearer in Chapter 9 whether this means argument is prominent in history discourse and to what extent it reflects contentiousness. Chapter 8 will look more closely at the role reason (cause and effect) plays in the writing of historians.
5.3 SUMMARY

This chapter has analysed the semantic roles performed by grammatical subjects in the history sample and compared them with the findings of other researchers for both science and history. It has proposed that, in addition to identification of the degree to which history discourse makes transparent the operations which the historian is performing on the data, the degree of author visibility, and the balance between concern with particulars and concern with the general, there should be an assessment of the degree to which the discourse reflects the author's evaluation of the data rather than merely recording what happened in the real world of the period under study. This involves examining the use of language which Gosden and Davies call 'hypothesised and objectivised viewpoint', but it also widens the net to include reference to particulars and classes which involve evaluation. In this way, it can be seen to what extent history discourse interweaves interpretation with narrative, with the narrative very much subordinated to analysis and interpretation and merely providing supporting detail.

The findings support the claim that history generalises. They also suggest that academic history discourse is even more concerned with abstraction than MacDonald's analysis of three history articles indicates. When the findings for the semantic functions of subjects constituting unmarked themes are placed alongside those for marked themes, presented in the previous chapter, it emerges that MacDonald's class 'attributes' constitutes the greatest proportion of sentence-initial themes in the history sample. In second place comes reference to human participants in historical events, in most cases as classes of people and people organised into institutions rather than as individuals, and time reference is in third place, followed by contrast. But contrast generally operates on a higher level than time reference, providing a framework in which time reference introduces supporting detail in short stretches of narrative. However, much of the burden of the author's argument is carried by evaluative abstractions functioning as subjects.

Had time and space permitted, a much richer analysis of content and functions of noun phrases functioning as GS would have involved examining the extent and consequences of nominalisation and the degree of complexity of subject noun phrases, and the functions of non-specific nouns and of this, occurring as either a determiner or a pro-form. These
features of the noun phrase play an important role in organising the heavy information content of academic discourse.
CHAPTER 6 NON-PROTOTYPICAL THEMES

As was seen in Chapter 3, certain GS themes are non-prototypical, being empty of ideational meaning, and their analysis in terms of theme-rheme structure is somewhat problematic. Analysts differ over whether to treat the ‘dummy’ subjects it and there in cleft, extraposed and existential constructions or the postponed notional subject as theme, or else a string containing both. They also differ over whether such themes should be classified as marked or unmarked. Interrogatives pose problems too since, typically, there is an initial non-GS element, but not of the sort generally recognised as a marked theme in this area of analysis; indeed, Eiler (1986) excludes interrogatives from her analysis of marked and unmarked themes. Also, many cases of fronting with inversion would seem to entail treating an entire sentence as theme if, as advocated by several researchers, GS is always included in theme. The present study sidesteps the problem of assigning such themes to either the marked or unmarked category by grouping them in a third category, non-prototypical themes, though they have been considered along with unmarked themes for the purpose of comparison. Treating these themes separately also facilitates examination of whether their syntactic markedness gives rise to special discourse uses which distinguish them from more regular themes. Pseudoclefts are also discussed in this chapter, though they satisfy both the syntactic and semantic criteria for unmarked themes; not only are they also marked constructions but they are conveniently discussed in relation to clefts.

Anticipatory it, including clefts and extraposition constructions, and existential there, constituted 2% and 1.5% respectively of all the themes in Eiler’s (1986) science lecture chapter, but she gives no text-specific interpretation for these items, which she calls predicated themes; they did not appear to her to denote any specific values associated with scientific enquiry or delivery of instruction. Both kinds of empty themes together constituted 7.5% of the themes in Gosden’s (1993) science research articles. He observes that those in the discourse domain frequently introduce evaluative comment and therefore play a significant role in interactional thematisation; those in the hypothetical and objectivised domain include seemingly formulaic patterns such as it is clear that, it seems that, it appears that, it is interesting to note that; those in the real world domain introduce postponed real world entities, research events and processes and reference to mental processes.
These grammatical devices are a means of resolving conflict between the need to package information appropriately and the need to preserve SVO word order. They would appear to fall into two groups according to salience. Extrapoosed and existential *there* constructions, though marked syntactically, are usually the preferred option because they comply with the principles of end weight and end focus without markedly highlighting any particular constituent. But clefts, pseudoclefts, interrogatives and fronting with inversion do attract attention and the first three, at least, have therefore been considered useful devices for foregrounding information, such as statements of discourse theme (Collins 1991, Delin 1991, Jones and Jones 1985, Prince 1978). Halliday views fronted complements as the most marked of marked themes; questions attract attention by their directness, making transparent the interpersonal dimension of text; pseudoclefts and clefts both focus attention on a particular element, which has the function of identifier with other candidates excluded (Halliday 1967:236). The latter, which state information emphatically (Collins 1991, Delin 1991) as unquestionable fact (Prince 1978), are considered especially suited to rhetorical, opinionated, persuasive writing (Collins 1991, Prince 1978), and Prince (1978) associates them with historical narrative in particular.

The following table indicates the distribution of all these types of themes across the four history texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Harriss</th>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>Mackenzie</th>
<th>Whiting</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pseudoclefts</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clefts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogatives</td>
<td>3 single</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 single</td>
<td>17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 adjacent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 conjoined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 conjoined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fronting+ inversion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraposition</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all levels)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential <em>there</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One of these is in a clause introduced by *for* and so is not included in the count of sentence-level themes.
As might be expected, marked constructions are used sparingly; interrogatives, pseudoclefts and clefts, considered separately, each account for a very small proportion of the total themes in any of the four texts, though fronting with inversion is more frequent. Several interrogatives are either conjoined or contiguous so that, though numbering 17 in total, they are distributed across only 12 locations, with Whiting and Harriss making more use of them than the other two authors. The data support the observation by Collins and Delin that it-clefts outnumber pseudo-clefts in written text. The two medieval history texts have more pseudoclefts and clefts than the modern history texts, largely accounted for by Walker’s much greater use of clefts. Harriss makes more than twice as much use of fronting with inversion than any of the other authors. Predictably, the less salient extraposition and existential there constructions are more common, the latter particularly so in the two modern history texts. This is the only non-prototypical theme which Mackenzie makes much use of.

6.1 PSEUDOCLEFTS

6.1.1 OBSERVATIONS IN THE LITERATURE

Pseudocleft constructions, also known as a thematic equatives, have been described as a form of grammatical metaphor employing nominalisation to reconfigure a clause into one consisting of two constituents linked in an identifying relationship by means of a copula (Matthiessen 1992). One of these constituents is a wh-clause and the other, usually a noun phrase, is variously referred to as the focus (Prince 1978), the highlighted element (Collins 1991) or the cleft head (Delin 1991). In basic pseudoclefts (Collins 1991), the wh-clause occurs as theme, functioning as GS in the superordinate clause, while in reversed pseudoclefts, the wh-clause occurs in rheme. Variations on the basic pseudocleft construction involve noun phrases with general reference in place of the wh-clause, such as All I want is..., The thing that surprises me is..., The one who came was..., The reason (why) he helped me was...

In both basic and reversed pseudoclefts, the information in the wh-clause, being syntactically subordinated in an embedded clause, is presented as taken for granted, presupposed, non-controversial or 'not-at-issue' (Huddleston 1984). Prince (1978) labels it given, by which she means assumed to be in the recipient’s consciousness either actually, if
it has an antecedent earlier in the discourse, or potentially, if inferrable from the context. She finds that the vast majority of pseudoclefts involve bridging inferences, and classifies pseudoclefts according to whether the information in the wh-clause relates to antecedents which are explicit, implicit (requiring inferential bridging), or in a relationship of contrast; or whether there is metalinguistic reference by means of phrases such as What he's saying is... or reference to mental processes, or reference to events by means of words such as happen. Collins calls the first three of these antecedents cotextual, involving a relationship either of similarity or of contrast, and the other three contextual, related to the register variables of mode, tenor and field respectively.

The motivation for reconfiguring a clause as a pseudocleft construction is seen as textual since the pseudocleft provides an alternative way of distributing information in a clause (Matthiessen, 1992). The information in the wh-clause has special status because it occupies one of the two focal points in the clause, constituting the starting off point as theme in the basic pseudocleft or attracting end focus in the reversed pseudocleft; and the entire construction is given prominence by the simplicity, crispness and identifying function that results from two constituents being joined by a copula comparatively empty of meaning. A pseudocleft construction can thus highlight the information it carries. Yet it is less emphatic than the cleft, which postpones both parts of the identifying relationship and throws the first into such high relief because of its placement immediately after the copula. Even the use of a non-prototypical element in theme in the basic pseudocleft does not interrupt the smooth flow of the discourse, because the conflation of theme, presupposition, givenness, syntactic dependency, and identified status preserves the background character of the wh-clause (Collins 1991).

Quirk et al (1985) consider the basic pseudocleft to be more typical since it can present a climax in the complement, but Collins finds reversed pseudoclefts are more numerous in both speech and writing. The great majority of reversed pseudoclefts in his sample from the LL and LOB corpora featured demonstrative this or that as the highlighted element in theme position, in most cases with anaphoric reference over extended text, whose content was thus related to information presented by the speaker as not at issue. He suggests that reversed pseudoclefts are therefore particularly suited to marking the conclusion of a section of text. On the other hand, it is the anaphoric potential of the wh-clause in basic pseudoclefts which Prince draws attention to; the wh-clause theme relates what the hearer or reader might be
assumed to be thinking about in a stretch of discourse more closely to the discourse theme because of the association of GS with topic continuity. A basic pseudocleft with a wh-clause which summarises the preceding section can function as a pivot at a turning point in text, paving the way for the topic of the new section, possibly with a contrastive theme which repudiates a previous idea in favour of a second. Basic pseudoclefts can thus serve as topic sentences for paragraphs or as theme summaries at the beginnings or endings of major sections of text, even as titles, and so highlight theme at different levels in the text structure and for stretches of text of varying length. They can also indicate the writer’s perspective when they contain an expression of emotion or attitude (Jones and Jones 1985).

6.1.2 PSEUDOCLEFTS IN THE HISTORY TEXTS

There are very few pseudoclefts in the history texts: three in each of the medieval history articles and only one in each of the modern history articles. One of the three in the Harriss text is in a clause introduced by for and so is not included in the count of sentence-level themes. All eight are basic pseudoclefts, supporting Quirk et al’s claim that the basic pseudocleft is more typical rather than Collins’s claim that reversed pseudoclefts are more numerous. All involve contrast, though in one case only indirectly.

As Delin (1991) found with it-cLEFTS, the three pseudoclefts in the history texts which perform correction moves exhibit contrast by means of the focal string, or cleft head, rather than the wh-clause, but, contrary to her findings for it-cLEFTs, these correction pseudocLEFTs contribute to higher level discourse goals. In her correction it-cLEFTs, a challenge is presented in the main clause by means of an item in the focal string which enters into a relationship of mutual exclusivity with something earlier in the text.

Then on Thursday afternoon we went on the lake. No, it was the morning, because we saw Sybil in the afternoon. (p119)

In the two clearest cases in the history texts of pseudocLEFTs which perform corrections, both parts of the relationship of mutual exclusivity are presented in the same place, within the focal string.

H/B/3/13/7 But what a great lord exercised through his affinity was not so much control or dominance as (to use the contemporary term) the “rule” of his country.
What characterised these years was not a decisive shift in the balance of judicial power towards the local communities, for this had never been the exclusive object of their petitioning, but a modest increase in the oversight of local society maintained by the king's government, achieved by the creation of a balance between professional and amateur justices on which both the Crown and the parliamentary spokesmen of the gentry could agree.

These correction pseudoclefts contribute to higher level discourse goals by helpfully summarising the content of stretches of text by means of both the wh-clause and the focal string, and by reiterating the macro-level contradiction between the author's own thesis and the interpretations of other historians, thus supporting the claim by Jones and Jones that pseudoclefts are often used to highlight the discourse theme. The contrast is made explicit by presenting summaries of both parts of the relation in the focal string linked with not so much...as, and not only...but.

H/B/3/13/7 provides a turning point in the middle of the last paragraph of the body of the article. The wh-clause encapsulates the topic entity of the first half of the paragraph - the operation of lordship - in order to attach a predicate which contrasts with the impression of dominance by magnates established in the first half. In this way, the wh-clause in a pseudocleft can function in a similar way to the discourse-organising nouns called labels by Francis (1994), organising chunks of discourse and drawing together threads for the reader. Prince would presumably treat this wh-clause as one with an implicit antecedent, requiring the bridging inference that the various facts presented in the preceding sentences of the paragraph were aspects of the exercise of lordship. W/C/6/18 is the penultimate sentence of the entire article. Jointly with the final sentence it provides top-level comment for its own paragraph while at the same time summarising and restating the thesis of the entire text. The content in each of the two components of the construction summarises the content of preceding text, and is therefore given information, but given information which is restated in a way which gives it greater salience, constituting a final punch in the argument.

A less explicit correction is provided by H/C/2/9, also the penultimate sentence of the article, making a broad generalisation about the consequences for later centuries of the phenomena which are the focus of the article.

H/C/2/9 He would not have been disappointed, for what survived the Wars of the Roses and the sharp legalism of the early Tudor state was what had been shaping over the two preceding centuries: a political society deeply versed in government, and a system of government in which crown and subjects shared responsibility.
This pseudocleft occurs in a clause introduced by for and provides support for the view that for can function more like a co-ordinating conjunction than a subordinator. It is also noteworthy that both constituents of the pseudocleft are wh-clauses, yet another example of parallelism in the Harriss text. The principal antecedent for the content of the first wh-clause is the label lasting consequences in the opening sentence, though there is also an anaphoric relationship with the phrase its own collective abandonment of the tradition of war in France in the sixth sentence. It is not clear whether Prince would classify this relationship between a label and its lexical realisation as a case of a 'more or less explicit' antecedent, or as an example of an implicit antecedent. The content of the focal string of the pseudocleft, while it provides new information insofar as it characterises the society of a later period than that which has been under study in this article, is at the same time a summary of the content of the body of the article, and so serves the function of reminding the reader yet again of the thesis of the article, thus highlighting the discourse theme. It is a correction in the sense that the reader recognises that the interpretation of the character of society in the period of study presented in the focal string here, the penultimate sentence of the entire article, is a final refutation of the interpretations of other historians summarised in the introduction to the article. Both this and the previous example are illustrations of very prominent positioning of pseudoclefts carrying top-level information which summarise entire texts to make a point very forcefully as the culmination of an extended argument.

Where contrast with an antecedent does involve local ties, it is between the wh-clause and its antecedent, in a type of pseudocleft also identified by Collins and Prince. The remaining five pseudoclefts (W/B/1/4/7, Wh/B/1/23/7, H/B/3/12/9, W/B/1/3/8, M/B/3/1/4) are each of this type, and the contrast relation is one of difference rather than mutual exclusivity. One of these pseudoclefts occurs in a fairly prominent position, as it is the final sentence of the opening paragraph of one of the major sub-sections of the body of the article.

Wa/B/4/1/7 What distinguished this latter group from the men of law on the quorum was, principally, their unquestionably gentle birth, though the important position on the Yorkshire commissions occupied by quorum lawyers drawn from established gentry families, such as Richard Gascoigne or John Conyers of Hornby, clearly suggests that this was not an immutable distinction.

The difference is between two categories in a classification, signalled by the word distinguishes in the relative clause, with the two contrasting categories both presented in the wh-clause and the distinguishing attribute presented in rheme, in the focal string. One of the noun phrases in the wh-clause, this latter group, has an explicit antecedent two sentences
earlier - the second group - but the other - the men of law on the quorum - is part of a relation operating over a greater stretch of text, having an explicit antecedent which was the topic entity for the previous major sub-section of the body of the article. The antecedent for the proposition realised by the wh-clause as a whole is implicit: since the entire body of the article consists of analysis of the composition and function of four groups of justices, it can be assumed the reader has in mind the fact that the author is making distinctions between these four groups. The pseudocleft could therefore be said to be fairly directly related to the macro-structure of the text.

In a second case, the link between the wh-clause and its antecedent stretches across the three preceding sentences.

Wh/B/1/23/7 What was missing was any attempt by the tier above the most local level in the union's organization, the districts, to take up the tax issue.

The wh-clause has retrospective scope over the preceding three sentences and establishes a difference between the situation described by these sentences and the antecedent is This latter aspect in the third sentence of the paragraph, which itself has an anaphoric tie with its lexicalisation in the preceding sentence.

In two other cases a local link of contrast between the wh-clause and an antecedent in the immediately preceding sentence has been set up in order to be used as a stepping stone to bring the discourse back up to a higher level. In both cases the local contrast is between degrees of likelihood.

H/B/3/12/9 What is certain is that any magnate was engulfed in a sea of gentry families whose support he needed to make his authority effective.

W/B/1/3/8 What is not so clear is whether such incidents were a regular occurrence.

The proposition in the wh-clause in H/B/3/12/9 participates in a local tie of contrast with the antecedent It is difficult to know... in the immediately preceding sentence, but the superordinate clause makes a point which supports the author's answer to a question posed at the beginning of a sub-section - whether the magnates dominated local government through their affinities, and one which supports the thesis of the entire article, namely that government at this time involved participation by all levels of political society. Were it not for the selection of a pseudocleft construction, the reader might not recognise the value of
the information in the theme with regard to the main theme of the discourse. The pseudocleft thus contributes to discourse goals which are not purely local. At the very least, it serves as the topic sentence for a stretch of seven sentences which constitute an embedded paragraph. This example illustrates how even at comparatively low levels of discourse structure an author scores points with an eye to the macro-level theme - keeping his eye on the ball, so to speak.

Wa/B/1/3/8 follows three sentences of narrative which constitute an illustration at the lowest level of discourse, being an account of a particular event involving particular individuals. Material in the preceding sentence (it seems very likely... is selected as an antecedent and a wh-clause is set up which can enter into a relationship of contrast with it so as to provide a link for the introduction of a more general proposition in theme. Thus the wh-clause in the pseudocleft construction provides a bridge between the preceding lower-level illustration and the higher, more general level of discourse reached in the focal string in the same sentence. The pseudocleft also serves an evaluative function, estimating the validity of making a generalisation based on the lower level illustration and so assessing the value of this preceding evidence with regard to the extent of the danger in the Crown’s reliance on magnates in local government. But it does not exemplify the claim by Jones and Jones (1985) that the primary function of pseudoclefts is to highlight the discourse theme. Although it does bring the discourse up a level, it is still comparatively ‘buried’.

However, the remaining pseudocleft with a wh-clause participating in a local tie of contrast (M/B/3/1/4) does contribute to the higher-level discourse goal of thematic salience, and with the content of both constituents, the wh-clause and the focal string.

M/B/3/1/4 What was unique about the war against Japan was that these considerations were quite different on each side.

Again, there is a local tie, since the antecedent for the wh-clause is in the immediately preceding sentence. The preceding sentence brings out a similarity between the war against
Japan and the other two theatres of war, while the pseudocleft presents a difference. But the pseudocleft is prominently located at the end of the short introductory paragraph for one of the three main sections of the body of the text, and it summarises the content of this section in advance: both the presupposed proposition in the *wh*-clause and the proposition realised by the superordinate clause preview what is to come.

In these examples of pseudoclefts which do enter into local ties, but by means of the *wh*-clause rather than the focal string, and which do not perform correction moves, the anaphoric tie of contrast means the content of the relative clause is to some extent given, which accords with the consensus view of relative clauses in pseudoclefts. The content of the focal string, however, is not always new. In H/B/3/12/9, the content of the focal string expresses a fact which is implicit in the content of the preceding six sentences, or rather, paraphrases in a more condensed form the information provided by the preceding sentences. Similarly, in W/C/6/14, discussed earlier, the information in both constituents, the *wh*-clause and the focus or highlighted element, is given. This type of pseudocleft, in which both components are given, is not discussed by Prince, Collins or Delin. Yet in these history texts it performs the very useful function of summarising the content of the preceding text in a way which makes a macro-proposition more salient. By this means, the author is able to restate the thesis of the entire text in a particularly salient way, and, in such lengthy texts as academic journal articles, this greatly contributes to the coherence of the text for the reader.

An interesting feature of the pseudoclefts in these texts is that they are all used to bring a segment of text to a close with a kind of culmination point or climax. In this they differ from most of the examples provided by Jones and Jones, which illustrate the use of pseudoclefts for highlighting the discourse theme at the beginnings of segments of text. Two of the above pseudoclefts (H/C/2/9, W/C/6/14) are the penultimate sentences of entire texts, each summarising the gist of the article before a final comment in the last sentence. Two others (W/B/4/1/7, M/B/3/1/4) are final sentences in the opening paragraphs of major sections of text. Another (H/B/3/13/7) ends the first half of a paragraph, functioning both as a pivot and to highlight the contrast between the content of the two halves. The remaining three end segments of paragraphs: H/B/3/12/9 ends a stretch of seven sentences by highlighting the theme of these sentences, while Wh/B/1/23/7 and Wa/B/1/3/8 follow three sentences of illustration at the lowest level of text, linking this segment to a higher level of discourse within the paragraph.
Though there is explicit expression of epistemic use of language in only two of these pseudoclefts - evaluation of truth with the adjectives *certain* and *clear* in H/B/3/129 and W/B/1/3/8 respectively, all of the pseudoclefts are employed for evaluation: identifying broad historical themes, characterising periods of history and evaluating their significance.

To summarise, most of the pseudoclefts in these texts function to highlight the discourse themes of segments of text of varying length, supporting the claim by Jones and Jones that the highlighting of theme is probably the most general and widespread function of pseudoclefts in discourse, but, in contrast to the illustrations provided by Jones and Jones, the pseudoclefts which highlight the discourse theme in the history texts do so in *final* rather than initial position, bringing a segment of text to a close with a climax. There is only one example of a pseudocleft used to introduce a topic rather than highlight it after it has been discussed (M/B/3/1/4) but this also occurs at the end of a text segment, albeit an opening paragraph, and thus also provides a climax for its own paragraph.

Related to this use of pseudoclefts at the end of a segment of text is a second function: their ability to raise the discourse level back up to a higher level, achieved by providing a stepping stone in the form of a local tie between the *wh*-clause and an antecedent in the immediately preceding sentence. Also related are two other functions: the capacity of pseudoclefts to summarise large chunks of text, and the function of restating given information in a more salient form. This reiteration is achieved by means of a type of pseudocleft not discussed by either Prince, Collins or Delin, namely one in which both constituents of the Pseudocleft are given. Pseudoclefts, like the *it*-clefts in Delin's data, can also be used to perform correction moves, but unlike Delin's correction *it*-clefts, the correction pseudoclefts in the present data achieve higher-level discourse goals rather than local goals.

Interestingly, all except one of the pseudoclefts in the present data occur late in the text, in either the final section or the conclusion to an article. The one which does not is the only one which does not echo a major theme but functions only to raise the level of discourse from the lowest level to the next lowest level. In general, pseudoclefts in these academic history articles occur after a mass of evidence has already accumulated and the reader has been reminded of the governing thesis several times already, so that the pseudocleft
permits yet further reiteration of the thesis, or ideas closely associated with the thesis, but in a yet more salient form, providing the final nail in the argument when used at the very end of a conclusion section. The combination of the functions of highlighting theme, summarising the content of large chunks of text, and performing correction moves capable of substituting propositions at the highest level of discourse makes pseudoclefts a particularly useful organisational tool in lengthy and complex academic discourse involving forceful argument. Because of its length, academic discourse requires constant reminders to the reader of the discourse theme and indications of how large stretches of text relate to one another and to the major line of reasoning. Pseudoclefts are particularly useful in history discourse because the forcefulness with which they reiterate a point contributes to a rhetorical style which is valued in this discipline. In these texts they are used to impose the historian's interpretation on the phenomena under study.

6.2 CLEFTS

6.2.1 OBSERVATIONS IN THE LITERATURE

The cleft construction is also known as *predicated theme* or *theme predication*, and various terms have been used to identify its constituents:

\[
\begin{eqnarray*}
| & It & \text{is} & John & \text{that you should be talking to} & \\
| focus & & \text{presupposition} & & (Chomsky 1971) & \\
| focus & & \text{that-clause} & & (Prince 1978) & \\
| cleft head & & \text{complement} & & (Delin 1990, 1989) & \\
| highlighted element & & \text{relative clause} & & (Collins 1991) & \\
| clefted constituent & & \text{cleft clause} & & (Delin & Oberlander 1992) & \\
\end{eqnarray*}
\]

The term *focus* can be misleading because of possible confusion as to whether syntactic or accentual focus is being referred to. The term *highlighted element* can also be misleading since the information in the relative clause, though syntactically backgrounded and presented as logically presupposed or taken for granted, can sometimes be more foregrounded pragmatically than that in the cleft head. The present analysis adopts the terms *cleft head* and either *cleft clause* or *relative clause*. 
It is the non-referential *it* in the above construction which distinguishes it from the superficially similar construction featuring *it* with anaphoric reference illustrated by the following sentence from the history sample.

Wu/C/6/1-2 A second general observation suggested by this study concerns the opposition between central government and local autonomy, royal authority and gentry independence that is assumed in so much writing on the subject of the justices of the peace. It is an opposition that the Yorkshire evidence cannot really sustain.

Like the pseudocleft, a cleft construction accomplishes both an identifying function and an alternative distribution of information (Matthiessen, 1992), though there is no reversed form. But clefts are more emphatic than pseudoclefts because of the presentational nature of a construction which predicates the entire information content of the main clause. Adding further to the salience of the cleft head is the fact that it tends to have an exclusive interpretation, which gives the information it carries crucial status in the discourse.

Prince (1978) identifies two types of *it*-clefts: in the (1) stressed focus *it*-cleft, the cleft head represents new, often contrastive, information, and the relative clause represents information which is often, though not always, known from the context; in the (2) informative-presupposition *it*-cleft, the cleft head usually contains an anaphoric item, and the relative clause contains the message, but a message that, even though it may be new information for the recipient, is presented, by means of syntactic subordination, as known to others, and thus as an established fact, rather than a claim the speaker or writer takes personal responsibility for. She uses the term *known* for this information rather than the term *given*, as used for the information in the wh-clause of a pseudocleft, but in doing so she uses it in a different sense from the usual sense of being known to the hearer or reader.

Collins (1991) refers to stressed-focus *it*-clefts as unmarked clefts and labels them Type 1, consisting of a new or contrastive cleft head and given or inferrable information in the relative clause. He refers to informative-presupposition *it*-clefts as marked clefts, and divides them into two types, according to whether the cleft head is also new or contrastive (Type 3) or not (Type 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unmarked</th>
<th>Highlighted element</th>
<th>relative clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>new or contrastive</td>
<td>given or inferrable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>given or inferrable</td>
<td>new or contrastive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>new or contrastive</td>
<td>new or contrastive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While agreeing with Prince that pseudoclefts are givenness-oriented, Collins rejects the term *knownness* with regard to clefts, seeing them as newness-oriented because the relative clause can contain information which is new to the recipient, even though its status is weakened by being logically presuppositioned and therefore backgrounded through the dependency of the subordinate clause. He cites Huddleston’s (1984) identification of two quite separate variables, *informativity* and *at-issueness*, the former realised intonationally and the latter syntactically. Since newness is associated with ‘at-issueness’ and givenness with ‘not-at-issueness’, the special flavour of information in the relative clause of marked clefts derives from the marked combination of newness and not-at-issueness.

Delin and Oberlander (1992) call Prince’s stressed-focus *it*-clefts *topic-clause clefts* and the informative presupposition type *comment-clause clefts*. Delin (1989) has also labelled the two types of clefts according to placement of primary or nuclear accent as *strong-weak* and *weak-strong* and subdivided each type into two sub-types according to whether the constituent which does not receive primary or nuclear accent is de-accented or receives subsidiary accent.

The following is a summary of these various accounts of cleft types:

**Fig 6.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleft head</th>
<th>That-clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>KNOWN (often from the context) but not necessarily in the hearer’s consciousness at the moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW and AT ISSUE</td>
<td>GIVEN and NOT AT ISSUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW or CONTRASTIVE</td>
<td>GIVEN or INFERRABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A nuclear accent</td>
<td>de-accented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (-shared, -salient)</td>
<td>(+shared, +salient)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B nuclear accent</td>
<td>subsidiary accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (-shared, -salient)</td>
<td>(+shared, -salient)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Type 2 (Collins 1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleft head</th>
<th>That-clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIVEN</td>
<td>KNOWN (but not by the reader/hearer) (Prince 1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIVEN and NOT AT ISSUE</td>
<td>NEW but NOT AT ISSUE (Huddleston 1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2 GIVEN or INFERRABLE</td>
<td>NEW or CONTRASTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3 NEW or CONTRASTIVE</td>
<td>NEW or CONTRASTIVE (Collins 1991)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **C** de-accented
  - (+shared, +salient): nuclear accent
  - (-shared, -salient): nuclear accent
- **D** subsidiary accent
  - (+shared, -salient): (-shared, -salient) (Delin 1989)

Quirk *et al* (1985) state that clefts are very common in spoken English, but others consider them to be particularly suited to writing, where they have been found to outnumber pseudoclefts. Collins (1991) notes their structural similarity to impersonal constructions such as *it is true that*, *it is said that*, which gives rise to a depersonalised quality that is often out of place in casual spoken genres. He also notes the contribution they make to information density in writing by being both informative and high in communicative dynamism when the information in the relative clause is new to the reader. Clefts are also a means of indicating appropriate intonation and stress, providing a written equivalent of the salience achieved by phonological stress in spoken English by asserting the crucialness of the focal item (Collins 1991; Quirk *et al* 1985). This can give written text an emphatic tone (Collins 1991; Delin 1991) which is especially suited to rhetorical, opinionated, persuasive writing (Collins 1991, Prince 1978).

For Jones and Jones (1985), the exclusiveness interpretation of clefts enables focus on a critical factor in the theme development of a text. They consider the primary function of clefts, as with pseudoclefts, to be the highlighting of the discourse theme in topic or thesis statements. Delin (1991), however, distinguishes between comment-clause clefts and topic-clause clefts in this respect. She claims comment-clause clefts achieve higher level discourse goals in guiding discourse development by promoting the salience of concepts, while topic-clause clefts typically operate over a very short distance and are the product of local goals such as repairing the discourse by means of a *correction* move which counters some claim made earlier, or performing a *fill* move, which fills in variables in propositions which are salient in the discourse. Prince (1978) contrasts the discourse-theme-signalling
capacity of the *wh*-clause of a pseudocleft with the incapacity of the relative clause of a stressed-focus *it*-cleft (topic clause cleft) to signal the discourse theme since it represents known or old information not assumed to be in the hearer's consciousness.

But Delin appears to have revised her view in Delin and Oberlander (1992), where topic clause clefts are said to ensure coherent linking across a large textual or inferential distance, signalling that a coherent relation is intended even when additions and modifications are made to the content of the cleft clause. She claims that topic clause clefts complete a discourse segment by providing the second item in a relation of contrast or question and answer and permit the following discourse segment to be related to the previous one by coordination, while comment clause clefts relate an incoming discourse segment by subordination, introducing an open-ended embedded segment. Comment-clause clefts perform continuation moves by adding new information which continues the discourse (Delin 1991). They have a thematising function when the head has an antecedent in the discourse and a topicalising function when it does not. She advocates further research to isolate exactly why a cleft is used instead of a declarative, to determine when clefting is necessary and when it is optional, and to discover over what textual distance phenomena such as correction and presupposition can operate.

According to Prince (1978) and Collins (1991), comment clause clefts in which the cleft head also conveys new information (Type 3 clefts) can be used to provide background information at the beginning of a stretch of text which brings the reader up to date in order to be in a position to appreciate the information to come, and are thus useful in news reportage. This is the same claim made by Jacobs (1989) with regard to presupposition in the opening sentences of newspaper texts by means of definite noun phrases with complex modification which convey new information in a way which flatters the reader by presenting it as if it were already known. Quirk et al (1985) also note the use of clefts in radio and television news broadcasts for scene-setting by fronting new information in time or place adjuncts together with new information presented as presupposed in the following *that*-clause. Collins claims that such discourse- or segment-initial Type 3 clefts moderate the brusqueness that might result from presenting unmitigated new content in topic sentence position by means of a non-cleft. Quirk et al (1985) also note the stylistic effect in narrative of a cleft consisting entirely of new information at the beginning of a chapter or a paragraph, such as *It was a very troubled wife that greeted Harry on his return that night.*
Prince (1978) considers comment clause clefts to be a useful device in historical narrative and persuasive discourse because the information in the relative clause, though not necessarily known to the reader, is presented as established fact, allowing the writer to inform the reader in an authoritative way but without commitment to personal responsibility for the truth or originality of the statement (see also Delin 1991). Unlike a hedge, this form of self-effacement strengthens the factual status of the information rather than weakening it. On the other hand, she maintains that the reduction in assertiveness or claim to originality means clefts are also useful when self-effacement is sought for politeness or deference, as when a cleft such as *It is with great pleasure that I introduce...* is used in the context of a formal spoken presentation to introduce the speaker in a deferential way (*ibid*). Another use of clefts she notes is the special one in the proverb *It is a wise child that know his father*.

### 6.2.2 ANALYSIS OF CLEFTS IN THE HISTORY TEXTS

Cleft constructions, being so marked, are a device to be used sparingly, and there are only 21 clefts in the four history research articles, though still significantly more than the number of pseudoclefts. Almost half of these clefts are in the Walker article, with only 5, 4 and 2 in the Harriss, Whiting and MacKenzie texts respectively. Overall there are approximately equal numbers of topic-clause and comment-clause type clefts, but the articles differ in the types of clefts predominantly used, their distribution throughout the text, and the functions that they perform. There is evidence of a type of cleft and of pragmatic uses of clefts not acknowledged in the literature as well as disconfirming evidence for some of the claims made in the literature as to the uses of clefts.

As can be seen from the table below, the clefts in the sample texts appear to fall into four categories rather than the three identified by Collins in accordance with the ideas of Prince and Huddleston.
Table 6.2
A new categorisation of types of clefts in the history sample, with an indication of their function and placement in paragraphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Type 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stressed-focus N head + topic clause</td>
<td>Inform-presupp G head + comment clause</td>
<td>Inform presup N head + comment clause</td>
<td>Stressed-focus G head + topic clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa/B/1/2/9 SFIntro</td>
<td>Wa/B/1/3/10 PFIntro</td>
<td>Wa/B/1/3/2 TSIntro</td>
<td>H/I/2/4 Re-pres/C/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB/1/19/4 FF Intro</td>
<td>Wa/B/1/3/11 PFEnd</td>
<td>H/I/2/4/2 Lab spec/P</td>
<td>H/I/1/0/4 Re-pres/Re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB/1/22/5 FF Intro</td>
<td>Wa/B/1/3/11 SFEnd</td>
<td>H/I/2/4/3 Lab spec/P</td>
<td>H/I/1/0/5 Re-pres/Rel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh/B/2/24 SFhilka</td>
<td>Wa/B/1/3/0 PFEnd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/B/4/8/2 Re-pres/Rel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh/B/3/1/2 FFIdi</td>
<td>Wa/B/5/1/2 PFEnd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/4/8/5 Re-pres/Rel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh/B/3/2/3/10 PFEnd</td>
<td>Wh/B/3/0/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/C/5/10 Re-pres/Rel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh/B/3/1/15/1 TS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/3/24/5 FFEnd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- C: contrast
- G: given
- N: new
- P: parallelism
- PF: final sentence in paragraph
- SF: final sentence in a section of a paragraph
- End: closing a stretch of discourse
- Illus: illustration
- Intro: introduction
- Lab spec: specification for a label

*Second-to-last sentence but effectively the final sentence as the last sentence merely elaborates on the content of this preceding sentence.

The most numerous type of cleft is Collins’s Type 2, with a given cleft head and a comment clause containing new information, but most of these are in the Walker text, with only two in the Whiting text and none in the other two. The second most numerous type of cleft is one not accounted for in either Prince’s, Collins’s or Delin and Oberlander’s taxonomy, and which Collins implies does not exist. This is a type of cleft in which both cleft head and relative clause contain primarily given material, and which occurs in three of the four texts.

The Type 1 topic-clause clefts, with a new cleft head and a topic clause, also occurs in three of the four texts. Three clefts of the informative-presupposition type, two in the Harriss article and one in the Walker article, are dubious cases of Type 3 clefts since the content of both the cleft head and the cleft clause is given to a large extent. The two in the Harriss text have primary stress on the cleft head while that in the Walker text has primary stress on the cleft clause.

6.2.2.1 TYPE 1

Only four of the 21 clefts in the history texts are of Type 1 - stressed focus/topic-clause clefts with new cleft heads and given or inferrable relative clauses. Two occur in paragraph-
final sentences and two in medial sentences. Three of the four (Wa/B/1/2/9, M/B/1/19/4, M/B/1/22/5) provide dubious support for Delin and Oberlander's (1992) claim that a topic-clause cleft brings a segment of text to a close, since they do so by indicating the topic of the following stretch of text.

Both the Type 1 clefts in the MacKenzie text occur as paragraph-final sentences in the first and longest section of the body of the article, but, while providing closure for their paragraphs, both exploit this position to introduce the topic of the next stretch of text, a device favoured by this author. Their markedness highlights the topic and enhances anticipation of the following discussion.

M/B/1/19/4 It was the potential usefulness of POWs as a source of labour that proved to be the most serious threat to their collective well-being.

M/B/1/22/5 Ironically, it was Pierre Laval, premier of the virtually defunct Vichy government, who came up with a solution to this problem in January 1943.

M/B/1/19/4 introduces the theme for a stretch of six paragraphs and M/B/1/22/5 for a stretch of three paragraphs. Both have have inferrable information in the relative clause and new information in the cleft head, but they differ as to the cleft constituent which introduces the new topic. In M/B/1/19/4 it is the cleft head whereas in M/B/1/22/5 it is the cleft clause, by means of the unspecific label: a solution to this problem. The information in this relative clause is inferrable insofar as the existence of the problem outlined earlier in the paragraph implies the need for a solution, but the use of a label with prospective scope creates anticipation, deferring specification of the solution until the following paragraphs. In both cases the use of a cleft accomplishes a dramatic change of tone which marks a shift in topic. This may be contrasted with a Type 2 comment-clause cleft in the Walker text which previews the topic of the next paragraph so unobtrusively that the fact that it does so is easily missed.

Wa/B/3/1/10 It was consequently important for the efficient working of each county bench that suitable members of the quorum be found to direct its activities in the absence of the assize justices, and it was to this end that the Chancery devoted much thought to the selection of the twenty-four justices appointed, at one stage or another of their careers, to the quorum of the three Ridings.

The Type 1 cleft in the Walker article is presumably of Delin's fill-cleft type since the cleft head fills a vacancy left by the elimination of two previously mentioned candidates.
In consequence, it was principally to the Scropes of Masham, resident within the Riding at Faxfleet, that the Chancery turned in search of steady oversight of the justices.

It is true that this cleft provides closure by presenting the last in a series of magnate candidates that the Chancery turned to for noble oversight of the bench, but it also introduces the sub-topic for the following two sentences, which provide detail about the candidate finally chosen. These three sentences, together with the previous three sentences, make up a stretch of text dealing with the situation in the East Riding, one of three aspects of the paragraph topic. The cleft provides closure at a higher level within this very small discourse segment, but it introduces continuation at a lower level in the form of elaboration of the content of the cleft itself. Thus, Delin and Oberlander’s claim that the topic-clause cleft (whose functions they limit to the contrast and question-answer relation) effectively closes off the dominating topic node and makes it inaccessible for the building of further structure is supported by this particular cleft only insofar as there is no further elaboration of the topic at the same level as the content of the cleft construction; there is elaboration of the sub-topic introduced by the cleft before the discourse segment comes to a close.

Only the Type 1 cleft in the Whiting article could be said to close off a segment of text without permitting further structure; it occurs in the last in a medial sequence of three sentences with low-level content, each of which provides illustration of the statement made by the opening sentence.

W. E. Layton, editor of The Economist suggested that the only way to avoid an indirect tax was to consume something else, and it was the impossibility of doing this with certain items that generated the revenue.

Overall, then, the Type 1 topic-clause clefts in these history texts only partially support Delin and Oberlander’s claim, but three of the four do bear out the claim by Jones and Jones (1985) that a principal function of clefts is to highlight theme, though in one case it is only at sub-topic level.

6.2.2.2 TYPE 2

Type 2 clefts (given information provided by the cleft head and new information in the relative clause) are the most numerous, though confined to the Walker and Whiting articles, with six in the former and two in the latter. Only one of these (Wh/B/1/15/1) supports the claim made by Delin and Oberlander that comment-clause clefts introduce open-ended
embedded segments. All six of the Walker Type 2 clefts constitute the culmination point for segments of text: four (Wa/B/1/3/11, Wa/B/3/1/10, Wa/B/3/3/9, Wa/B/4/2/10) are in paragraph-final sentences, one (Wa/B/3/5/12) is in the penultimate sentence in its paragraph and one (Wa/B/3/1/6) ends a medial segment of a paragraph. One of the two Whiting clefts (Wh/B/3/9/5) provides the last of the material at the lowest discourse level in the paragraph and is the only Type 2 comment-clause cleft which supports Delin and Oberlander's additional claim that comment-clause clefts present background material.

The four paragraph-final clefts all provide strong closure for their paragraphs. Though the antecedent for the cleft head in Wa/B/1/3/11 is in the rheme of the previous sentence, the cleft provides final comment on the paragraph content which is not only at the highest discourse level in the paragraph but also closely related to the discourse theme of the entire article.

**Wa/B/1/3/11** It was such effective local lordship that the Crown was most anxious to harness or, in exceptional cases, to neutralise.

The cleft head in Wa/B/3/3/9 also has its antecedent in the rheme of the preceding sentence, but material in both the cleft head and the relative clause echoes that in the opening sentence of the paragraph, which presents the topic proposition that the displacement of local lawyers by Westminster practitioners was only uncertainly effected.

**Wa/B/3/3/9** Though John Burgh's place on the quorum was eventually filled, after his death in 1412, by Norton and James Strangeways of West Harsley, a newly-created sergeant-at-law, it was the local man amongst the justices, William Lombard, who remained the most frequent attender at sessions to the very end of Henry IV’s reign.

Another paragraph-final cleft ends a segment of a paragraph but in a way which echoes the content of the second sentence of the paragraph, thus functioning as an appropriate closing sentence for the entire paragraph by reminding the reader of its theme.

**Wa/B/4/2/10** It is in respect of this virtual absence of substantial gentry active on the bench that the North Riding commission, characterised by an unusual degree of magnate participation in its sessions and a dominant quorum on which the stewards and advisers of those magnates were prominent, is most clearly distinguished from the rest of Yorkshire.

Admittedly, the remaining paragraph-final Type 2 cleft (Wa/B/3/1/10), introduced for comparison in the previous section, previews the topic of the following paragraph and so
could be viewed as introducing a segment of text, but this is easily overlooked, as already noted. The two paragraph-final Type 1 clefts in the MacKenzie text are much more effective in introducing the topic of subsequent stretches of text. The primary function of this cleft is to provide top-level comment for the content of its own paragraph, comment which is closely related to the main line of reasoning in the body of the article, and therefore closure for this paragraph.

Another Type 2 cleft in the Walker text is in the penultimate rather than the final sentence but brings the content of a long paragraph to a conclusion, with the final sentence merely elaborating on the content of the cleft. It reports a state of affairs which was the culmination of a period during which central government was unable to establish a satisfactory quorum, an account of which forms the subject matter of the entire paragraph, while the final sentence of the paragraph reports the consequence and aftermath of the solution reported by the cleft sentence.

\[ Wa/B/3/5/12 \text{ In the end, it was this shortage of suitably qualified justices willing to take an active role on the East Riding quorum which ensured that William Hungate was, in the summer of 1401, restored to the partnership with Hugh Ardern that his experience and frequent attendance at quarter sessions had always suggested.} \]

The sixth Type 2 cleft in the Walker text is paragraph-medial but it ends a segment of text which constitutes the first half of the paragraph, providing information about the end point of a process of change in the composition and powers of the commission of the peace.

\[ Wa/B/3/1/6 \text{ It was this form of commission that remained in force, except for a brief reintroduction of the double quorum in December 1405, until it was further modified in 1417 and, more substantially, in 1424.} \]

One of the Whiting Type 2 clefts also ends a conceptual segment, being the second of the two sentences providing content at the lowest level of the discourse in this paragraph and it is the only Type 2 cleft which clearly presents background material:

\[ Wh/B/3/9/5 \text{ Capital levies after the war (which, while helping to repay war loan also had the potential to re-distribute wealth) and enhanced death duties were the ways of attacking this wealth, and it was to these schemes that Dalton devoted his attention, and not to the taxation of business profits.} \]

The content of the that-clause is to some extent foreshadowed by a clause in an earlier sentence in the same paragraph: This became Dalton's own territory.
The only Type 2 cleft which can be said to unequivocally introduce a new segment of discourse is a paragraph-initial topic sentence in the Whiting article.

Wh/B/1/15/1 It was at this point that the greater pressure from South Wales began to meet resistance from other districts in the M.F.G.B.

The antecedent for the cleft head is in the final sentence of the previous paragraph. Although the concept of resistance in the that-clause is predominantly new, it echoes the idea stated two paragraphs earlier that there was an opposing viewpoint.

Delin and Oberlander's explanation for their claim that comment-clause clefts introduce open-ended embedded segments is that in not stating that the topic entity is unique with respect to any particular predicate a comment-clause cleft permits any number of different predications about the same topic entity, leaving the topic node to which it attaches open for further elaboration. But it can be seen from the above data that this latter claim does not entail the former. As regards Jones and Jones's association of clefts with topic sentences, only one of the eight Type 2 clefts functions as a topic sentence, but at least three of the others do echo paragraph topics and two are reminders of the discourse theme.

6.2.2.3 TYPE 3

It is questionable whether the history texts yield any truly Type 3 clefts, combining a new cleft head with a comment clause, since the content of both constituents in the three clefts assigned to this category is also inferrable or given to some extent. Two of these clefts are in adjacent sentences in the same paragraph of the Harriss article, another manifestation of the use of parallelism for rhetorical effect by this author.

H/B/1/4/2 It was the receipt of querelae, or plaints, which extended the crown's criminal jurisdiction beyond felony to embrace many trespasses and which produced 'the third and final phase of the judicial revolution which transformed the governance of England between 1150 and 1400'.

H/B/1/4/3 Similarly, it was the insistent demand of plaintiffs for legal advantage that spawned the hordes of attorneys and private lawyers, and led to an explosion in the types of common-law writs available in legal process.

These two clefts occur early in a stretch of text; constituting the second and third sentences in a six-sentence paragraph, and providing information which is elaboration of that in the
opening sentence and which is itself further elaborated upon in the remaining sentences of the paragraph. They provide an intermediary level in a general-to-particular movement from the topic sentence to the supporting evidence in the remaining three sentences of the paragraph. In each one, the content of both the cleft head and the relative clause is to some extent given or inferrable in that it is predicted by cataphoric labels in the opening sentence of the paragraph:

H/B/1/4/1 The same pressures from below - from thousands of landowners seeking to defend or extend their property rights - led to the emergence of new legal procedures and new courts

But the content of each cleft constituent is also new in providing lexicalisation for these labels. In each case the cleft head is a nominalisation of a process, and singles out a different aspect of the nominalised process in the opening, topic sentence. The content of each of these clefts as a whole reinforces the topic proposition of the paragraph, which itself is illustrative of the main thesis of the entire article. Their emphatic nature thus keeps the discourse theme salient in the reader's mind. They are not cases of the use of Type 3 clefts identified by Collins and Prince, namely to fill the reader in on necessary background material at the beginning of a segment of discourse. Because of the informative nature of each constituent in these two clefts, they have been classed as Type 3, but they have some of the character of a type of cleft discussed in the next section which Collins suggests does not exist, one with a given cleft-head and a given cleft-clause.

The third cleft of this type is in the Walker article:

Wa/B/1/3/1-2 Although the resources of the Duchy of Lancaster allowed the Crown, after 1399, to maintain close and effective supervision of the West Riding commission, reliance on magnates like the Nevilles and Scroopes to uphold social discipline both within their own 'countries' and on the county benches held its own dangers. Indeed, it was the close connection between the local agents of royal justice and the aristocracy that attracted the particular criticism of the Commons.

The cleft head provides a narrower specification of the topic of the paragraph than the more general statement in the opening sentence but by foregrounding a phenomenon already approached from a different angle in the foregoing discussion of the close connection between the local agents of royal justice and the aristocracy as represented in the Duchy of Lancaster. The word particular attracts slightly more stress to the cleft clause although this word only serves to reinforce the newness of the relation between the two constituents rather than add much newness to the content of the relative clause: the idea of criticism of the
magnates by the Commons has been introduced two paragraphs earlier in the opening three sentences of this section of the text. This comment clause cleft, which is the second sentence in its paragraph, does, however, support the claim that such clefts open a new segment of text, since it narrows the focus of the opening topic sentence and subsumes the elaboration provided in the rest of the paragraph. The previous two clefts also partially support this claim since they precede elaboration in the remaining sentences in the paragraph. Though none of these three clefts is the opening or topic sentence of the paragraph, all three highlight the discourse theme by echoing a major idea in the article and thus provide some support for the claim by Jones and Jones that clefts are mainly used to highlight the discourse theme. They do not support the claim that comment-clause clefts provide background information.

6.2.2.4 TYPE 4

Six of the 21 clefts in the history text suggest that a fourth type of cleft should be added to the taxonomy provided by Collins (1991), namely one in which there is primarily given or inferrable information in both the cleft head and the relative clause. Two of the three clearest examples of this also seem to illustrate a function of clefts not discussed in the literature: the restating of information in a more emphatic way. Though the use of clefts for emphasis has been noted, this has not been associated with the restating of information. In doing so in a prominent position, one of these clefts highlights the thesis of the entire article. Another sets up an item for contrasting with a later item, in contrast to illustrations in the literature, where only contrast with an earlier item is discussed. Another three of these clefts serve to relate material to the paragraph topic. Harriss also deploys this type of cleft to achieve parallelism, which is characteristic of his style.

The first it-cleft in the Harriss article is a triple-cleft construction with ellipsis of non-referential it and the copula was. It brings to a close a segment of discourse dealing with the 'law state' created by the Angevin kings, which is to be contrasted with the 'war state' which followed them and which is discussed in the remainder of the paragraph.

H/I/2/4 It was from the crown that the drive for effective government came, through royal authority that the realm achieved a sense of unity, and on the king that men's expectations of justice centred.
This is one of several examples of the author's use of parallelism for rhetorical effect; the triple cleft construction hammers home an emphasis on the crown's being responsible for effective government, which is the view of the historian whose interpretation is being reported here, as well as of other historians whose stance Harriss sets out to challenge in this article. In stating in such a salient way that effective government in the Angevin period could be credited to the efforts of the crown, Harriss highlights a state of affairs so that it can be contrasted with the state of affairs described later in the paragraph: a decline in the authority of the crown. This contrast is not Harriss's own, but that made by the historian whose views are being reported in this paragraph. However, by drawing attention in such an emphatic way to the perceived importance of the crown in state development, Harriss also sets up clearly at the beginning of his article the position which he will subsequently attack by maintaining that the significance of the period for state development is not to be measured in terms of the efforts of the crown; rather, state development was a product of pressures from society at large.

This cleft thus contributes to highlighting the discourse theme, not only of this paragraph but of a greater stretch of text, yet it is not a topic sentence, unlike the illustrations provided by Jones and Jones (1985). The cleft also differs from illustrations in the literature in the type of contrast involved. Prince and Collins, with regard to pseudoclefts, and Delin, with regard to clefts, provide examples in which the information conveyed by the cleft head is new and in contrast with what has gone before, whereas here the contrast is with what comes later. This type of it-cleft seems to more closely resemble Delin's fill type of cleft than either of her continuation or correction types, since the two elements in contrast are not mutually exclusive but merely existed in different time periods.

This Harriss cleft also differs from those discussed in the literature with regard to the information status of the cleft constituents. It is an example of a cleft head conveying given information yet still being the more foregrounded of the two constituents, a foregrounding which is reinforced by the triple nature of the construction. The noun phrase functioning as the subject of the preceding sentence, the crown, is repeated first in identical form and then paraphrased within the adverbial prepositional phrases constituting the abstract spatial predicated themes of the triple cleft construction. The prepositions introducing these prepositional phrases do not actually add anything that is not stated or implied in the previous sentence; little would be lost if the cleft construction was reworded as:
It was the crown that provided the drive for effective government, royal authority that gave the realm a sense of unity, the king that was the centre of men's expectations of justice.

Neither Prince, Collins nor Delin and Oberlander explicitly recognise the combination of primary stress or accent with a given cleft head. Gundel (1985:93), on the other hand, does note that a speaker may want to call attention to the topic as well as the comment in a cleft when the topic is being explicitly contrasted with some other topic in the discourse. She defines the topic as information which will always be interpreted as taken for granted in some sense - not part of what is actually asserted or questioned by the sentence - while the comment is always new information in relation to the topic.

However, it is not just in the combination of primary accent with givenness in the cleft head that the above cleft differs from those discussed in the literature. It also differs in that neither constituent of the cleft is new. The information in the relative clauses of this triple cleft construction is inferrable in varying degrees from what has been stated in the preceding sentence. Although Gundel acknowledges the existence of sentences where the entire sentence can be interpreted as comment, with no expression in the sentence referring to topic, she apparently does not envisage that the opposite might also occur. But Delin and Oberlander (1992:23-24) seem to allow for this possibility when they observe that sometimes the cleft topic and its antecedent are described in terms too different for the relationship between them to be immediately appreciated, possibly because of a desire to avoid the stylistic infelicity of restating material in identical terms and a wish to package additional information as economically as possible: 'the cleft allows creative additions and modifications to be made to content while still signalling that a coherent relation is intended...Where coherence is expressed at the level of syntactic structure, the expression of coherence at the content level is not so crucial.'

In this Harris cleft, both the cleft head and the relative clause together recast the information gained from the preceding sentence in a way which foregrounds it more. What is new is the uniqueness and crucialness interpretation that it was the crown and no other source that provided effective government, justice and a sense of unity. This is the source of what Huddleston (1984) calls at-issueness. The triple nature of the cleft construction serves to underline this crucialness all the more. This source of newness transcends the division between stressed-focus/topic-clause and informative-presupposition/comment-clause clefts,
being common to all types of clefts. Therefore, it would seem, contrary to Collins’s (1991) findings, that a fourth type of cleft does in fact exist, namely one in which both the cleft head and the relative clause have given information as their primary content (which is not to deny that both the cleft head and the relative clause in a cleft construction may contain a mixture of given and new information, as noted in the literature, eg. by Delin).

Collins believed his findings to be consistent with the principle derived from intonationally based theories of information that all sentences must contain at least one item that is designated as news, either ‘fresh’ or ‘for noting’. What the Harris triple cleft construction does is restate information in a more salient way, with the added interpretation of uniqueness, so that the reader is in no danger of missing the point. The uniqueness interpretation is what is ‘for noting’. So the idea that every sentence must contain an item for noting is consistent with the presence of given information in both of the separate constituents of a cleft, where it is the relationship between these two constituents which is for noting. Delin and Oberlander (1992:9) make a similar point with regard to the connection between the new cleft head and the topic clause in a stressed-focus/topic-clause cleft: ‘It is the connection between a new element and the topic, rather than the simple existence of the new element, that is the communicative content of the sentence.’

In fact, in stating that ‘Type 1 clefts display a correlation between the structurally highlighted element and the locus of new information,’ Collins does note that the information is often new in the sense of ‘newly identified’ or ‘contrastive’. Earlier he observes that new status may be derived by being treated differently when introduced a second time. This is presumably what he means by ‘newly identified.’ Similarly, Halliday (1967:204) states that new information may be said to be focal ‘not in the sense that it cannot have been previously mentioned...but in the sense that the speaker presents it as not being recoverable from previous discourse.’ Obviously, much hinges on the definitions of given and new, which are various in the literature.

Prince uses the term textually evoked for reference to entities which have been referred to earlier in the discourse, and treats entities evoked textually or situationally as given. Brown and Yule (1983) make a further, helpful distinction between current and displaced textually evoked entities, the former having been introduced as new immediately before the current new entity was introduced, and the latter prior to current entities. This is similar to Chafe’s
(1992, 1991) distinction between active and semi-active referents, except that Chafe’s semi-active referents also include inferrable referents, which Prince and Brown and Yule treat separately from evoked referents. Chafe also restricts given status to active referents in his given, accessible, new taxonomy. Semi-active referents of the sort which Brown and Yule label displaced evoked entities, are included, along with inferrable semi-active referents, in the accessible category. Brown and Yule, however, treat both current (Chafe’s active) and displaced (Chafe’s semi-active) evoked entities as given. They follow Halliday in treating phonological prominence as a marker of newness and state that evoked expressions are not realised with phonological prominence except in a few cases of contrast, while new and inferrable entities are.

On the one hand, the referent of the noun phrase the crown in the Harriss cleft would seem to satisfy Chafe’s comparatively narrow definition of given, and would appear to be what Brown and Yule term a current evoked referent, since it is the subject of the immediately preceding independent clause. On the other hand, it does not satisfy Halliday’s criterion, also adopted by Brown and Yule, of phonological non-prominence. A newness interpretation is also allowed for by Halliday’s notion of something previously mentioned in the discourse being presented as not being recoverable from preceding discourse, and by Collin’s statement that new status may be derived by being treated differently when introduced a second time, though Collins associates the notion ‘recoverable but to be freshly attended to’ with the category of informativity which he labels Contrastive.

The idea of a previously mentioned entity being treated differently when introduced a second time, and the association of the ‘for noting’ concept with what might otherwise be considered given information, as illustrated in the above cleft, is reminiscent of Ushie’s (1986) notion of co-representation, that is the presenting of an already identified referent in a new light and from a different perspective. She applies this notion to cases where an indefinite article is used with a noun phrase which is in a relationship of co-reference with a preceding expression, with the result that aspects of the referent which the text producer considers to be particularly relevant or important are brought into focus. This idea might perhaps better be captured by the term re-presenting. But Ushie’s illustrations involve co-reference with a preceding item at some distance from the latest reference, that is displaced evoked entities. In the above cleft the referent is the topic of the immediately preceding independent clause, therefore a current evoked entity. The term co-representation might,
However, also be applied to a phenomenon discussed by Geisler et al (1985), who note the use of *this* as determiner to raise an item given in the preceding sentence from the status of out of focus topic to that of topic in focus. What the cleft seems to be doing in the above Harris example is to raise an already in focus topic to a higher status by making it more crucial, that is, throwing it into even greater relief.

The present argument is that a cleft construction in which the cleft head re-enters with primary phonological stress a referent which not only has been previously mentioned in the discourse but is actually still in focus, and in which the content of the relative clause is given or inferrable, deserves to be treated as a separate type, consisting of a stressed given cleft head and a given or inferrable relative clause. It seems odd to resort, as Halliday and Collins do, to labelling information as new in the sense of 'presented as if it were new' when the information is currently in focus, having been introduced as topic in the immediately preceding independent clause. Collins is happy to keep informativity and at-issueness separate in viewing the relative clauses in his Type 2 and 3 clefts as combining newness and not-at-issueness. Why not the same in reverse with regard to cleft heads, that is treating the cleft head in the above example from Harris as a combination of givenness with at-issueness? The main objection to this would be from those who distinguish new information from given information phonologically. Perhaps it is at-issueness/not-at-issueness which should be distinguished phonologically, while new/given can be distinguished according to whether information has been previously mentioned, is obvious from the context, or can be assumed to be part of the shared knowledge both reader and writer bring to the context and the text.

The second *it*-cleft in the introduction to the Harriss example is another case where the information in the preceding sentence is recast in a more foregrounded form.

H/I/10/4 *It was these pressures which shaped the institutions of government, the conventions of governing, and the capacity of kings to govern effectively.*

This cleft highlights the thesis of the entire article, thus illustrating what Jones and Jones (1985) consider to be the primary function of clefts. But it does not unambiguously confirm their association of clefts with paragraph or section initial position; though it does highlight the discourse theme for the rest of the article, it is the final sentence in its own paragraph and represents a culmination of the ideas in that paragraph. This discourse theme is also in
direct contrast with the interpretation of other historians which is negatively evaluated in the opening sentence of this four-sentence paragraph, as well as in less direct contrast with the summary of the views of these historians presented in earlier paragraphs in the introduction.

Again, there is given information in both the cleft head and the cleft clause. The cleft head is a noun phrase, these pressures, which is co-referential with pressures from within political society in the preceding sentence, while the content of the relative clause is an expansion of the information conveyed by the words Government was moulded more by in the previous sentence. However, whereas in the previous sentence these pressures are merely presented as a more influential agent of change than the efforts of kings or officials, in the cleft sentence they are re-presented as uniquely the agent of change. Again, there is a case of primary stress on a given cleft head, with the new information being the relation of uniqueness of identity which is asserted between the cleft head and the relative clause. It is true that the absence in the relative clause of the concept of comparison represented by the words more by in the theme of the previous sentence makes the content of the relative clause somewhat different from that of the preceding sentence; however, what remains as content of the relative clause is nevertheless still given as it is the topic of the entire foregoing section of text, as well as of the entire article, and very much in the forefront of the reader's mind.

The third cleft in the Harriss article functions to link subsidiary information to the topic of the paragraph, bringing to a close a small stretch of sentences at a lower discourse level.

H/B/1/3/5 It was at and through the exchequer that these demands were satisfied.

The two preceding sentences describe a historical development and the cleft then deftly establishes the relevance of this material by relating it to the topic of the paragraph and bringing that topic, the exchequer, back into prominence. The pseudocleft performs something like what Delin (1991) has called a fill-move rather than supplying the second item in a relationship of contrast or the answer to a question, the only two options provided by Delina and Oberlander (1992) for closing a segment of text (unless they treat a fill-move as a type of answer to a question). Again there is an abstract spatial cleft head conveying given information but receiving primary stress, while the information in the relative clause is inferrable from material in the immediately preceding sentence. These demands is a paraphrase of the content of the theme of the preceding sentence and the idea of demands
needing to be satisfied and ultimately being satisfied can be inferred from this content. Once again, it is the relationship between the cleft head and the relative clause rather than either of these constituents in isolation which is new and asserted. However, the difference between this cleft and the two Harriss clefts already discussed is that the cleft head is in a relationship of co-reference not with an item in the immediately preceding sentence but with an item which occurs three sentences earlier. It could be said, therefore, that the cleft brings this topic back into focus, except that, since it is the paragraph topic entity, the medieval exchequer, in the second sentence of the paragraph, being a paraphrase of the financial offices in the opening, topic sentence, it was never really completely out of focus. What this cleft does is relate the preceding subsidiary material to the paragraph topic, demonstrating its relevance, and raising the discourse back to a higher level.

There is a similar type of cleft in the Whiting article, which also provides reiteration for emphasis.

Wh/B/1/24/3 But although the meshing of the tax question with vigorous industrial action varied from union to union, it was as a trade union problem that the issue had made its impact on the tax authorities.

This is a salient sentence, being the final sentence of a three-sentence paragraph. It reiterates the point made by the final sentence of the previous paragraph, with the highlighted element having its antecedent in the theme of this earlier sentence and the that-clause having its antecedent in the theme of the same sentence.

Walker has two clefts with stressed cleft heads which present given information and information in the relative clause which is inferrable. Each provides illustration of a preceding statement. One is paragraph-final; though providing illustration rather than a higher-level assertion, the cleft form ensures a strong closure to the paragraph.

Wa/C/5/6 When the Parliament of November 1411 requested a statute specifically prohibiting the Chief Justice of King’s Bench from sitting on assizes in his own county, apparently on the grounds that he might be required to sit in error on a case he had already tried at first instance, the petition drew upon a long tradition of complaint on the issue, but it was clearly against Gascoigne and his local influence that the resulting legislation was principally aimed.

The other Walker cleft with a given but stressed cleft head picks out an entity in the context frame provided by the marked theme of its own sentence and makes it the topic of the
sentence, which provides an example as evidence of the more general statement made by the preceding sentence.

On occasion, the justices' enthusiastic use of their powers ran counter to the Crown's expressed desire for impartiality: when a group of villagers was indicted, in the course of an enclosure dispute, for breaking Sir Robert Conyer's close at Upsall in Cleveland, it was Conyers himself who heard the initial indictment.

Again, there is a similarity here with the phenomenon discussed by Gasler et al (1985), whereby demonstrative this used as a determiner with a noun phrase in a relationship of coreference with an item in an immediately preceding segment of text raises the referent of the preceding expression to the status of topic in focus; and with the use of indefinite articles with given material to represent information in a new light, noted by Ushie (1986).

The material in the relative clause is also inferrable since the fact that there was an indictment was presented in the marked theme, giving rise to the inference that the indictment was 'heard' by someone. The fact that it was only the initial indictment, rather than a subsequent indictment, which Conyers heard has minimal newsworthiness. Unlike the examples of stressed given cleft heads combined with inferrable cleft clauses in the Harriss text, however, this cleft does not repeat already known information in a more salient way. The cleft as a whole presents a new proposition. The material in this cleft provides subordinate information, but not as a preamble to a segment of text. It furnishes an example for a statement made in the previous independent clause, to which it is linked by a semicolon. It is this preceding clause which introduces a segment of text.

In summary, the clefts in this sample of academic history discourse provide evidence of a type of cleft and of pragmatic uses of clefts not previously noted in the literature, and do not provide much support for several claims made in the literature as regards other uses of clefts. The four articles in the sample differ in the types of clefts predominantly used, their distribution throughout the text, and the functions that they perform.

The second largest group of clefts in the history texts, here labelled Type 4, is of a type not acknowledged in the literature and which Collins (1991) implies does not exist. These clefts, containing given or inferrable information in both cleft constituents, also bear out an observation which has been made only with regard to clefts containing new information in
one or other or both of the constituents, namely that it can be the relation between constituents asserted by the cleft as a whole, rather than the content of either constituent in isolation, that carries the main message. In some cases the Type 4 cleft as a whole makes a completely new assertion, while in others it restates a proposition in a more emphatic way, with the only new information being the concept of uniqueness added by the cleft construction. The uniqueness interpretation of clefts has been noted before, but it has not been represented as constituting the only new information in some clefts. The emphatic nature of clefts has also been noted elsewhere (e.g. Collins 1991), but not in association with the restating of information in a more salient form, as illustrated in the present sample. Harriss’s employment of clefts of this type to recast, or re-present an idea with an emphatic tone contributes to the more highly rhetorical style of his text. One of these clefts presents the first part of a contrast with a later item, unlike examples of contrast in the literature, which have all been of cleft heads in contrast with preceding rather than later items. Type 4 clefts are also used to relate lower-level information within the paragraph to the paragraph topic, raising the discourse level back towards the top level in the paragraph. Yet another use is to raise an entity which is out of focus in the marked theme of the same sentence to the status of sentence topic.

None of the five clefts in the Harriss article exhibits completely new material in either the cleft head or the relative clause, but two present detail in both constituents which is not entirely inferable, being specification of a label. Though the foreshadowing of the content of each cleft constituent by preceding labels gives these clefts an aspect of Type 4, they are here labelled Type 3 because the specification is new. Contrary to the claim (Collins 1991, following Prince and Huddleston) that the cleft head in Type 3 clefts is typically a circumstantial adjunct, it is only the Type 3 group of clefts in the present data which does not include this kind of cleft head, while one of the three Type 1 clefts, three of the eight Type 2 clefts, and two of the four Type 4 clefts do. But Collins’s claim that the cleft head in Type 2 clefts is typically short and anaphoric is borne out by the present sample, in which all seven Type 2 clefts feature short cleft heads, five of which are noun phrases containing the determiners this or such. In two of the five clefts in the Harriss article, the cleft head is an abstract spatial prepositional phrase incorporating a noun phrase which refers to an institution of the medieval state, while in the other three the cleft head is a nominalisation of a process, realising reference to features of the development of the medieval state.
Jones and Jones’s (1985) assertion that a principal function of clefts is to highlight theme in text requires modification to be applicable to these texts. The examples they give illustrate the highlighting of the themes of entire texts or else at least of paragraph topics. Yet in these history articles cleft constructions are more often used not as topic sentences, either major or minor, but to provide closure, in the form of a final comment or a culmination point in, for example, a process of development or change. They can also be used to link lower-level material within a paragraph to the paragraph topic, or to provide illustration for a preceding more general statement. Frequently clefts used in this way do also echo or indirectly reiterate the theme or topic of a paragraph or a greater stretch of text, but without themselves constituting the initial statements of theme, or topic sentences for those segments of text in which they occur.

The clefts in the history sample do not provide much support for the claims by Delin and Oberlander (1992) that topic-clause clefts - with new cleft heads and given cleft clauses - close a segment of discourse, while comment-clause clefts - with given cleft heads and new cleft clauses - open a segment of discourse and do so by providing background information. Three of the four Type 1 stressed focus/topic clause clefts provide evidence both for and against the first claim, since they also announce the topic of the following stretch of text. Only one of the Type 2 comment-clause clefts supports the second claim. On the contrary, this type of cleft is mostly used to end segments of text. All but one of the Type 2 clefts are also counter-examples for the third claim. Even the Type 2 cleft which does open a text segment does so by providing the topic sentence rather than background material. Collins restricts the discourse-opening claim to comment clause clefts of Type 3, and the illustrations Prince provides for opening with background information are also of Type 3, though she does not explicitly distinguish them from the other type of comment clause cleft. The three Type 3 clefts in the history sample do provide some support for Delin and Oberlander’s second claim, but not for their third claim.

The four articles differ in their deployment of clefts. MacKenzie uses only two clefts and only Type 1, Harriss only Types 3 and 4, Whiting uses no Type 3, and though Walker uses at least one of each type, he mainly uses Type 2. Though conveying an overall impression of being more rhetorical and emphatic, the Harriss text contains only half the number of clefts in the Walker text, but these five clefts are deployed with greater rhetorical effect. Whereas the ten clefts in the Walker text are distributed throughout the body and conclusion section
of the article, the five Harriss clefts are confined to a comparatively short stretch of text comprising the introduction section and the first half of the first section of the body of the article, setting an emphatic tone early on. Harriss tends to use clefts to recast given propositions in a more salient form. He gives three of his clefts extra force by employing parallelism, either in the form of a triple cleft construction or juxtaposition of two clefts, and uses a fourth to state the thesis of his article at the end of a highly foregrounded paragraph. Both clefts in the MacKenzie text occur in the first section of the body of the article, but they differ in type and function from those in the Harriss article. Both Mackenzie and Walker favour paragraph-final position for cleft sentences, whereas only one of the five clefts in the Harriss article and one of the four in the Whiting article occur in paragraph-final position. Clefts are one of the means whereby MacKenzie exploits final placement to preview the topic of subsequent stretches of text, whereas Walker employs them mainly to provide closure for paragraphs or longer stretches of text. The four clefts in the Whiting article are distributed throughout the text: two are salient sentences, while the other two present lower-level material. The clefts in the history texts do not make explicit reference to research processes, products or participants, nor do they participate in text reference. But they do make a major contribution to the highlighting of discourse theme and to the authoritative tone of the text.

6.3 QUESTIONS

Thompson (2001) discusses questions in written text as realisation of writer-reader interaction, which may be interactive - involving the management of the flow of information - or interactional - aiming to involve readers in the argument or ethos of the text. A question may be projected as being asked by the reader, and therefore have a primarily interactional purpose, but at the same time, it may serve to signal where the text is going next, and thus also have an interactive function. According to Thompson, such questions typically reflect an attempt to involve the reader: ‘the writer offers a token of solidarity by overtly demonstrating understanding of, and concern for, the reader’s processing of the text’ while spelling out ‘the question that the co-operative reader ought to be expecting to be answered at that point and thus’ encouraging ‘the reader to accept the direction the text is taking’ (p.61). He claims that interactional choices tend to be associated with argumentation, which, in academic texts, is likely to be salient in the introduction, discussion and
conclusion sections, and sees questions as one of three main options open to academic writers to perform overt dialogic interaction with their readers, the others being commands and statements projected as being made by the reader which the writer brings in to be contradicted.

Crismore et al (1993) have a category of metadiscourse called commentary which ‘draws readers into an implicit dialogue’ (Crismore and Farnsworth (1990:124), and which includes questions. Mauranen (1993) uses the term metatext with a narrower interpretation than Vande Kopple’s term metadiscourse, for language which realises text reflexivity, that is, a writer’s explicit commentary on his own ongoing text by means of references to the text itself or to the text as language. This includes 1) reviews - clauses (sometimes abbreviated) which contain an explicit indicator that an earlier stage of the text is being repeated or summarised; 2) previews - clauses (sometimes abbreviated) which contain an explicit indicator that a later stage of the text is being anticipated; 3) illocution markers - indicators of discourse acts performed in the text. Tadros (1985) includes questions in her signals of prediction. Peters’ (1986) category of interpersonal metadiscourse includes rhetorical questions, as well as modals, and first and second person pronouns.

The number of rhetorical questions in a text is not a discriminator between the medieval and modern historians. Harriss and Whiting use questions with equal frequency, though Harriss uses more overall if each member of a conjoined or contiguous pair is counted separately. In both articles the questions are distributed across only five locations, but Harriss has a total of nine, made up of four questions conjoined in one sentence by means of colons and semi-colons, two adjacent questions and three single occurrences of questions elsewhere in the text, while Whiting has six, comprising two conjoined questions together with four single occurrences. There are only two questions in the Walker article and none in the MacKenzie article. The majority of the questions in these texts have a discourse-organising function by virtue of their ability to foreground a focal proposition summarising a large stretch of text, often also clarifying the relationship between stretches of text by functioning as a pivot consisting of both retrospective and prospective summaries. These functions explain the tendency for questions to occur at major boundaries in text. All except one of the 17 questions, distributed across 12 locations realises the interpersonal macro-function.
All nine questions in the Harriss text occur at boundaries between sections of the text structure and either summarise the material in the preceding text or establish the focus for the following text or both. In addition, the four conjoined and two contiguous questions are two cases of the parallelism frequently employed by this author which contributes to his more flamboyant style. The former end a highly foregrounded paragraph which summarises the issues brought to light in the literature review. They paraphrase the material earlier in the same paragraph, itself a summary of the content of the preceding five paragraphs, in a way which synthesises the various views of the six historians whose ideas have been reviewed. Their primary function is that of summarising preceding text for the purposes of clarification but they also highlight the theme of subsequent text since they encapsulate the views which the author has set himself the task of refuting and providing an alternative interpretation for in the remainder of the article.

H/I/7/8 The issues in debate are familiar and recurrent: was state building advanced more by war or peace, and did war strengthen or weaken royal authority; is devolved or centralised government the more effective, and absolutist or limited monarchy strongest?

Parallelism is more highly marked in this paragraph than in any other in the article, and enables the author to achieve the rhetorical flourish afforded by balance, which offsets the abruptness resulting from short segments of text with very brief noun phrases functioning in subject position as unmarked themes. This parallelism is markedly sustained throughout these questions, which consist of two pairs of questions with the items in each pair joined by the same linker and each question being an alternative question.

The two contiguous questions begin another foregrounded paragraph, which opens the final sub-section of the body of the text. They constitute a pivot between stretches of text by summarising the preceding two sub-sections text by means of complex noun phrases functioning as GS while at the same time establishing a topic proposition for the remaining sub-section, which is their primary function.

H/B/3/11/1-2 Did this huge expansion of law-keeping and law-seeking by the propertied class subvert the public authority of the crown? Did the decline of the eyre, with its policing and exploitative functions, allow lords to dominate local legal and administrative structures through their affinities?

The other Harriss questions also provide a focus for a following section or sub-section. One is particularly foregrounded: it opens the final conceptual paragraph of the introduction by
posing a general research question for the entire article which is made more specific in the following sentence, which presents the writer’s statement of the scope, purpose and structure of the body of the text.

H/I/1/1/7-8  How did this affect its development and functioning? I want to examine three aspects of late medieval government on which debate has centred:...

A question occurs in each of the opening paragraphs functioning as introductions to the first and third sections of the body of the article.

H/B/1/1/3  Did this form an ossifying and unwieldy bureaucracy, or was it responsive to the changing demands?

H/B/3/1/7  How accurate is this picture?

All of Harriss’s questions occur at a significant text boundary, highlight a discourse theme and have a summarising function. In the case of the four conjoined questions, it is the question as a whole which performs a retrospective summary of a preceding stretch of text as specification of a more general summary provided by an anaphoric label in the opening part of the sentence in which the question is embedded. In the other cases, the question as a whole provides a summarising topic proposition for subsequent text but the retrospective summary is provided by one of its constituents, the GS, realised by a definite noun phrase. Only in the second contiguous question is the summarising function of the noun phrase not supported by demonstrative this. In two of the six questions, this constitutes the entire noun phrase, while in another it is combined with an anaphoric noun.

One of Walker’s two questions marks a significant text boundary.

Wa/C/2/1  How far do these conclusions hold good for the rest of the country?

Following an initial paragraph in the conclusion section which summarises the conclusions the author has arrived at in the body of the article, this question establishes, at the beginning of the following paragraph, that the focus in the remainder of the conclusion section is being broadened to consider the implications for the rest of the country of the findings for one county which was the particular object of study in this article. Again there is a noun phrase functioning as GS which provides a retrospective summary, so that the question functions as a pivot relating the following text to the preceding paragraph. The summarising power of
the noun phrase is enhanced by the fact that it is brief and consists of an anaphoric label, supported by demonstrative this.

The other rhetorical question merely encapsulates one of three sub-topics in a paragraph in the introduction.

**Wa/I/3/7** Who were the 'best and most law-worthy' men of the shire who the Commons insisted should be chosen as justices?

This is the third of three challenges to the consensus view, all of which the author intends to explore in relation to his own data. The question has some prominence by virtue of occurring in one of only four paragraphs in the introduction, and the one which summarises the objections to the consensus view which the author will address in the body of the article, and of representing one of these research questions. But it does not mark the boundary of a substantial section of text, as do the questions in the Harriss text.

Though generally less rhetorical in style than the other three authors, particularly the two medieval history authors, Whiting uses questions as often as Harriss, usually at major text boundaries and, in three cases, to establish the focus for major sections of text. Only one of these (Wh/B/3/1/3) does not contain a retrospectively summarising element. But there is only one case of anaphoric demonstrative this being used to summarise (Wh/B/2/1/8), and one case of an anaphoric label being used for this purpose (Wh/B/1/25/3).

One occurs as the first sentence of a two-sentence paragraph which concludes one major section by introducing the topic of the next major section.

**Wh/B/1/28/1** How far was the energy generated over income tax used to wider effect, either to get rid of other taxes or to make forays into capitalist wealth by encouraging new taxes for others to pay?

Two occur as final sentences in introductory paragraphs for major sections of text, establishing the topic for the section.

**Wh/B/2/1/8** Does this mean that the real taxation of the working class was successfully carried on through indirect taxation, arousing little hostility amongst the industrial workers, while the much more insignificant income tax took all the flak?

**Wh/B/3/1/3** But how far did the working class, either through the trade unions or the labour party, try to press for tax changes which would be placed directly upon the shoulders of others?
One of the Whiting questions is a topic sentence, though the third sentence in its paragraph.

**Wh/B/1/25/3 How impressive were the arguments on the labour side?**

Unlike the other questions in the history sample, the two conjoined questions in the Whiting text are questions which the author presents as having occurred to the participants in the historical events under study, part of the historical data, rather than questions about the interpretation of the data. But they still constitute summaries of content in the preceding section, constituting the penultimate sentence of a final-paragraph summary of content.

**Wh/B/2/6/12-13 But increasingly, pragmatic questions of power and the economy had become part of the argument; would the trade unions be able to shift the tax by putting up wages, and what would the costs of such efforts be, even if ultimately successful?**

The above data illustrate the powerful discourse-organising function of questions, by virtue of their ability to highlight the discourse theme; summarise large stretches of text, both retrospectively and prospectively; and act as a pivot relating adjacent stretches of text, and they tend to occur at major text boundaries, where these functions are most useful. Their retrospective summarising function is performed particularly efficiently when demonstrative *this* or an anaphoric label is employed, and it is the Harriss text which makes most use of this device. In most cases the use of questions in the history texts is epistemic in that they directly engage the reader in interpretation of the data under study.

Indirect questions, i.e. subordinate interrogative clauses. Two examples in which they occur as embedded subjects.

**M/B/1/5/2 Whether or not this was contrary to the terms of the Geneva Convention was not entirely clear; but the discovery on Sark of dead Wehrmacht personnel with their hands tied behind them struck the German military authorities and Hitler himself as flagrantly unlawful.**

**M/B/1/32/2 What could happen when the opposite held true - when ideology generally ran contrary to the idea of the uniformed captive as essentially similar to the captor - was starkly evident in the Russo-German war.**

The first has the nature of an aside, while the second occurs in the final sentence of the longest section in the body of the article, a sentence which previews the theme of the next section.
6.4 FRONTED THEMES

Thematised elements which provoke inversion of subject and verb have a particularly marked effect (Downing and Locke 1992:228): as was seen in Chapter 3, Halliday considers fronted complements to be the most marked of marked themes. There are twenty-nine examples of fronting accompanied by inversion in the sample texts.

Table 6.3
Numbers of fronted themes classified according to author and semantic function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Harriss</th>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Whiting</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If quoted material is left out of account, once again, the Harriss text contains the most examples of a salient form: more than twice as many as any of the other three texts, and the Whiting text only one. The Walker and MacKenzie texts each have six examples of fronting involving subject-verb inversion, excluding the 8 MacKenzie quote themes. The largest category is of fronted elements featuring the comparative forms of adjectives, which accounts for all six of the McKenzie marked themes involving inversion, three of those in the Walker text and one in the Harriss text.

6.4.1 COMPARISON

By far the greatest proportion of fronted forms prompting inversion are used for comparison. Most of these feature comparative forms of adjectives and more than half of these ten fronted comparative adjectives occur in the MacKenzie text, accounting for all of the examples of fronted forms in the MacKenzie article. Three occur in the Walker text, one in the Harriss text, and none in the Whiting text. Five of these ten constructions with comparative adjectives are used as topic sentences, of which four have scope over more than one paragraph. Only one of these five topic sentences is the opening sentence in its paragraph, providing a link of comparison with material in the previous paragraph.
Even more important was the response of the Allies when such breaches of the convention were discovered.

The other four are either second sentences or the second independent clause in the opening sentence, so that the cohesive link is with the immediately preceding independent clause or sentence in its own paragraph.

There were other, smaller-scale confrontations arising from what was perceived to be unfair treatment of POWs by the enemy, but even more potentially destabilizing was the attitude of the Nazi leadership in the latter part of the war.

More serious - and contrary to the spirit if not the letter of the Geneva Convention - was the treatment accorded German prisoners after the war had ended.

Rather more controversial was the position of the six million or so German servicemen, who fell into Allied hands in the last weeks of the war and immediately after the final surrender.

More significant in shaping the character of the bench in this period was the considerable effort expended by the king and his advisers to ensure the appointment of gentry justices of proven diligence and loyalty.

These four non-initial independent clauses featuring fronted comparative forms which function as topic sentences are each immediately preceded by a topic introducer providing comment on the content of the preceding paragraph as a lead-in to the new topic. Of the four authors, MacKenzie makes most use of topic sentences preceded by topic introducers; there is no example of this in the Harriss article and only one in the Walker article.

The fronting of elements containing comparative forms seems to be a device favoured by MacKenzie, and especially their use as topic sentences. However, he also uses this form of fronting twice without topic sentence status, in each case towards the end of a paragraph.

Even more indicative of the deterrent strength of fears for prisoners in enemy hands was the manner in which captured Jews in British and American uniform were handled.

Making a precarious situation even worse was the work prisoners were forced to undertake - usually heavy manual labor on war-related projects (the largest being the notorious Burma-Siam railway on which sixteen thousand out of a POW workforce of forty thousand died) seven days a week regardless of their deteriorating physical condition.

In three of MacKenzie’s fronted comparative elements the markedness of the construction is enhanced by use of the intensifier even, as in the last two examples. It is worth noting that a version of the last of the above sentences without fronting would require substitution of the
simple past form of the verb *make* in place of the verb *was* and the *-ing* form *making* as otherwise a progressive aspect interpretation would arise which would result in an inappropriate change in meaning. Thus, in this sentence, the comparative adjective phrase is not itself the complement of *be*

A fronted complement with comparative co-reference can perform a similar function to a topic sentence at a lower level in the hierarchy of the text, introducing the topic of a paragraph segment, as in the following two examples from the Walker article.

Wa/B/1/4/10 More problematic is the evidence for a growth in Percy representation among the justices of both the North and East Ridings after 1399.

Wa/C/3/9 Less typical, however, were the marked changes in the personnel of the Yorkshire commissions during Henry IV's reign; they were a solution to the particular problems created by the county's involvement in the Percy rebellions of 1403 and 1405, and one made possible by the extensive resources of the Duchy of Lancaster estates in the region.

These fronted comparative forms are typically used with an evaluative function, as is evident from the adjectives employed: *important, potentially destabilising, serious* (twice), *controversial, significant, indicative, worse, problematic, typical*. They are a means whereby the author assesses the significance of the evidence and the degree to which it either supports or detracts from the author's thesis. In the following example from the Harriss article, for example, this device is associated with the function of concession.

H/B/2/2/6-7 More serious was the threat, and occasional eruption of, popular opposition. Yet here again, although taxation bore heavily in times of economic hardship, its overall level must have been broadly consistent with the level of rural wealth.

The fronted comparative form introduces evidence which might appear to undermine the claim made by the author in the topic sentence three sentences earlier, but is immediately followed in the next sentence by a qualification of the significance of this evidence.

Two other cases of fronted adjectives realise similarity rather than difference:

H/B/3/9/4 Equally specific was his punishment of those who broke the peace, whether by fine and imprisonment of individuals, or by the dispatch of commissions of oyer and terminer or justices of the King's Bench to disturbed regions.
Also important was the willingness of certain officials to press harder than most what was undoubtedly a genuine grievance, and to respond to the working class income tax payer as a trade unionist rather than leaving him to fend for himself as an individual citizen.

6.4.2 ADDITION

There are six cases of inversion after _so, nor, neither_ or _not merely_, used as additive devices, all from the Harriss text. Two of the three uses of _so_ are cases of substitution, while in the third there is a conjunctive relation. In the first case of substitution with _so_, it introduces a sort of rejoinder following a concession.

They might indeed be corrupted by private interests, but _so_ were royal bureaucrats.

In the second two uses of _so_, it is part of the correlative _just as...so_ and occurs in opening topic sentences.

Just as the tax system rested on a political dialogue between crown and subjects, _so too_ did the expenditure of revenue.

Public order and dispute settlement were thus largely regulated by local hierarchies, _but just as J.P.s came under the surveillance of the crown’s justices, so might gentry disputes need to be determined by the crown’s authority._

Use of correlative linkers in these two sentences permits not only linking across a paragraph boundary but also a fuller reminder of the preceding content by repetition not only of what is predicated but also of the entity it is predicated of. All three uses of _so_ could be said to exemplify the parallelism and balancing of one text segment against another which is characteristic of the style of the Harriss text. The same could be said of the use of _not merely_, while the use of _nor_ and _neither_ with inversion appears to hammer home points in the argument.

Few verdicts were irreversible, _for not merely did the law offer a wide variety of actions with which to counter an opponent, all such tactics - legal, quasi-legal and corrupt - might be designed ultimately to secure an advantageous settlement out of court._

Nor _did the crown hand over its judicial responsibilities to local amateurs, for the J.P.s acted under the supervision of professional judges_.

But neither _was the crown any more successful in securing acceptance of direct taxation for normal peacetime government_.
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In fact, all these cases of inversion are emphatic and therefore in keeping with the Harriss rhetorical style.

6.4.3 CONCESSION

The four examples of concessive fronted elements are confined to the medieval history texts. Three of these feature the use of only. The three Harriss examples all occur in the penultimate independent clauses of their paragraphs and are associated with chronological development. Concession might normally be associated with backgrounding but in these three cases, the marked fronting with inversion construction together with the paragraph-final position and the association with the culmination of a chronological development mean that the concessive statement actually provides a sense of closure for the paragraph. The author introduces information which is contrary to the main point of the paragraph but indicates that it is not counter-evidence because it is outside the time frame with which the article is concerned.

H/B/2/3/9  Only as the “war state” faded in the mid-fifteenth century was the need for alternative revenues and modes of taxation acutely felt, and by then taxation was deeply rooted in political conventions which proved hard to change.

H/B/2/5/10  Only with the last decades of the sixteenth century was there something of a return to the medieval pattern of habitual if lighter levies, with parliament acknowledging its obligation to provide against a continuing threat of war.

H/B/3/9/11  Not until the Star Chamber Act of 1487 was there provision for prosecution by the crown on its own initiative, and even thereafter such cases were rare.

The Walker example occurs in the second sentence of its paragraph. It introduces an exception in evidence which is otherwise supportive of the statement made in the opening topic sentence; both the exception and the more substantial supporting evidence are presented in the same sentence. The remainder of the paragraph provides elaborative detail for the evidence of both types.

Wa/B/4/2/2  More than half (25 out of 42) of the gentry justices appointed to the three commissions can be shown to have attended the sessions at least once, while, in terms of justice-days for which payment was made, only in the North Riding did the attendance levels of the gentry justices (39 per cent) fall significantly below those of the quorum lawyers; in the West Riding the figure was 42 and in the East Riding 49 per cent.
6.4.4 REFERENCE TO HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

Fronted elements involving reference to human beings are found only in the medieval history texts, are all examples of abstract spatial adverbial phrases and all refer to groups of people, even the phrase In neither case.

H/B/1/7/6 Among the Commons were men who moved easily within the court and central government, and were leaders and governors of their communities.

Wa/B/1/4/2 Among the Yorkshire justices receiving annual fees from Henry, lord Fitzhugh, for instance were his steward, John Burgh, and several lawyers: John Conyers, Richard Norton, James Strangeways, William Lodington and William Waldeby.

Wa/B/1/4/6 In neither case can the existence of such ties realistically be described as a threat to the proper conduct of the bench.

6.4.5 QUOTATIONS

There are ten fronted themes consisting of quoted material, all from the body of the articles and from the modern history texts: two from the Whiting article and eight from the MacKenzie article. Only three involve inversion of subject and verb. These include the two from the Whiting text.

Wh/B/3/7/2 'The Excess Profits Tax is not a sufficient check on greediness' noted the Yorkshire Factory Times.

Wh/B/3/7/4 '[Quote]' argued the addendum to the ministry of reconstruction's report on trusts in 1918, written by Ernest Bevin, Hobson, W. Watkins and Sidney Webb.

The following is one of the seven from the MacKenzie text which does not involve inversion.

M/B/2/2/2 'Hitler,' Field Marshall Wilhelm Keitel (OKW chief of staff) later explained, 'did not consider this a formal battle between two states...'

6.4.6 PERSPECTIVE

The one case of a fronted element of the perspective type is from the Harriss text. It is a topic sentence which is the second sentence in its paragraph because it is preceded by an opening topic sentence with scope over both this and the following paragraph.
6.4.7 SUMMARY

Of the total of 29 examples of marked themes involving both fronting and inversion, eight occur as topic sentences and three provide closure for their paragraphs. The functional types associated with the former use are those of comparison and addition, while that associated with the latter is, surprisingly, concession, which might normally be expected to occur with backgrounded material. Harriss makes by far the most use of this marked construction, and particularly for adding points, while MacKenzie has a marked preference for using fronting of comparative adjectives for topic statements.

6.5 EXTRAPOSITION

Martin et al (1997) distinguish three uses of it as GS other than the prototypical use with cataphoric reference: ambient it, as in It's hot; non-representational it, as in It's raining, It is said that he's a decent fellow, It seems he's a decent fellow; and anticipatory it, as in clefts and extraposition with mental or relational verbs, as in It worries me that he is not doing his homework, It is irrelevant that she is a woman. They treat ambient it as a regular topical theme, arguing that it in It's hot represents a phenomenon of experience and is paradigmatically interchangeable with a noun phrase such as The room in answer to the question What is hot? They also treat non-representational it as an unmarked theme since it is regular in its orientation to the mood selection of the clause, though not prototypical in that it does not have a role in the experiential structure of the clause. Anticipatory it in cleft constructions results from theme predication, which is considered to have marked status. They do not state whether anticipatory it is marked or unmarked in mental and relational clauses, where it anticipates a later embedded clause which functions as theme in an alternative packaging of the propositional content according to canonical order, as in:

It worries me that he is not doing his homework.
That he is not doing his homework worries me.

Quirk et al (1985) treat both Martin et al's ambient it and their meteorological use of non-representational it as cases of 'prop' it, or empty subject. This seems to account for it in It's
hot better than the suggestion that it is topical and is in a paradigmatical relationship with The room in The room is hot, as the latter explanation does not account for the meaning of it in It’s hot in this room. Both Quirk et al and Downing and Locke (1992) treat Martin et al’s impersonal projection use of non-representational it in It is said that he is a decent fellow and It seems he is a decent fellow as cases of obligatory extraposition. Downing and Locke also include It looks as though the weather is about to change and It sounds as if someone is crying in the same category. However, while the verbs seems, looks and sounds perform a similar semantic function, the grammatical difference between the complements associated with these verbs suggests that in the last two examples it is better accounted for by Martin and Matthiessen’s term non-representational it. There is support for this view in Quirk et al’s own stance that it is doubtful whether the adverbial clause in It would be a pity if we missed the show could act as subject and therefore be considered an extraposed subject. Non-representational it is another term for what Quirk et al and Downing and Locke mean by ‘prop’ it, which the latter suggest is a presentative use of it similar to there in existential constructions: it presents something new to the discourse.

MacDonald’s (1994, 1992) analysis of sentence subjects extends the string to be considered in extraposed constructions beyond the empty grammatical subject it to include the verb be and the adjective immediately following it, but disregards the postposed notional subject, although in It is important to note..., the infinitive, which is part of the complement of the adjective and therefore of the linguistic realisation of the notional subject, is included in the string because this verb signals epistemic status. Gosden includes anticipatory it and existential there in his category of empty theme choices by coding the semantic function of the predicated theme, so that There are reports is labelled Empty Discourse Theme, It was evident and There was evidence Empty Hypothesised and Objectivised Theme, and It was found and There was a delay Empty Real World Theme.

In the four history texts there are 46 examples of contentless it as subject in non-cleft constructions, as indicated by the following table. The MacKenzie text has the fewest instances of these non-referential it constructions while the other modern history text contains the most, with the two medieval history texts having roughly an equal number.
Table 6.4
Number of contentless *it* construction in each of the four history articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Harriss</th>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Whiting</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-initial</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-preceded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/;/-initial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/;/-preceded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/but/-initial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/but/-preceded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Epistemic       | 9       | 10     | 2         | 7       | 28    |
Phenomenal      | 2       | 2      | 4         | 10      | 18    |

There are 39 straightforward cases of extraposition in that there is a complement of the verb as well as an extraposed noun clause. Twenty-two of these are cases of extraposition following the verb *be* and an adjective complement, as in:

H/B/1/6/2 *It is perhaps significant that these, council and parliament, were political rather than administrative in function; that is, not executive agencies of the king’s will, but meeting points for the interests of the crown and realm.*

In ten of these twenty-two sentences the extraposed subject is a *that*-clause; in eleven an infinitive clause; and in one a preposition together with an infinitive complement. Another eight cases of extraposition involve verbs other than *be* (*seem, remain, become, prove, need*) together with an adjective or an infinitive complement, as in:

Wa/B/1/3/6 *On this occasion, it seems very likely that Neville had temporarily subordinated his public capacity as a royal justice to his private concern to maintain and protect his own affinity.*

In four of these eight cases, the extraposed subject is a *that*-clause; in two an infinitive clause; and in one an interrogative clause beginning with *How far*. There are seven cases of extraposition after passive verbs (*show, hope, argue, estimate, suggest*) with complements, each involving an extraposed *that*-clause. Two further examples of extraposition involve the verb *be* and a noun phrase complement followed by an extraposed clause:

H/B/3/9/3 *It was his duty to ensure that his officers, notably his judicial officers, were incorrupt, and kings occasionally took exemplary action against guilty judges and others.*

M/B/3/3/2 *...and during the Russo-Japanese war it had been a point of pride that captured Russians received exemplary treatment at the hands of their Japanese captors.*
The remaining seven instances of contentless it are not so clearly extraposition. One featuring seems followed by a noun clause but with no intervening complement would be treated as a case of obligatory extraposition by both Quirk et al and Downing and Locke:

Wa/B/2/2/7 The precise relationship between the regular quarter sessions and the sessions attended by the assize justices is not easy to recover, but it seems that, while the justices of the peace did not deliberately arrange their sessions to coincide with the arrival of the assizes in the county, joint sessions of assize and of the peace were, in practice, held often enough to provide the assize justices with a good knowledge of the abilities and conscientiousness of the Yorkshire justices of the peace.

Downing and Locke also view constructions with looks as though as obligatory extraposition, as illustrated by these sentences from the history texts.

Wh/B/2/2/6 It looks, then, as though part of the practical value in the labour demand to extract more revenue from income tax rather than indirect taxes was that the former was more open to forceful negotiation than the latter.

Wh/B/1/25/2 It now looked as though the workers simply did not want to pay any tax at all, but shift it onto other shoulders.

However, though the verb looks in these sentences is little different in meaning from the verb seems in the previous sentence, it is followed by an adverbial clause and Quirk et al view adverbial clauses as doubtful candidates for being treated as extraposed subjects. The same objection applies to the following two sentences from the history articles which resemble extraposed constructions.

H/B/3/3/4 It took another half century of argument and experiment before these problems were resolved......

Wa/B/4/2/4 It would be surprising if this were not the case;....

In contrast, Downing and Locke provide the following sentence with an adverbial clause in final position as an example of extraposition:

It's a bore when people can't make up their minds. (p36)

And, indeed, it is difficult to explain why this is less obviously a case of extraposition than yet another example they provide:

It doesn't matter where you sit.
Cf. Where you sit doesn't matter.
Finally, two sentences with be + worth, which presumably both Downing and Locke and Quirk et al would treat as cases of obligatory extraposition, could be paraphrased without extraposition if worth were replaced by worthwhile, but the resulting non-extraposed version would still be of doubtful acceptability.

H/B/1/5/2 It is worth reflecting on the consequences of this. Cf. Reflecting on the consequences of this is worthwhile.

In the case of one of these sentences the non-extraposed version would be in flagrant violation of the principle of end weight.

Wh/B/1/2/5 Because of the way the burden of tax varied within social classes, it will be worth considering, alongside the more political aspects, the sociological question of how far the opposition had to follow the lines of differentiation created by the tax system, and how far it was able to draw upon the broader-based energies generated by industrial conflict.

Two sentences which may at first appear to be cases of extraposition can in fact be treated as instances of referential it.

Wh/B/3/11/4 It was a question of generations not classes - the young died, the old stayed at home; the producers of the 1920s had to pay the war loan holders of 1916, for example.

Wh/B/1/22/4 According to the commission it was all a matter of appearances....

These could be rephrased as follows:

The question was one of generations not classes...
According to the commission, the matter was one of appearances......

In both the original and the rephrased versions, the subjects can be interpreted as making reference to a more or less implicit idea introduced earlier in the paragraph.

In 28 of these 46 instances of contentless it the construction is employed for explicit interpretation of the data rather than for direct reference to the phenomena under study. In other words, the majority of these sentences have an epistemic function, being a type of metadiscoursal clause MacDonald (1994:161) includes in her Class 4 (Reasons) category of sentence subjects. Similarly, Gosden finds the primary role of empty theme choices is to project evaluative material in the three non-participant domains. In each of the Harriss and
Walker texts all but two of the sentences of this type are used epistemically, while in the two modern history texts they are more often used for non-epistemic statements.

The epistemic use is most often realised by means of extraposition following the verb be and an adjective complement, accounting for 17 of the 22 instances of this construction. Nine of the 14 instances of contentless it with the active form of a verb other than be also realise this function, as do 2 of the 7 examples of it with a passive verb form. The epistemic use of these constructions can usually be distinguished from the phenomenal use according to whether present tense (is, has been, will be) or the conditional use of the past tense (would be) is used rather than past tense (was, became, had been, had become), but this distinction is blurred in one case where past tense is associated with an evaluative adjective and the word therefore:

Wa/C/4/10 It was not, therefore, inevitable that the Gascoigne family should cleave so promptly and firmly to the Lancastrian cause on Henry's return to England in June 1399,.....

Adjectives and verbs used to evaluate the truth of propositions in the epistemic use of these constructions are: hard (not to associate), difficult (to know), true, evident, clear, seems, remains (open to question), looks (as though). Adjectives and verbs used to evaluate the importance of evidence or analytic procedures are: worth, important, necessary, appropriate, significant, artificial, usual, surprising, inevitable, needs (to be emphasised).

It is worth comparing cases of non-obligatory extraposition in the texts with corresponding examples where extraposition has not taken place. Most of the sentences below, whether featuring extraposition or not, occur either initially or finally in a segment of text and most are used to introduce the topic of the following text. Extraposition permits the positioning of material adjacent to related material, at the beginning of the sentence if it relates to the content of preceding text and at the end of the sentence if it relates to the content of subsequent text. The first three sentences all feature use of the adjective clear.

Wh/B/1/11/7 From the early stages it was clear that the tax was going to generate friction.

M/B/1/5/2 Whether or not this was contrary to the terms of the Geneva Convention was not entirely clear; but the discovery on Sark of dead Wehrmacht personnel with their hands tied behind them struck the German military authorities and Hitler himself as flagrantly unlawful.
M/B/3/5/3 That no real commitment had been made became clear in 1942, when after the fall of Singapore and Bataan the number of captured enemy personnel grew too large to ignore and general policies had to be formulated.

All three sentences introduce the topic of subsequent text. Wh/B/1/1/7, the sentence with extraposition, and M/B/3/5/3, the second of the non-extraposed sentences, both occur late in their own paragraphs - the former is the penultimate sentence, which is followed by a quote as the last sentence, and the latter is paragraph-final - but each introduces the topic of a series of subsequent paragraphs. The other non-extraposed sentence is the second sentence in its paragraph but also leads into the topic of its own and subsequent paragraphs. The difference between the extraposed and the non-extraposed constructions is that the latter start with embedded clauses functioning as unmarked theme - GS for the clause in which the adjective clear functions as complement - which comment on the content of the preceding text. Extraposition does not take place when the clause functioning as GS serves to provide comment on the content of preceding text unless it also constitutes or leads into the topic of subsequent text, in which case it is manoeuvred into end position by means of extraposition. Additionally, the principle of end weight is satisfied by extraposition in Wh/B/1/11/7 and would be violated by extraposition in M/B/3/5/3. But in M/B/1/5/2, violation of the principle of end weight within the initial clause is compensated for by the fact that it is so backgrounded by functioning as an aside to the following clause with which it is co-ordinated.

In another pair of sentences, evident, an adjective similar in meaning to clear, occurs both with and without extraposition.

H/B/3/1/3 Even so, it is evident that the early fourteenth century faced two interlocking problems.

M/B/1/32/2 What could happen when the opposite held true - when ideology generally ran contrary to the idea of the uniformed captive as essentially similar to the captor - was starkly evident in the Russo-German war.

Extraposition in H/B/3/1/3 permits compliance with the principle of end weight and late positioning of a label with cataphoric reference to material in the following sentence which outlines the two major topic areas of the section this paragraph introduces. Also, early positioning of evident supports the contrast with a counter-claim in the previous sentence. M/B/1/32/2 is a section-final sentence which introduces the topic of the following section. Though the material in the clause functioning as GS also relates to the next section, the phrase in the Russo-German war has priority for placement in end position because the body
of the article is divided into three sections on a geographical basis, with each section dealing with a different theatre of war.

Another group of sentences features adjectives indicating negative evaluation: artificial and misleading.

H/I/9/1 It is similarly artificial to set up a polarity between the crown as a central and public authority, and the landlord classes as private and local powers.

H/I/8/11 In short war was a normal and integral element in the medieval polity, and to present it as a contrasting and alternative option to state-building is misleading.

Wa/B/2/2/4 To rely on the evidence of such payments alone would, however, be misleading; they appear to relate only to those occasions when the justices sat on the Riding benches outside their assize sessions.

H/I/9/1 is a paragraph-initial topic sentence. Extraposition permits early positioning of negative evaluation presented in a relation of similarity with the negative evaluation at the end of the previous paragraph and indicating how the two paragraphs are related to each other and to the text structure. It also permits late positioning of the thesis which the new paragraph sets out to counter. H/I/8/11 is a paragraph-final sentence which summarises the content of the paragraph then negatively evaluates an opposing point of view. Violation of the principle of end weight attracts attention to the negative evaluation, giving it more force. It also places it conveniently adjacent to related negative evaluation at the beginning of the opening sentence of the next paragraph. Wa/B/2/2/4 is a paragraph-medial sentence which starts with an infinitive clause with content anaphorically related to preceding text while misleading is juxtaposed with the material which explains this evaluation.)

Another group of sentences features use of the passive form of either the verb show or the verb illustrate.

H/B/2/2/1 It has been shown that in the period 1368-81, when the war was actively resumed, the yield of these taxes was sufficient to meet the crown's military commitments.

Wa/B/1/2/6 That this was regarded as a desirable state of affairs is shown by the Chancery's efforts, over nearly a quarter of a century, to find a local magnate in the East Riding who was willing to involve himself in the work of the justices there in the same way.

M/B/1/29/1 That callous self-interest and a desire for retribution played a role in the fate of these men is illustrated by the way in which the safeguards in the convention governing POW labor were often ignored.
H/B/2/2/1, the extraposed construction, is the opening sentence of a paragraph but not the topic sentence. Extraposition permits information to be arranged in a form that parallels the distribution of information in the following sentence. There is no need for opening transition material with anaphoric reference because the preceding paragraph is an introductory paragraph providing background information while this paragraph begins the author's reasoning in support of his own thesis. A non-extraposed version of this sentence would violate the principle of end weight. Wa/B/1/2/6 is the topic sentence for the second half of the paragraph. In this case, extraposition would violate the principle of end-weight as well as resulting in inappropriate reverse positioning of material relating to preceding text and material relating to subsequent text. M/B/1/29/1 is a paragraph-initial topic sentence in which, similarly, material at the beginning and the end of the sentence is positioned adjacent to the text it relates to. Extraposition is not possible with this verb in any case.

6.6 EXISTENTIAL THERE

Clauses which begin with non-referential *there* introduce a participant into the text by asserting the very existence of that participant. Martin *et al* (1997) view existential *there* as unmarked topical theme, since it gives the mood choice, whether declarative or interrogative, thematic status: 'the meaning is simply that of “existential”...In other words, the point of departure is precisely the fact that a participant...is to be introduced. So although *there* does not itself function as a participant (or circumstance) it can still be regarded as topical Theme' (p34). Downing and Locke (1992: 138-139, 257-261) stress the presentative notion of *there* rather than the existential meaning, and therefore its textual function of presenting on the scene of the discourse by pushing the true subject to the right, thereby placing it under stronger focus. Thus, 'even definite noun phrases which represent referents that are in a sense 'known' can be introduced into the discourse by a *there*-construction' (p260). Gosden (1993) refers to existential-*there* as well as anticipatory *it* as empty theme choices which may introduce postponed discourse or real world entities, noting that the thematic interpretation of such constructions has created difficulties for discourse analysts. But he codes them according to the semantic function of the postponed notional subject, which he refers to as predicated theme.

As shown in the following table, the two modern history authors make more use of the existential *there* construction than the medieval history authors.
Table 6.5
Number of existential *there* constructions in the four history texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Harriss</th>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Whiting</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S-initial</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S-preceded</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/-initial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/-preceded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/but/-initial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/but/-preceded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemic</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phenomenal</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The authors differ in their use of this construction. MacKenzie fully exploits the presentational function of existential-*there* by using it mostly in paragraph-initial or paragraph-final position and mainly in topic sentences, more often major than minor. None of the Harriss and Walker existential-*there* constructions is paragraph-initial or paragraph-final and only five of the 20 Whiting constructions are. In all except one case, Walker uses the construction to make epistemic statements, in three cases to introduce illustration. In the one non-epistemic use the construction presents illustration. The other three authors make epistemic use of the construction in a minority of cases, and in three of these cases the fact that the construction is used epistemically is blurred by its association with a past tense rather than present tense verb. Harriss and Whiting also deploy the construction for parallelism in order to highlight a contrast.

Seven of the 11 MacKenzie existential-*there* sentences are paragraph-initial while another two are paragraph-final. Four of the former are major topic sentences, two are minor topic sentences, and another major topic sentence is paragraph-final. So 7 of the 11 existential-*there* sentences are topic sentences, five major; and 9 of the 11 are either paragraph-initial or paragraph-final. The other two are penultimate sentences, one (M/B/1/22/4) paving the way for a paragraph-final major topic sentence by presenting a problem for which the topic sentence introduces the solution and the other M/I/2/7) presenting the last of a series of points of view in the literature review paragraph in the introduction. In one of the paragraph-initial major topic sentences (M/B/1/9/1), the existential-*there* construction itself actually presents background material in the first part of a co-ordinated sentence, which is in a relation of comparison with the second part, which is the part which introduces the topic of the next sequence of paragraphs.
There were other, smaller-scale confrontations arising from what was perceived to be unfair treatment of POWs by the enemy, but even more potentially destabilizing was the attitude of the Nazi leadership in the latter part of the war.

Another paragraph-initial existential-there construction (M/B/1/25/1) is also associated with background material which is concessive. It occurs in a three-sentence paragraph providing a conclusion to a sub-section, and, together with the second sentence presents counter-evidence - a concession - before a final sentence summing up the gist of the sub-section.

There was some opposition to these moves within OKW and the Abwehr legal section. "The so-called technique of conversion," Sauckel later stressed, "caused me difficulties." The fact remained, however, that utilitarian considerations - using POWs as hostages and as cost-effective slave labor - had largely overridden humanitarian considerations where no possibility of reprisal existed.

None of the six Walker existential-there constructions is paragraph-initial or paragraph-final, but one (Wa/C/2/2) is a second sentence and the only instance in the Walker text of the construction being used in a topic sentence. None of the three existential-there constructions in the Harriss text is paragraph-initial or paragraph-final but each is relatively foregrounded, with two co-ordinated within one sentence by means of a semi-colon in a paragraph which provides an introduction to a section and the other deriving some salience from inversion following an adverb and from being the penultimate sentence of a subsection.

Only 5, or 25%, of the instances of this construction in the Whiting text are either paragraph-initial (Wh/B/3/10/1, Wh/B/3/4/1) or paragraph-final (Wh/B/1/7/3, Wh/B/1/21/4, Wh/B/3/10/2) and only in the two paragraph-initial cases are they topic sentences, one (Wh/B/3/10/1) being a joint topic sentence with the second sentence in its two sentence paragraph. The three paragraph-final sentences occur in very short paragraphs, one (Wh/B/3/10/2) a two-sentence paragraph, one (Wh/B/1/7/3) a 3-sentence paragraph, and the other (Wh/B/1/21/4) a four-sentence paragraph. In addition to the paragraph-final sentence which is the second sentence in its paragraph (Wh/B/3/10/2), there are another four second sentence existential-there constructions in the Whiting text (Wh/B/1/2/2, Wh/B/1/9/2, Wh/B/3/5/2, Wh/B/3/7/2), two of which (Wh/B/1/2/2, Wh/B/1/9/2) provide part specification for a preceding label. Three sentences (Wh/B/1/12/4, Wh/B/3/6/10, Wh/B/3/11/5) are penultimate in their paragraphs. In addition to the five existential-there constructions which are foregrounded by being in either paragraph-initial or paragraph-final position, there are another four which are relatively foregrounded, two (Wh/B/1/2/2-3) being in a relation of
parallelism and occurring in the second paragraph of the two-paragraph introduction section and two (Wh/C/1/6, Wh/C/1/8) occurring in the one-paragraph conclusion section. There are two cases of parallel existential-there constructions being used for contrast in the Whiting text.

Wh/1/2/2-3 There were the questions of how far opposition to taxes could justifiably be taken, what priority it should have in the light of other issues, and whether it was a subject for political representation since it affected the working class as citizens or of trade union organization because of implications for the standard of living. But there was also the matter of how the tax system should be regarded, whether optimistically as a means of redistributing wealth or pessimistically as being essentially powerless to soften the injustices of the market.

Wh/B/3/10/1-2 There was hope of course, that taxation of inherited wealth would have a beneficial effect upon the psychology of the working class by removing a sense of resentment and encouraging industrial harmony. But there was doubt even among sympathetic commentators whether inheritance taxes would have this effect: 'it is... (quote)

The second pair constitute the entire paragraph, which makes their content all the more salient. The case of parallelism in the Harriss text also illustrates the epistemic use with a past tense verb.

H/B/3/1/4 There was a short-term crisis of local criminal disorders, arising from war and economic dislocation; and there was the longer-term question of the effect of an expanding propertied class on the law and the legal profession.

The use of two parallel existential-there constructions highlights the contrast between the two notional subjects. The use of the word question seems explicit reference to the research process but it is presented in contrast with a word, crisis, which has phenomenal reference, and in association with a past tense verb. There are only three epistemic uses of the construction in the Whiting text (Wh/B/1/11/6, Wh/B/3/11/5, Wh/C/1/8) but two (Wh/B/1/11/6, Wh/C/1/8) of these employ past tense, which blurs the distinction between epistemic and phenomenal reference.

Wh/B/1/11/6 But there was little evidence of George Barnes’s fear that the workmen would not be able to pursue their rights against the inland revenue: ‘The merit...(Quote)

Wh/B/3/11/5 While Dalton’s interest in the idea remained strong, there is little sign in the T.U.C.’s evidence before the Colwyn committee in 1925 that the trade union side had kept up with the developing arguments about a capital levy.

Wh/C/1/8 Equally there was no strong evidence that the working class was convinced about the ability of profits taxes to hit the wealth of others, nor that it was imbued with the same enthusiasm for taxing personal wealth as middle class socialists.
It is clear from the context provided by the rest of the paragraph in each case that even though Whiting uses past tense rather than present tense in two of these sentences, he is not viewing the facts as they appeared to the participants in the historical events under study but as evidence in the eyes of the historian examining the period. In contrast, Walker uses the epistemic anaphoric label evidence with a present tense verb.

Wa/B/3/2/3 There is some evidence that, especially under Henry IV, this was the result of a deliberate Chancery policy, instituted in December 1405, which sought both a reduction in the size of the quorum and the exclusion from it of all those justices who did not depend on the Crown for some form of office. (Followed by one sentence providing one illustration)

Wa/B/4/7/6 There is some evidence to suggest that the degree of control the Crown achieved over the personnel of the Yorkshire commissions in this period was reflected in some progress towards this end. (Followed by the penultimate and final sentences in the paragraph, providing illustration)

Use of past tense in the Whiting examples is not explained by the fact that the label is used with negative rather than positive meaning, as Walker makes similar use of an identical label in association with present tense, to present a relatively backgrounded point in contrast with the elaboration of the paragraph topic which follows.

Wa/B/4/6/3 Richard II had shown himself anxious to secure peace commissions in conformity with his wishes as early as 1386, but there is little sign of direct royal influence on the personnel of the Yorkshire commissions before the political crisis of 1397.

The above two sentences Wa/B/3/2/3, Wa/B/4/7/6 are two of three in the Walker text in which an existential-there construction, employing a cataphoric label, is used to introduce illustration, the other being Wa/B/4/6/5. In addition, there is one case where the construction is used to present the illustration itself, for a concessive point preceding the penultimate and final sentence of the entire body of the article:

Wa/B/4/8/6 Yorkshire still experienced sporadic outbursts of disorder at the end of Henry IV’s reign: there was opposition to Sir Robert Plumptton’s authority as steward of Knaresborough, and the gentry family of Routhe led resistance to the sheriff’s officials in the East Riding.

Only 2 of the nine sentence-level existential-there constructions in the MacKenzie text are preceded by a marked theme, as opposed to 13 of the 19 in the Whiting text, and an equal division between the two in the Harriss and Walker articles. But six of the nine sentence-initial existential-there themes have insertions, usually between the verb and the notional subject but in one case between the head of the noun phrase complement and its
postmodifier relative clause. The adverb however appears as an insertion three times, the adverb admittedly once, and in the other two cases there are clausal insertions.

6.7 CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has been concerned with two groups of marked syntactic constructions, all but one of which are not easily classified as having either marked or unmarked themes. One group consists of constructions- clefts, pseudoclefts, interrogatives and those involving fronting accompanied by inversion - which are salient in text and so suited to being vehicles for information which is to be foregrounded. The other group consists of extraposed and existential-there constructions, which facilitate compliance with unmarked information packaging. Apart from very few uses of existential there, extraposition and one of fronting, all these non-prototypical constructions, where they are not used for explicit reference to research, are used for evaluation. It is considered that all rhetorical questions are in the former category because in posing a question to the reader they focus on the fact that the data is being interpreted. All of the clefts and pseudoclefts are considered to be used for evaluation because they are so emphatic. The fact that the constructions discussed in this chapter are typically used for one or other of these two broad functions has justified separating them from the other two categories of themes.

The two constructions which, though syntactically marked, are not informationally marked and therefore might have been expected not to encode foregrounded information, are extraposed constructions and existential there-constructions. Predictably, these less salient constructions are more common, the latter particularly so in the two modern history texts. The MacKenzie text makes much less use of these non-referential it constructions than the others. But in more than half of the instances of contentless it the construction is employed epistemically for explicit interpretation of the data rather than for direct reference to the phenomena under study, though mainly in the medieval history rather than the modern history texts. Extraposition is commonly associated with evaluation (e.g. Hunston and Sinclair 2000, Gosden 1993); in the history texts, it is used to evaluate the truth of propositions and the importance of evidence or of methodological procedures. Interrogatives are used less frequently than clefts but slightly more frequently than pseudoclefts.
Rather surprisingly perhaps, existential there-constructions are used mainly for topic sentences by MacKenzie, more often major than minor, and mostly in paragraph-initial or paragraph-final position. He thus exploits what Downing and Locke call the presentative function of these constructions. Only two of his nine sentence-level there-constructions are preceded by marked themes, though six do have parenthetic insertions, usually between the GS and the verb. In contrast, none of the three Harriss and six Walker there-sentences are paragraph-initial or final and only five of the twenty Whiting occurrences are. But in all except one case, Walker uses the construction to make epistemic statements.

It has also been interesting to look at how fronted elements are used for evaluation and, in particular, by MacKenzie for topic sentences, whether in paragraph initial or paragraph final position. Fronting accompanied by inversion, though it attracts attention, is more frequently used than clefts, pseudoclefts and interrogatives. The powerful discourse-organising function of questions is also illustrated by the data; they can highlight the discourse theme; summarise large stretches of text, both retrospectively and prospectively; and act as a pivot relating adjacent stretches of text, and so they tend to occur at major text boundaries, where these functions are most useful. Their retrospective summarising function is performed particularly efficiently when demonstrative this or an anaphoric label is employed, and it is the Harriss text which makes most use of this device. In most cases the use of questions in the history texts is epistemic in that they directly engage the reader in interpretation of the data under study. There were no cases of imperative forms.

The data support the observation by Collins (1991) and Delin (1991) that it-clefts outnumber pseudoclefts in written text, though Walker's much greater use of clefts accounts in large part for the fact that there are more than twice as many of the former. The two medieval history texts have more of both constructions than the modern history texts. All eight pseudoclefts are basic pseudoclefts, supporting Quirk et al's (1985) claim that the basic pseudocleft is more typical rather than Collin's claim that reversed pseudoclefts are more numerous. The sample of academic history discourse provides evidence of a type of cleft, a type of pseudocleft and of pragmatic uses of clefts and pseudoclefts not previously noted in the literature, as well as counter-evidence for several claims made in the literature. The four articles in the sample differ in the types of clefts predominantly used, their distribution throughout the text, and the functions that they perform.
The claim by Jones and Jones (1985) that the principal function of clefts and pseudoclefts is to highlight the discourse theme is supported by the data from the history texts as regards pseudoclefts but not so much in the case of clefts. Their illustrations suggest that this function is performed by the use of clefts and pseudoclefts in early occurring topic sentences, whereas in the history texts all the pseudoclefts which highlight the discourse theme do so at the end of segments of text. Others are used as non-topic sentences in end position to provide closure to a segment of text in the form of a final comment or a culmination point in, for example, a process of development or change. In fact, all except one of the pseudoclefts - the only one which does not echo a major theme - occur late in the text, in either the final section or the conclusion to an article; in general, they occur after a mass of evidence has already accumulated and the reader has been reminded of the governing thesis several times already, so that the pseudocleft permits yet further reiteration of the thesis, but in a yet more salient form. The combination of the functions of highlighting theme, summarising the content of large chunks of text, and performing correction moves involving macro-propositions makes pseudoclefts a particularly useful tool in organising lengthy and complex discourse involving forceful argument, such as academic history discourse.

The claims by Delin and Oberlander (1992) that topic-clause clefts - with new cleft heads and given cleft clauses - close a segment of discourse, while comment-clause clefts - with given cleft heads and new cleft clauses - open a segment of discourse and are associated with background information do not receive much support from the examples in the history sample. Most of the topic-clause clefts are either followed by further elaboration or even when paragraph-final provide the topic for subsequent text, while most of the comment-clause clefts end segments of text, and usually provide closure rather than background information.

Walker's article affords convenient examples for examining the motivation behind the choice of either a cleft or a pseudocleft construction to foreground information. In two places he identifies a characteristic which distinguishes between two entities. In one of these places he uses a pseudocleft construction to do this while in the other he uses a cleft.
What distinguished this latter group from the men of law on the quorum was, principally, their unquestionably gentle birth, though the important position on the Yorkshire commissions occupied by quorum lawyers drawn from established gentry families, such as Richard Gascoigne or John Conyers of Hornby, clearly suggests that this was not an immutable distinction.

It is in respect of this virtual absence of substantial gentry active on the bench that the North Riding commission, characterised by an unusual degree of magnate participation in its sessions and a dominant quorum on which the stewards and advisers of those magnates were prominent, is most clearly distinguished from the rest of Yorkshire.

The information in each of these could be recast in the form of the other construction as follows.

It is their unquestionably gentle birth which distinguished this latter group from the men of law on the quorum.....

What most clearly distinguishes the North Riding commission..... from the rest of Yorkshire is this virtual absence of substantial gentry active on the bench.
CHAPTER 7  TIME, PLACE, PEOPLE, MISCELLANEOUS CATEGORIES

In the last chapter, the analysis of non-prototypical themes was primarily organised according to formal criteria before discussion of the discourse uses of each type of construction in turn. In contrast, in the interests of a tidy division of content, marked themes have first been organised into three broad groups on semantic grounds, with a separate chapter devoted to each group. The primary organisation within each chapter is also on semantic grounds, and only secondarily according to formal criteria.

If one adopts Grierson's (1944: 21-22) view that the human mind perceives three orders of phenomena - phenomena in space, phenomena in time, and the relations between thoughts in the mind - this chapter may be seen as mainly concerned with the first two of these orders, and subsequent chapters mainly with the third. The majority of the sentence level themes dealt with in this chapter fall into two semantic categories commonly associated with history, and narrative in particular: location in time, almost always realised by means of marked themes, and reference to people, whether individuals or classes, mainly realised by unmarked themes. But, several miscellaneous categories of marked themes not easily grouped under the topics of subsequent chapters are also briefly considered below. In roughly ascending order of abstraction, phenomena in space will be dealt with before phenomena in time, but the categories location in space and location in time also include sub-categories of themes realising location in discourse space and time.

7.1  REFERENCE TO INANIMATE ENTITIES

Gosden observes that the empirical content of scientific research and its reporting account for the dominance of the real world domain in GS in his science sample, specifically Real World Entities (56.1%) and Real World Events/Processes (17.9%), which constitute approximately three-quarters of all GSs, whether or not preceded by marked themes. Predictably, there is a particularly high proportion of Real World Entities (85.9%) in the experimental section, though, somewhat surprisingly, Real World Events/processes constitute only 9.8% here, the lowest percentage across all sections. Discourse entities
account for 3.9% of GSs in the entire sample, made up of 2.1% Micro Discourse Entities (figure, diagram), 1.6% Interactive Discourse Entities (previous studies) and 0.2% Macro Discourse Entities (paper, work, report). In the history sample, on the other hand, Discourse Entities outnumber the meagre incidence of Real World Inanimate Entities, as indicated in the following table.

Table 7.1
Reference to inanimate entities in the history sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENTENCE-INITIAL</th>
<th>PRECEDED BY MARKED THEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHENOMENAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulars</td>
<td>H/I/8/3 The ruler’s sword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>M/B/3/1/4 Rations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/2/16/8 Heat, shelter and clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/2/8/6 typhus epidemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPISTEMIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulars</td>
<td>Wa/I/1/4 This paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/4/1 This paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/I/1/2 This article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/I/2/4 The first part of this article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/C/1/1 This article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/C/1/2 It (this article)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/C/1/3 It (this article)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>H/I/1/3 Some recent writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/I/2/1 The historical literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/3/6 several studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is people rather than objects which are the concern of history and there are only three cases of reference to inanimate physical entities by unmarked themes, and one by GS preceded by marked theme. And these cases are not clear-cut, being reference to physical conditions rather than individual entities, taken singly or in groups, or else, in the case of the ruler’s sword, a physical entity treated as a symbol. Most of the reference to inanimate entities is to discourse entities: nine with unmarked themes and one with GS preceded by marked theme, all in either the introduction or the conclusion section. Using Gosden’s terms, three are Interactive Discourse Entities and seven are Macro Discourse Entities, mostly in the Whiting text. As Whiting does not situate his own work in relation to that of other historians, there is no Interactive Discourse Entity reference in his article. It is worth noting that the Macro Discourse Entity reference is by means of a label (Francis 1994) accompanied by this or the pronoun it. There are no examples of Micro Discourse Entities as historians do not generally
make use of illustrations such as diagrams and charts in their writing. Taking all these into account, reference to inanimate entities by GS amounts to 1.2% in the total sample, with 1.0% being by unmarked theme (0.75% epistemic, 0.25% phenomenal).

7.2 REFERENCE TO HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

In Gosden’s sample of science discourse, reference to human participants by GS, including participant viewpoint (our data, our arguments), constitutes 9.2% of the sentence-level subjects, both as unmarked themes and preceded by marked themes (constructions with fronted complements, imperative verbs and question forms are excluded). Excluding participant viewpoint, that is taking into account only subjects with reference by means of the Head of the noun phrase to individuals or groups of people, the proportion is 8.6%. This semantic category does not figure in Gosden’s analysis of marked themes in science discourse, and MacDonald does not distinguish human particulars and groups from other particulars and groups in her analysis of three disciplinary discourses.

All the participant reference by GS in Gosden’s science sample is epistemic, being reference to other researchers or to discourse participants. History discourse, on the other hand, is concerned with the behaviour of human participants in the real world which is the object of study; reference to animate entities takes the place of reference to inanimate entities in science. Reference to individuals and groups or classes of people by unmarked themes and non-prototypical themes in the history sample accounts for 12.0% of the total number of themes, both marked and unmarked, 10.8% of these involving reference to historical participants rather than research or discourse participants. If, following Gosden’s example, all subjects are included, whether or not preceded by marked themes, the proportion of total subjects in the sample involving participant reference is 23.4%, of which 21.3% make reference to historical participants. However, if institutions are also viewed as groups of people, and only secondarily as systems or sets of procedures, the proportion of GSs referring to human participants, both phenomenal and epistemic, increases to 32.7%, comprising 9.6% reference to individuals, 13.8% to groups, and 9.3% to institutions. On the other hand, the proportion of epistemic subjects with this function remains 2.1%, which is significantly lower than Gosden’s 8.6%.

Including reference to institutions, the proportion of unmarked themes with participant
reference is 15.3% and that of non-prototypical themes 0.3%, making a total of 15.6%, comprising 5.2% reference to individuals and 10.4% to groups (3.7% institutions and 6.7% other groups). A significant number of marked themes in the history sample (7.8%) also refer to human beings, albeit combined with other semantic functions, such as the realisation of role or perspective. If these are added to the number of instances of participant reference by UTs or non-prototypical themes, the proportion of reference to individuals in strict initial theme position increases to 5.3%, reference to groups to 9.4%, and to institutions to 4.2%, making a total of 19.0%, of which 1.2%, all unmarked themes, make epistemic reference (0.9% individuals, 0.3% groups). The figures for each text are: Walker 22.8%, Harriss 18.7%, MacKenzie 18.0% and Whiting 16.7%.

Harriss makes the most references to research and discourse participants: ten times as opposed to twice each by Walker and MacKenzie and once by Whiting. This is largely because of his more extended literature review, in which he reviews the research of six other historians, but he also makes more use of we inclusive of both the author and the reader, and of the first person singular for reference to himself alone. Greater freedom from the convention of impersonal expression in academic writing has been associated with degree of eminence amongst scholars and it may be that this Oxford historian has high status in his field, which would also be in keeping with his more authoritative and flamboyant style of writing, though it must also be noted that Whiting also uses the first person singular pronoun, if only once.

The claim by Eggins et al (1987) that concern with groups or classes of people is a manifestation of the way history generalises is borne out overall in the sample (9.5% versus 5.3% for individuals and 4.2% for institutions) but not very strongly with regard to two of the historians. There is not much difference between reference to groups and reference to individuals in the case of Walker (10.6% versus 9.1%) and Whiting (7.1% versus 6.8%), though there is more of the former. Non-epistemic reference to individuals is made most often by Walker and Whiting (9.1% and 6.8% respectively as opposed to 3.7% for Harriss and 2.6% for MacKenzie), and to groups most often by Walker and MacKenzie (10.6% and 12.4% respectively as opposed to 7.9% for Harriss and 7.1% for Whiting), but Harriss makes most frequent reference to institutions (7.1% as opposed to 3.0%, 2.9% and 2.8% for Walker, MacKenzie and Whiting respectively). This reflects Walker's concern with the personnel of the commissions of the peace both as individuals and as members of a group, Harriss's concern with the development of state institutions and procedures, MacKenzie's
concern with prisoners of war as a class and belligerents as a group, and Whiting’s concern with the views of individual politicians and trade union leaders. There are four cases of reference to people which at first sight appear to be reference to individuals but which have been treated as reference to institutions because the concern is with the role the individual plays in state organisation.

H/B/2/5/6 He (the king)
H/B/2/6/9 The treasurer
H/B/2/6/11 Every fifteenth century treasurer
H/B/3/92 The king

These contrast with reference to particular kings or other individuals by name.

Seventeen of the forty marked themes realising reference to people are abstract spatial prepositional phrases, all referring to groups or classes of people rather than individuals (H 4+2 Wa 4+1 M 4 Wh 2). There are seven occurrences of among or amongst with reference to classes or groups (Among the Yorkshire justices), four of in with society (In that society) or hands (In German hands), three of on with side (On the Allied side), one each of at and below with reference to levels in the social hierarchy (At the local level), and one of within with reference to a political movement (Within the Labour Movement). Other prepositions introducing marked themes with reference to people are for, as, of, as for, in relation to, in the case of, and further up. There is one -ing clause marked theme which provides specification for the following GS noun phrase referring to people (Numbering over 550,000)

Where marked themes realise some other semantic function besides reference to people, the latter has been treated as primary to facilitate comparison with the other semantic functions considered characteristic of history discourse: time, reason and contrast. In most cases of multiple semantic function including reference to people, the other function is condition or perspective. For example, In the case of the gentry is similar to In this case, which Gosden categorises as expressing real world condition. For, as for, further up and with are used in a similar way:

Wa/B/1/2/2 For the aristocracy, attendance did not entail...
M/B/1/19/1 For the POWs from the occupied states captivity was made more onerous by...
M/B/2/8/5 As for Jews, commissars, or other suspect elements within the prisoner population, arrangements were made for...
Wb/B/1/5/7 Further up the income scale, ...
Wb/B/1/7/4 With larger families,...
Similar meaning is expressed by a marked theme which resembles what Halliday and Hasan (1976) call expressions of a respective conjunctive relation.

M/B/2/10/1-2 These were cogent arguments, and similar ones had often had a positive effect on POW treatment in the West. In relation to POWs in the East, however, they made little or no headway, especially with Hitler.

If these phrases are seen as expressing condition, then eleven of the forty marked themes realising reference to people also simultaneously realise condition. In addition to condition, the last of the above illustrations suggests a category of meaning, also expressed by phrases introduced by the preposition for, which in the present analysis is called perspective, and is discussed below in 9.5.5, and illustrated by the following marked themes, which Eiler (1986) would call focusing adjuncts.

Wa/B/4/4/2 For the Commons, the greater responsibility for ....was an essential precondition...
Wa/B/4/7/1 For the Crown, this increased ability to....was an important end in itself...
M/B/1/24/1 For the POWs this was a disaster, but "transformation" (Umsetzung) was so effective from the German perspective....

Here for might be paraphrased as From the point of view of, so that these marked themes would appear to be candidates for Gosden's category viewpoint. Another marked theme might seem to realise the semantic function of role, but actually indicates perspective or the viewpoint of the author and the reader, being paraphrasable as If we consider the gentry members of the quorum as a group.

Wa/B/3/1/8 As a group, the gentry members of the quorum...were the most frequent attenders at quarter sessions....

However, role is realised by other marked themes simultaneously realising reference to people.

M/B/1/23/3 As civilian "guest" workers they were no longer protected by the Geneva Convention...
M/B/1/31/3 As captured military personnel, however, the number and location of Jewish POWs from Western armies had become known...

A noun phrase occurring as marked theme illustrates Fries's observation that some marked themes are primarily a means of packing in extra information.
An apprentice-at-law who had been marshal of the Exchequer since 1384 and became chief steward of the northern estates of the Duchy of Lancaster between 1400 and 1407, Richard Gascoigne discharged the duties of the quorum more or less single-handed after his brother's elevation as Chief Justice of King's Bench in November 1400.

7.3 LOCATION IN SPACE

Location in space accounts for 19.1% of the marked themes in Gosden's science texts, comprising 14.9% realising real world location in space and 4.2% realising location within the discourse. But in the history sample, despite the concern in history with events in particular countries and frequently with historical personages located in particular areas of a country, the incidence of marked themes realising location in space is significantly lower: 3.7% for real world location and only two instances of location within the discourse. If the four unmarked and non-prototypical themes realising reference to location in the real world are also included, the proportion of all themes - marked, unmarked and non-prototypical - is 1.8%. Gosden's sample consisted of texts from the hard sciences - physics, chemistry and biological sciences - which make observations about tangible objects in the real world, including their precise physical location, whereas history needs less frequent and generally less precisely focused reference to geographical location to situate the behaviours, events and developments it analyses.

7.3.1 LOCATION IN SPACE: REAL WORLD

The Walker article has the highest number of references to place in marked theme (7.84%), which is to be expected since the author compares data for three Yorkshire Ridings and so frequently organises his data within sections according to geographical area. He is the only author to have place themes in the introduction section. MacKenzie has the next highest percentage of reference to real world location (3.33%), accounted for by the fact that he organises the body of his text into sections according to the theatre of war and within these sections makes several references to the belligerents according to the side they were on. There is little difference between the figures for Harriss and Whiting, 1.34% and 1.79% respectively. Harriss is concerned with the development of institutions and procedures with general application to the country at large rather than with variations across geographical areas. Whiting does focus at one point on the area of South Wales but is otherwise also mainly concerned with nationwide political movements.
Fourteen of the eighteen instances of real world location in space in marked theme involve prepositional phrases, all except one beginning with in. One of these (M/B/1/8/3) is similar in function to nearby themes which have been categorised as realising reference to people, in a paragraph which presents the attitudes of various parties involved in the war towards reprisals against enemy prisoners of war. The first three sentences provide a sequence of marked themes: On the Allied side; On the Axis side; In Berlin, meanwhile. The first two of these have been interpreted as reference to people, belligerents in the war, but reference to a specific city in the third makes this seem inappropriate. Yet, it functions to introduce the attitude of other members of the Axis side and the action taken by them as a consequence, and participates in a relationship of parallelism with the marked themes in the preceding two sentences.

Only two marked themes would traditionally have been labelled as adverbial clauses of place, both beginning with where.

M/C/1/1 Where a sufficient degree of respect for the foe as part of a common humanity existed - that is, where ideological consideration tended toward benevolence - or, even more important, where concern existed for the well-being of friendly prisoners in enemy hands, as was mostly the case in the West and on the Allied side in the Far East, the 1929 Geneva Convention could in practice remain the standard by which treatment was measured.

M/C/2/3 Where such considerations were paramount, when the war was seen as truly total, then life itself for POWs could and did depend on the degree to which they were seen as better able to contribute to their captors' war effort alive than dead.

These clauses are actually concerned with circumstances more than with place, and there is an argument for treating them as similar in semantic function to phrases such as under these conditions, in these circumstances, which both Gosden and Halliday treat as realising condition. However, they have been allocated to the location in space category here.

Allocating the four unmarked themes realising location in space to MacDonald's categories of particulars and groups was not straightforward, but it was decided to treat reference to the broadest possible geographical location for the subject matter of the article as general reference, allocated to the groups category. Thus, Late medieval England in the fourth sentence of the opening paragraph of the second section of the Harriss text indicates the country whose history the author is concerned with. This gave one item in the particulars category - South Wales (Wh/B/1/18/3) and three in the groups category - Late medieval England (H/B/2/1/4), a few shires (H/B/3/12/5), and Yorkshire (Wa/B/4/8/6). Another unmarked theme is a doubtful case.
Although the name of a country appears as GS, the concern is really with the government of that country as representative of the nation, so it was decided to treat this unmarked theme as involving reference to an institution.

Forty-seven abstract spatial prepositional phrases in marked theme, most commonly introduced by the preposition in and including three occurring with inversion of subject and verb, realise meanings which qualify them for inclusion in other semantic categories discussed below, namely: reference to groups or classes of people (17), condition (17), means (10), and process (2). One of these, treated as process, provides the all-important first signal of location in space in the real world but by means of a subordinate element, and adjectival pre-modifier within an NP.

In the development of the English state, the late Middle Ages has been seen as a period of retreat and stagnation after the achievements of the Angevins and the first Plantaganets, an ebb tide before the next forward surge under the Tudors.

7.3.2 LOCATION IN SPACE: DISCOURSE

There are only two themes realising location in the discourse, both marked themes.

So far the concern has been with resistance to taxation by trade unions.

On a similar though more subtle level, the high standards Axis prisoners enjoyed in the United States during the Second World War, as compared to the harsher conditions endured by U.S. personnel in Axis hands, have often implicitly been treated as a matter of greater American compassion:...

The first, an adverb, opens the final section of the body of the article and refers to progress through the discourse. It is categorised here as a spatial expression because of the association of the word far with distance, though it must be noted that it could be paraphrased by a temporal expression such as up to now or up to this point (in time/space).

The second, an abstract spatial prepositional phrase, occurs in the second paragraph, which provides the literature review, in a three-paragraph introduction. It refers to a theoretical level of stance towards the topic on the part of other historians but can also be viewed as being on a particular level of reasoning within the current discourse. The only other adverb of place which occurs in marked theme, here, is rather ambiguous as to semantic function, but is treated as an instance of real world location in space in the present analysis.
It was at and through the exchequer that these demands were satisfied. Here too the wording of warrants for issue bears witness to the ingenuity of creditors and their advisors in formulating different modes of preference to secure payment.

If this is paraphrased as In the case of the exchequer too, it would appear similar to phrases beginning In the case of, which Gosden categorises as condition. There is also an overtone of location within the author’s argument, as he makes an additional point.

7.4 LOCATION IN TIME

Predictably, time reference is realised frequently in theme position in these history texts, coming in third place after reference to attributes and to human participants. It accounts for 12.4% of the total number of sentence-initial themes, with 11.7% involving phenomenal time reference and 0.7% location in discourse time. Time reference constitutes the largest proportion (27.68%) of the marked themes, almost double that (14%) of marked themes falling into this semantic category in Gosden’s sample of science research articles, and significantly larger than the proportion of contrast and concession marked themes (21.8%) in the history texts.

There are only five instances of time realised by unmarked theme and two by non-prototypical theme. It can be difficult to decide whether to classify a noun phrase as realising time reference or reference to something else, such as an event. NPs such as the late Middle Ages and the period clearly realise reference to time. But in the MacKenzie text it is the NP the Second World War in the very first sentence, denoting an event or set of behaviours, which establishes the period of history under study. Indeed this is the only way time is referred to in theme position in the introduction section of this article. In the medieval history texts also, periods of time are indicated by reference to wars such as the Hundred Years War and the Wars of the Roses, and more precise time reference is provided by reference to events such as as the Lancastrian usurpation and the accession of Henry IV. Mention of the name of a particular king or dynasty (the Tudor monarchs) is also a crucial signal of the time period under focus for readers of medieval history texts. Time can also be signalled at the same time as reference to place or social or administrative structure: late medieval England, the Tudor state, the late medieval state, the late medieval tax system. If all GSs such as these are included they total 23 further instances of reference to time across the four texts, all except three occurring in the medieval history texts, with 10 occurring as
7.4.1 LOCATION IN TIME: REAL WORLD

Real world time reference is realised frequently in theme position in the history texts by 26.3% of the total number of marked themes, more than double the proportion (11.2%) in Gosden’s sample of science research articles. Only contrast and concession combined approach that proportion, at 21.83%, which, though still significantly higher than the proportion for this category in Gosden’s sample (18.3%), is not as markedly so. Time reference can also be signalled by unmarked themes. There are only four instances in the total sample where the NP functioning as GS signals time alone, but if important signals of time in the form of GSs referring to events, such as the Second World War, or kings or reigns of kings are included, time reference is provided by a further 10 unmarked themes and 13 GSs preceded by marked themes. These make a significant difference to the incidence of time reference in theme in this sample of history discourse. However, even when all themes, both marked and unmarked, are taken into account, those realising time reference (11.5%) are still exceeded by those realising reference to attributes (30.7%) and human participants (14.4%).

Of course, time reference is provided much more frequently in these texts than is indicated by a categorisation of marked and unmarked themes according to their primary semantic function. Many themes, both marked and unmarked, falling into other semantic categories incorporate time reference realised at a lower rank, such as in noun phrase modification, or in parentheses, as in the following examples.

In a stimulating survey of the ensuing period, from 1369 to 1422, frequently seen as one of acute political, social and spiritual crisis, John Gillingham also denies...

If we speak of “public authority” or “public administration” in the late Middle Ages, it cannot simply be equated with...

Though he cannot be shown to have sat on the bench after 1392, Scrope’s example was subsequently followed by...

In late medieval England,.....

The wide-ranging military and police powers originally committed on an emergency basis to small groups of royal officials, acting as keepers of the peace, in the early thirteenth century had evolved by.....

The general commission of July 1389 drastically reduced....
Henry IV's councillors certainly contemplated...

In light of the fact that the Soviet soldier was indoctrinated with Bolshevist hatred for National Socialism, an order governing the treatment of Russian POWs dated September 8 explained that...

There are 47 instances of time reference provided by premodification or postmodification in GS functioning as unmarked theme and a further 25 in GS preceded by marked themes. Despite being embedded at a low rank syntactically, these signals of time have a significant role in a discipline in which location of events and developments in time is so important. A high incidence of time reference is to be expected in rheme too; in these texts it is frequently realised by an element within the predicate of the main clause. Where it occurs in free modifiers in final position it tends to be realised by a lower rank item within a superordinate structure with a different semantic function rather than in a clause or phrase with time reference as its primary function.

Sometimes a when-clause follows a time prepositional phrase, and functions as a non-restrictive relative clause.

M/B/1/10/2 In March 1944, when Hitler learned that seventy-six Allied officers had tunnelled their way out of Stalag Luft 111 at Sagan, he flew into a rage at the supposed incompetence of the Wehrmacht POW section and ordered Reichsführer SS Heinrich Himmler to make sure that instead of being reincarcerated (in accordance with the terms of the Geneva Convention), all recaptured prisoners be "made an example of" by the Gestapo.

Despite the much higher proportion of time marked themes overall in the history sample than in Gosden's science research articles, the percentage in the introduction sections is only slightly higher: 12.5% as opposed to 11.5%. The period of history under study needs to be signalled early in a history text, but this is achieved in two of the articles by the GS following a marked theme in the opening sentence; in a third by the premodification of the noun phrase complement of a preposition in the marked theme itself in the opening sentence, and in the fourth by a noun phrase in rheme in the second sentence. The two modern history articles, with introductions of only two or three paragraphs, have no time marked themes.

Direct comparison between other sections in Gosden's sample and those in the history sample is not possible as the history articles do not follow the science IMRAD format. Gosden finds by far the greatest proportion of time marked themes in the experimental section (36.2%); those for the results and discussion section are 8.7% and 5.3% respectively. The bulge in the history sample is, predictably, in the body of the article, but the proportion
(29.0%) is not as great as that in the science experimental section, though much greater than those in the science results and discussion sections. A science experimental section typically presents a chronological report of experimental procedures, without commentary, the results section is less concerned with events in sequence, while the discussion section contains interpretation rather than reporting of events. In contrast, in the body of a history article, narrative and interpretation are interwoven, with narrative structure sustained only over small segments of text. The conclusion section of a history article typically summarises the content of the body of the article. Though the focus is even more on interpretation, there is necessarily still reference to events in time, giving rise to the figure of 10.3% for time marked themes, a proportion which is significantly less than that in the body of the text but not as low as those for Gosden’s results and discussion sections.

There is a distinction between the medieval history articles on the one hand and the modern history articles on the other as regards time reference. The proportions are almost exactly the same in the latter and significantly higher than those in the medieval history articles, which are also very similar. The difference seems to follow from a greater concern in the modern history articles with specific incidents and pronouncements by protagonists within a much narrower time period, and with the behaviour of particular protagonists. The references in these articles to points in time outnumber those to periods in time whereas the opposite is the case in the medieval history articles. There is more mention of specific dates and specific years, partly a reflection of the fact that modern historians have access to more evidence in the form of documentation, including texts of the speech of historical personages, and therefore have more opportunities to pinpoint exactly what happened and what was said on particular occasions. Working within narrower time periods, the two modern historians are also able to relate events as they unfold month by month and sometimes even day by day. The medieval historians, on the other hand, are more concerned with the development of institutions over broader sweeps of time and have less evidence for the minutiae of utterances, behaviour and incidents on particular days or in particular months. It is often sufficient to set up a broad time period of several decades or a century or more at the beginning of a stretch of text, with very little reference within that stretch of text to particular years or decades.

7.4.2 LOCATION IN TIME: DISCOURSE

There are only eight instances of time expressions used for reference not to time in the real
world but to stages in the presentation of information by the author, falling into Gosden's
category of Location in Time - Discourse Entity. These are a manifestation of the dimension
of historical interpretation and commentary rather than of the subject matter under analysis,
and so may be considered epistemic uses in MacDonald's sense of the word. Seven are the
enumerators first, secondly, thirdly, fourthly, six of which are in the Harriss text, distributed
across two locations. Though both Gosden and Quirk et al treat such items indicating order
of sequence as realising reference to discourse time, it could be argued that they are really
little different in function from moreover and furthermore, which Gosden classifies as
signals of emphatic addition.

The remaining item is a finite clause indicating the sequence of stages in mental processing.

Wa/I/3/1 Before such an interpretation, and the consequences that flow from it, can be fully accepted,
certain objections, each of which casts doubt upon the degree of dominance the substantial gentry
exercised over the commission of the peace, need to be resolved.

This marked theme opens the third paragraph in the Walker introduction and functions as a
pivotal link by encapsulating and labelling the information given in the second half of the
preceding paragraph, which presents the standard view in the literature which will be
confirmed or disconfirmed by the author.

The present analysis differs from Gosden's in not placing in the same category in short, in
sum, which signal a concluding point in a line of reasoning. Because their summarising
function is treated as primary, they are grouped with items such as overall, and for the most
part in a category labelled generalising, discussed later in this chapter.

7.4.3 MULTIPLE SEMANTIC FUNCTIONS

Both Gosden and Eiler associate time expressions in their science texts with description of
experiments and procedures for handling data, and particularly with sequencing. In history,
where the time scale is much greater than that of an experiment, much of the reference is, of
course, to dates. But claims that history discourse is characterised by a high incidence of
linguistic realisations of time reference have to be moderated by the consideration that time
expressions are very often not purely realisations of reference to time but also express other
meanings: reference to events, circumstances, behaviour or reason. 'Pure' location in time
tends to be realised by less complex forms such as adverbs, and comparatively light noun
and prepositional phrases, whereas clauses traditionally labelled time clauses realise more than one semantic function and are a subtle tool for enriching the meaning of text economically. Given this blending of meanings, it is not surprising that several ‘time’ conjunctions, such as since, as and while, have acquired multiple semantic meanings and also introduce non-time clauses, such as clauses of reason, manner or concession.

7.4.3.1 Time reference only

The four unmarked time themes which provide ‘pure’ time reference are generalising expressions in that they refer to broad periods of time rather than particular years or days.

- The early Tudor period
- It (the period)

On the other hand, the only NP functioning as a marked time theme refers to a particular day.

The following day

By far the most common means of reference to time is the prepositional phrase:

- By 1500
- Up to this point
- In the following decade

In these history texts the concern is mainly with periods of time. These tend to be broader in the medieval history texts than in the modern history articles, the former being concerned with changes and developments in institutions and relationships across reigns and centuries while the latter deal with narrower historical time periods: the Second World War or the decade following the First World War. Only MacKenzie, confined to the seven years of the Second World War, uses on with an exact date, and only three times (On October 7, 1942; On May 19; On September 15, 1941), though he also uses it once to refer to occasions (On two occasions), as does Walker, a medieval historian (On this occasion). Walker uses at twice (At the start of the period, At the general reissue of the peace commissions made in June 1394) for time reference with less precise focus. Even a phrase consisting of the preposition in and a year usually refers to an extended time period rather than a point of time within that year and only MacKenzie uses it, four times, with periods as short as a season, a month or less. Whiting uses in nine times with reference to a year, but of the two medieval history only Harriss uses in and only once and with reference to a decade. All except
Whiting use by with reference to particular years as endpoints for developments over periods of time. Other prepositions used to signal periods of time are between, over, from before, within, towards, up to, until and during, the last, which is associated with shorter periods of time, used only by the modern historians.

7.4.3 2 Circumstances

Many time expressions, even relatively short prepositional phrases, combine time reference with a suggestion of events or states of affairs:

Under Edward II and Henry V
over the course of these centuries
on this occasion
after the defeat of Poland in 1939

This is also the case with two of the three examples of adverbials of frequency in these texts: occasionally, and on occasion. There is a gradation away from a precise time focus towards frequency through the expressions on this occasion, on two occasions, on occasion, occasionally. Eventually is another adverb of time which has overtones of something else.

The indication of circumstances (in the everyday sense of conditions obtaining at a particular time) is stronger, though still minimal, in these prepositional phrases.

Wh/B/2/5/4 In the aftermath of the war [Cf. After the war]
Wh/B/2/5/3 In an upswing
H/B/1/6/14 At any crisis of confidence in local government

In more complex forms, such as clauses, there is inevitably much more information about circumstances.

When George Darrell of Sessay was indicted before Ralph Neville and his fellows, justices of the peace in the North Riding, for the murder of Neville's servant, Sir Thomas Colville of Coxwold, during the Scrope rising in May 1405, Darrell failed to appear before the justices, and, after repeated exactions, was eventually outlawed in the county court.

When Mussolini had been overthrown in July 1943...

When the need to raise more revenue and bring the worker into the income tax was recognised....

Often, a more or less precise time reference is established first by means of a brief prepositional phrase while a following 'time' clause describes events, developments,
behaviour or circumstances which occur or obtain within this time framework.

Eiler also noted realisation of multiple semantic functions by when-clause marked themes associated with experimental procedures in her science chapter; they combined the functions of conditional, circumstantial and temporal clauses, and could nearly always be paraphrased as if-clauses followed by then. But condition is not one of the functions realised by such clauses in the history texts. Experiments may be repeated, but in the history texts the reference is to events in the past which, in most cases, could only occur once; more general reference, as in When kings abandoned war...is rare. Here time clauses elaborate on the circumstances in which an event or circumstances referred to in the main clause took place or came into being. Clauses beginning with 'time' or 'place' conjunctions always provide elaboration on the circumstances, and, as indicated above, reference to circumstances is, in the present analysis, included in a separate functional category Reference to behaviour/process/circumstances. The only clearcut cases of pure time or place are adverbials and prepositional phrases such as in 1941, by the mid-fourteenth century, in Yorkshire.

7.4.3.3 Addition

Addition can also be signalled at the same time as time reference. It is often difficult to determine whether the phrase at the same time carries any time meaning at all, even when it is not being used concessively. In the following example, representative of the usual use of this phrase in the history texts, time seems to be involved only to the degree that it is involved in any coexistence of facts or attributes.

H/B/1/7/4-5 As a vehicle for mobilizing the resources of the realm - financial, military and political - its [parliament's] support could add vastly to the crown's authority. At the same time it directly reflected the wealth and influence of the political class for whom membership of it became part of the cursus honorum.

It introduces the addition of a second aspect of parliament, but there is also a concessive flavour since the fact that parliament reflected the power of the political class does not appear to follow from the fact that it was a means of increasing the crown's authority. In contrast, in the next example, there is fairly specific reference to real time, though still with the meaning of addition in the sense that two examples of 'special orders' are given.
In accordance with this ideology of absolute war special orders were prepared. On May 19, guidelines for the conduct of troops in Russia were issued that reiterated the message that the most ruthless action was to be taken against Jewish-Bolshevik cadres and all resistance smashed by whatever means was necessary. At the same time, secret special instructions dealing with the treatment of political commissars were being drawn up, ready for circulation on June 6.

Another way of signalling both simultaneity and addition at the same time is with the conjunction while. The following example occurs at a boundary between sub-sections within the first section of the Harriss text and so serves multiple functions: simultaneity, addition, signalling text structure and providing a transition between sub-sections of text structure.

While these old institutions were changing their character under pressure from an expanding political society, major new institutions of government were appearing.

7.4.3.4 Reason

Often there is a causal connection between the information in the main clause and that in the preceding subordinate clause of time. Cause is often associated with the sort of conditional constructions used in science discourse and Eiler also notes an underlying causality where when could be replaced by if...then in her text, but, rather than a causal connection between the when-clause and the main clause, she illustrates a deep structure causality underlying the when-clause itself: When we work up our data (cause our data to be worked up), When there is more motion at the source (more motion is caused at the source). In the history texts, where there is a causal connection it is between clauses, as in the following example, where the when-clause gives the reason why Hitler flew into a rage:

In March 1944, when Hitler learned that seventy-six Allied officers had tunneled their way out of Stalag Luft III at Sagan, he flew into a rage at the supposed incompetence of the Wehrmacht POW section and ordered Reichsführer SS Heinrich Himmler to make sure that instead of being reincarcerated (in accordance with the terms of the Geneva Convention), all recaptured prisoners be “made an example of” by the Gestapo.

The when-clause in the above sentence elaborates on circumstances as well as providing a reason or cause, as do the time clauses in the following examples.

As war became less popular the grants from subjects became fewer and more grudging.

As political society enlarged and government extended, such crises had ever widening repercussions...

When the first prisoners reached Germany, the extent of the damage done in the East became starkly clear.
Prepositional phrases indicating time can also have a causal connection with the following main clause:

M/B/1/16/2 After the immensely successful campaigns of the spring and early summer of 1940 and the conclusion of armistice agreements with Norwegian, Dutch, Belgian and French surrender delegations, the Wehrmacht found itself taking into captivity virtually the entire remaining armed forces of all four countries - most significantly the nearly two million Frenchmen in uniform - on top of the half-million or so Poles already behind barbed wire.

7.4.3.5 Concession

Time clauses in marked theme position can also provide information which enters into a concessive relationship with the information in the following main clause. There are eight examples of this, three in the Harriss medieval history text, four in the MacKenzie modern history text and one in the Whiting modern history text. In six of these cases concession is signalled by the combination of even with when:

H/B/3/12/11 Even after the English had been expelled from France (except Calais) and were developing a new insularity of outlook, parliament would grant adequate taxation for offensive campaigns provided these were occasional and short, as in 1475

M/C/2/4 Even when utilitarian considerations came to outweigh malevolent ideological imperatives, cost-benefit concerns usually meant that only the barest essentials to sustain life were provided and that prisoners were made to work to their maximum capacity regardless of humanitarian considerations.

In a seventh case, the concessive signal even occurs later, in rheme.

M/B/2/14/3 Moreover, once the atrocities against Russian prisoners in German hands became known, Foreign Commissar V. M. Molotov announced that his government had no intention, even in the given circumstances, of applying retaliatory repressive measures against prisoners of war" and would continue to observe the terms of the Hague Convention.

In the final case there is no explicit signal of concession. The concessive sense can only be understood if the reader brings background knowledge of Himmler's ferocity to the text, or has inferred and retained this information from earlier in the text (M/B/1/10/3-4). In either case, the reader has to work harder to interpret the meaning accurately.

M/B/1/14/5 Likewise, when control of POW administration was handed over to Himmler [who was assiduous in carrying out draconian treatment] in September 1944 on Hitler's orders, the treatment of British and American prisoners under SS Obergruppenfuhrer Gottlob Berger did not significantly change.
7.4.3.6 Means

Some phrases and clauses are ambiguous between time and means. Even if reference to a specific date were omitted in the following examples, each could answer a question beginning with either how or when.

M/B/2/12/3 In a note to the Munitions Ministry in February 1942, Dr, Werner Mansfield of the Labour Ministry pointed out that... [When/How did Mansfield point out...?]

M/B/3/4/6 By 1940, when a new Field Service Code was drafted, soldiers themselves were being told that to be captured would bring dishonor on the family.... [When/How were soldiers told...?]

Wh/B/1/20/3 ...in evidence to the royal commission on the income tax, Shirkie of the T.U.C. favoured a tax specifically on bachelors, and during the parliamentary debates on income tax in 1915 Barnes had suggested.... [When/How did Shirkie let it be known that he favoured...?]

It is possible to read reason as well as time and means into the following example.

H/B/3/1/5 In dealing with these the crown is said to have surrendered... [Why is the crown said to have surrendered...? Because of the way it dealt with these. When/How did the crown surrender...?]

7.4.3.7 Place

Similarly, the following marked theme indicates time as well as place and means, whether the date is mentioned or not:

M/B/3/6/1 At a meeting of senior War Ministry officials held at the end of April 1942 to discuss the question of POW treatment, General Tojo Hideki (war minister and premier) made it clear that... [When/Where/How did Tojo make it clear that...?]

In the next two examples, it would seem to make little difference in meaning if where were to be replaced by when and when by where in the clauses which in marked theme which also provide reasons for the statements in the main clause. It could even be argued, in line with Gosden’s view of phrases such as under these conditions as signals of condition, that the clauses here introduced by where or when function as adjuncts of condition rather than adjuncts of place or time.

M/C/1/1 Where a sufficient degree of respect for the foe as part of a common humanity existed - that is, where ideological considerations tended toward benevolence - or, even more important, where concern existed for the well-being of friendly prisoners in enemy hands, as was mostly the case in the West and on the Allied side in the Far East, the 1929 Geneva Convention could in practice remain the standard by which treatment was measured.
M/C/2/3 Where such considerations were paramount, when the war was seen as truly total, then life itself for the POWs could and did depend on the degree to which they were seen as better able to contribute to their captors' war effort alive than dead.

7.4.4 DISCOURSE GOALS ACHIEVED BY TIME THEMES

7.4.4.1 Text structuring

Time marked themes in history discourse might be expected to provide framing and orientation for extended stretches of text because of the interest in change and development over large time periods. In the four-paragraph introduction to the Walker article, marked themes with time reference are prominently placed and have a powerful orientation effect. Though primarily an adverbial of place rather than time, the opening marked theme, *In late medieval England*, neatly establishes the period of history as well as the country that the writer of the article is concerned with, and so provides a context frame for the entire article as well as for the introduction of the more specific topic - the commission of the peace - in the rheme of this very first sentence. A narrower specification of the time period, 1389 and 1413, is provided at the very beginning of the next paragraph. These two marked themes with time reference could not be more prominently situated or have greater scope, providing a context frame for the entire text. The final paragraph in the introduction has no marked theme in the first sentence, but specification of the period under study is repeated at the end of the rheme of this sentence, this time in terms of the kings whose reigns it embraced, and reference to it is picked up in a time phrase as marked theme in the very next sentence. The introduction ends with reference to the end of the period under study - *early Lancastrian England* as the very last item in the rheme of the final sentence.

The Harriss medieval history introduction relies on GS rather than marked theme for keeping awareness of the period under study in the reader's mind, reflecting a greater concern with presenting and rebutting the views of other historians in a more rhetorical style than the Walker text. It is the GS preceded by a marked theme in the opening sentence - *the late Middle Ages* - which establishes the time period for the entire article. This time reference is echoed by the very last phrase - *in this period* - in the rheme of the last sentence of the introduction, which may be seen to have a retrospective span identical to the prospective span of the GS in the first sentence. Similarly, the period of time under focus is reiterated in the third rheme of the four-sentence introductory paragraph beginning the first section of the body of the text. The next five paragraphs in the introduction focus on the views of various
Although the introduction is much longer than Walker’s, there is only one primarily time marked theme, *Under Edward III* and *Henry V*, beginning the second-to-last sentence of the literature review before the final paragraph summarising the views of other historians. The function is not exclusively time reference since expression of time in terms of the names of kings rather than dates is motivated by the need to contrast strong kings with weak kings, the main idea of the sentence being that whether the ‘war state’ was viable depended on whether the king was strong or weak. The only mention of dates in marked theme occurs as modification of a noun in a prepositional phrase at the beginning of the same paragraph, in a marked theme primarily functioning to signal discussion of the view of another historian. The other two of the three time marked themes are ‘time’ clauses, one with *as* and one with *when*, which provide reasons for the statements in their associated main clauses, constituting steps in the reasoning within the paragraph rather than being situated prominently at the beginning or end of a paragraph with a correspondingly greater context span.

In both the introductory paragraph for the entire text and the introductory paragraph for the first section of the body of the text, the overall time period, the late Middle Ages, is an important part of the topic of the article. Once this has been established, in subsequent paragraphs there is a more narrowly focussed topic for which reference points within this broad time period are background information. The subsequent paragraphs in the first section of the body of the article focus on the development of government institutions. Throughout the article, where time reference occurs as CF within marked theme it tends to signal chronological sequence within the broad time period of the late Middle Ages. Where reference to this broad time period itself is reiterated this tends to be in theme.

The two modern history articles have comparatively short introductions, consisting of two and three paragraphs respectively, and no primarily time marked themes in strict initial position. The Whiting introduction has one (Wh/I/8) preceded by *however*, in the form of a *when*-clause providing circumstances and reason, with time reference prominent only in a lower-ranking hypotactically linked phrase, *as in the First World War*. This article is the only one which does not establish the time frame for the entire article in the very first sentence or in either marked theme or GS position. It is not established until the theme of the second sentence, by the phrase *the First World War*. The other modern history article establishes the period in the opening sentence by means of a GS *the Second World War* preceded by a marked theme.
7.4.4.1.1 Initial versus final position

According to Longacre (1989), adverbial when clauses are normally preposed, but Greenbaum and Nelson (1996) found adverbial clauses of time occurred more often in final position (61.2% vs. 38.8% respectively) in their sample of both spoken and written English, including academic writing. They consider adverbial clauses to be optional structurally, and include all clauses in final position, not just final free modifiers, though in their illustration of how adverbial clauses are optional structurally, the when-clause seems necessary on pragmatic grounds, in order to complete the message of the main clause and avoid distortion of the message by inaccurately representing the situation in the main clause as coinciding with the moment of utterance:

```
I feel like doing all the windows when I leave you know.
```

In the history sample, there are certainly more marked theme time clauses than final free modifier time clauses. Six of the seven FFM when-clauses are relative clauses modifying an immediately preceding time phrase, leaving only one when-clause functioning as an adverbial in contrast with 21 as marked theme. One of the marked themes features a when-clause which, strictly speaking, is also a relative clause, but for the purposes of the present analysis the when is treated as part of a four-word subordinator at a time when since the preceding time phrases is so non-specific. The total number of time clause marked themes is 33, as opposed to five FFM time clauses not functioning as relative clauses. Subordinators other than when introducing the time marked theme clauses are as (3), by the time (2), (months) before (2), while (1), even after (1), whenever (1), at the same time as (1) and at a time when; the subordinators introducing FFM time clauses are as (2), when (1), until (1), at the same time as (1).

In the Mackenzie text, there are only two clauses introduced by time subordinators in final position which are separated from the rest of the sentence by punctuation.

M/B/1/19/4 The differences in the treatment accorded Anglo-American and other POWs became even more stark in March 1944, when OKW issued instructions that all escaped prisoners would in future be secretly handed over to the SS Security Service (SD) and sent to the concentration camp at Mauthausen to be executed: “except”, the order cautioned, “British and American prisoners of war”.

M/B/3/5/3 That no real commitment had been made became clear in 1942, when after the fall of Singapore and Bataan the number of captured enemy personnel grew too large to ignore and general policies had to be formulated.

Three other time clauses presented in separate punctuation units are in medial position,
making a total of five free modifiers according to the writer's use of punctuation.

M/B/3/4/7 ...but the heavily emphasised "surrender-is-shameful" aspects of the new code, when combined with the potential ripple effect of officially sanctioned brutality within the Japanese army and the record in China, did not bode well for humane treatment of Allied POWs.

M/B/3/7/1 For the hundreds of thousands of Allied POWs in camps throughout Asia this attitude, when coupled with the prevailing Japanese contemptuousness toward surrender and the rights of the captors' disciplinary code, resulted in an existence that varied from the harsh to the intolerable, depending on the outlook of individual camp guards and commandants.

On the other hand, there are nine when-clauses and one as-clause without preceding commas in end position at sentence level or in relation to the first independent clause in a compound sentence, as illustrated by the next two sentences

M/B/1/15/1 The significance of the mutual hostage factor in shaping official attitudes toward upholding the Geneva Convention in the West is also highlighted by the extent to which it came to be disregarded or avoided when one side or the other held a monopoly on POWs.

M/B/24/6 A gloss of legitimacy was given to all this when Mussolini officially placed the Italian prisoners at the disposal of the Reich in early 1944; but living and working conditions for the IMIs remained extraordinarily bad.

There is also one when clause without a preceding comma embedded in the post-modification of a NP functioning as GS. If this last one is included within the scope of the unmarked theme, the total number of time clauses in rhyme is fifteen, of which twelve are in end position, as opposed to nineteen 'time' clauses in marked theme position, mostly multifunctional, as has been seen.

As noted by Giora (1983) a paragraph-final time clause can move the discourse forward by introducing information just before text segmentation which becomes the discourse topic of the following paragraph or paragraphs.

M/B/3/5/3 That no real commitment had been made became clear in 1942, when after the fall of Singapore and Bataan the number of captured enemy personnel grew too large to ignore and general policies had to be formulated.

The following paragraphs discuss the general policies formulated by the Japanese government for the treatment of prisoners of war. However, in doing so they also elaborate on the message of the main clause in the above sentence. The date in the time phrase at the end of the main clause is particularly highlighted, the information in the when-clause serving as elaboration on the circumstances which made this date significant.
Similarly, the following sentence introduces a time span which holds for the next sentence, consisting of three main clauses. Again, the when-clause modifies a date in the main clause by elaborating on circumstances which obtained during the period of time indicated by the time phrase. There is a faint causality in that the reduced frequency of war explains why the developments of the period presented in the next three main clauses were possible. Again, however, it must be noted that the information in the main clause is foregrounded in relation to the information in the when clause, unlike in Giora’s example.

Fortescue’s diagnosis was broadly vindicated in the century after 1460, when war became intermittent.

Longacre (1989) and Mathiessen and Thompson (1988) provide illustrations in which when-clauses code nuclear rather than satellite information. The nuclear information in Longacre’s (1989) illustration He was up in a tree when he saw the wolf coming is an event which moves the storyline along, while the satellite information, realised by the main clause, is the setting in which the event takes place. In his ranking scheme for the coding of setting and events in narrative, when-clauses occupy the lowest (cohesive) band, but in this case, the when-clause has been promoted to the first band. He suggests that one motivation for encoding the event as a subordinate clause is to maintain the thematic spotlight on the central character in the narrative (a pig) rather than on the wolf and his doings.

One striking example of a foregrounded time clause in the history texts is the until-clause in the following sentence.

As political society enlarged and government extended, such crises had ever widening repercussions, until in 1450 the conjuncture of Henry VI’s disastrous failure to regulate political society, with its own collective abandonment of the tradition of war in France, produced a fundamental change in English government.

This sentence occurs mid-way through the second paragraph of the two-paragraph conclusion section and is part of the build-up to a climax in the very last sentence of the article. The until-clause in final position presents the culmination of the process referred to in the preceding main clause, a culmination of major importance, which therefore underlines the significance of what is referred to in the main clause, which summarises information in the body of the article. The length, and the corresponding density of information of the until-clause contributes to its prominence. Moreover, the two circumstances presented as being in conjunction in the until clause are each in turn taken up as subject in the two succeeding independent clauses. The until clause has a span which extends over five
independent clauses, constituting three sentences, which immediately precede the last sentence of the article. There is thus a very strong case for treating the until clause as equal in status to independent clauses introduced by and and but on functional grounds, despite its being introduced by a subordinator.

7.5 MISCELLANEOUS SEMANTIC CATEGORIES

Ten miscellaneous semantic categories of marked themes account for 13.1% of the marked themes in the history texts, as opposed to a remainder of 9.8% in Gosden’s sample. In descending order of frequency, they are: evaluation (2.5%), generalising (2.5%), citing (2.3%), means (1.9%), perspective (1.9%), attitude (0.6%), process (0.6%), likelihood (0.4%), degree (0.2%) and exemplification (0.2%).

7.5.1 EVALUATION, ATTITUDE AND LIKELIHOOD

There are 19 marked and non-prototypical themes, mostly containing adverbs or comparative forms of adjectives, which express some sort of value judgement as to the nature, importance or likelihood of the situation in the main clause. Quirk et al (1985: 620-623) distinguish value judgement content disjuncts from content disjuncts expressing a degree of truth, but both involve judgement by the writer.

The largest group (14) evaluate importance, significance or typicality, using the adjectives important, serious, problematic, significant, indicative, controversial, precarious or typical, the adverbs significantly or characteristically, or the noun importance. Ten of these are fronted complements involving inversion of subject and verb In nine of these ten cases there is fronting of comparative adjectives with inversion, a construction which is used as either first, second or final sentence in a paragraph to signal a new topic, the comparative form providing a cohesive link with the preceding material at the same time as highlighting the importance of the new topic. Fronting the complement as theme provides cohesive linking and the build-up of anticipation, adding to the salience of the new topic introduced in rheme.

Quirk et al (1985:622) treat ironically, here viewed, along with In an irony worthy of... as realising attitude, as a type of value judgment content disjunct which judges what is said to be strange or unexpected, and would presumably treat In an irony worthy of... in the same
way. Another marked theme As was to be expected is equivalent in meaning to the adverb predictably, which Quirk et al (1985:622) class as a type of value judgment content disjunct which makes the comment that something is to be expected. However, it was decided to treat this as a case of a kind of additive meaning which the present research has labelled ‘compatibility’ and discusses in the next chapter.

Quirk et al (1985:620, 628) class both probably and certainly as content disjuncts which provide comment on degree of truth, grouping the former with those which express some degree of doubt and the latter with those which express conviction. Gosden, however, treats another such adverb, perhaps, as expressing hypothetical condition, while he includes certainly, along with significantly, in the category he calls internal validation, which includes ‘the internal discourse mechanisms writers employ to validate and structure their own evidence to help persuade the external community.’ The present analysis treats probably, perhaps and certainly, which each occur once in the sample, as expressing judgements of different degrees of likelihood. The single occurrence of certainly, at the beginning of the very last sentence in the body of the the Harriss article, illustrates the observation made by Quirk et al (p623, note c) that this item implies concession as well as certainty.

H/B/3/13/11-12 Over all, bastard feudalism functioned in a sporadic and imperfect fashion, and perhaps to the increasing dissatisfaction of the gentry. Certainly over the course of these centuries the increasing independence of the gentry is a theme which emerges from different studies and is evident in their growing political power and sense of identity.

7.5.2 CITATION

Only Whiting and MacKenzie use marked themes to introduce quotations. MacKenzie does this only once, with According to, though several times he begins sentences with the first words of a quotation. According to is used a further six times by Whiting, who uses quotations in his article so many times that marked themes introducing quotations account for a sizeable proportion of the miscellaneous marked themes in his text. There are also five instances in the Whiting article of citing by means of a finite clause beginning with As and containing the reporting verbs observed, noted or put it, as well as one case of a prepositional phrase beginning with For. In only two cases is the marked theme in the author’s own words also followed by a GS of his creation. In nine of Whiting’s uses of marked themes to introduce quoted material, the marked theme is the only part of the sentence in his own words. He also has two entire sentences of quoted material which are integrated into
paragraphs rather than being set apart by line spacing as his more extensive stretches of quoted material are. In addition to these cases of quoted material introduced by marked themes, there are ten cases of fronted quoted material, where the quote is interrupted by a reporting verb and GS supplied by the author.

This type of marked theme is not mentioned by Gosden, which is not surprising, since the evidence written up in science texts is generally physical phenomena observed in experiments rather than statements by human participants. As already suggested in Chapter 5, modern historians are more likely to make use of this type of marked theme than medieval historians as the comparative abundance of primary sources for the history of the recent past enables more frequent quoting of speeches and writings by the participants in historical events, whereas medieval historians necessarily rely more on statutes, pipe rolls and other such official documentation, which they cite by means of superscript numbers in the body of the text and footnotes at the bottom of the same page.

7.5.3 MEANS

The proportion of marked themes realising means in the history texts (1.9%) is almost the same as that in Gosden’s science texts (2.0%). The most interesting feature of this category in the history texts is that the majority - seven of the ten instances - are epistemic, referring to research processes (lecture, survey, examination). All ten instances are abstract spatial prepositional phrases and all except one (in a note) involve a nominalisation as complement of the preposition, in four cases an -ing non-finite clause. All but two of the ten prepositional phrases begin with in, leaving one which begins with from and one beginning with by. Harriss has the highest proportion of this kind of marked theme at 3.4% (5), followed by the other medieval historian, Walker, at 2.94% (3). Whiting does not have any marked themes of this type, while MacKenzie has 1.33% (2).

All seven epistemic means marked themes occur in introduction and conclusion sections, three in extremely prominent positions. One (M/I/1/1) begins the very first sentence of the articles while two others (H/C/1/1, Wa/C/1/1) each begin the very first sentence of the conclusion section, retrospectively summarising activity carried out in the entire body of the article. All of the five means MTs which appear in introduction sections are epistemic. The three in the Harriss introduction make reference to the research activity and point of view of historians whose work is summarised in the literature review. One of the other two
(Wa/I/4/3), as well as two (H/C/1/1, Wa/C/1/1) of the three in conclusion sections, refer to the author's own research activity, either about to be embarked on or just completed. The remaining one in an introduction section (M/I/1/1) embraces the type of activity related to the topic undertaken by any historian, including the author.

7.5.4 GENERALISING

This category of marked themes, of which there are thirteen instances in the sample, includes essentially, in essence, in effect, for the most part, in the main, overall, in short, and in sum. These indicate that the content of the main clause provides the gist of the matter under discussion or a generalisation, and so the category has been labelled generalising. Several of these items have been categorised differently by other analysts. Quirk et al (p621) class essentially as a content disjunct commenting on the degree of truth by claiming what is said is true in principle, while for Gosden the same item is an exponent of emphatic condition. Quirk et al (p635) label overall as summative, along with to sum up and to summarise, whereas Gosden, following Halliday and Hasan, categorises in summary as realising location in time within the discourse. In short, in sum in the history sample are treated as generalising about the discourse content, while for the most part generalises about the views of other historians, so all three are epistemic uses of generalising expressions. There was a temptation to also include in this generalising category four cases of thus, which Quirk et al would presumably also interpret as the summative use of thus (H/B/1/8/1, H/B/2/2/11, H/B/2/6/14, H/B/3/4/7). However, it was decided, after all, to include them with Reason themes in Chapter 8.

7.5.5 PERSPECTIVE AND DEGREE

Ten marked themes (1.9%) establish a perspective from which the content of the main clause can be seen to be true, or establish an aspect of the topic in relation to which the content is true. Eiler refers to in terms of as a focusing adjunct but several of the marked themes treated above as making reference to classes of people also merit this term and the present analysis distinguishes these from focusing adjuncts which do not make reference to people. Gosden categorises a similar item in the broader view, as realising viewpoint, along with interestingly, unfortunately, surprisingly and apparently, but the present analysis categorises the last four items as value judgement content disjuncts of the sort given the label attitude marked themes above. However, when perspective and attitude marked themes in the
history texts are added together, they account for 2.5% of the total, which may be compared with Gosden’s finding of 0.9% for viewpoint in the science sample. Notionally similar to the items in the perspective category is the one case of what might be called an expression of degree.

Insofar as there was any consistency to Hitler’s worldview in his writings and articulated thoughts, it was the need to crush this menace utterly and give Germany Lebensraum in the East.

### 7.5.6 PROCESS AND EXEMPLIFICATION

There are three marked themes, all in the Harriss text, which do not seem to fit into any of Gosden’s categories and are here treated as realising reference to process. Two are abstract spatial prepositional phrases - *In the development of the English state* (H/I/1/1), *In litigation* (H/B/3/5/6) - referring to real world phenomena, while the third is an -ing clause used epistemically to refer to an observation made by another historian.

Noting that both the Lancastrian and Yorkist dynasties foundered amid factional quarrels of the nobility, Richmond blames this on the failure of the monarchy to lead the nation in an effective war.

All three occur in prominent sentences. The first has particular prominence, being the opening words of the text, and it serves the very important function of establishing the broad topic domain of the article. The second occurs in a minor topic sentence in the body of the article and establishes the topic domain for the bulk of its paragraph. The third is in the second, more specific, minor topic sentence for a conceptual paragraph forming the second part of an orthographic paragraph in the literature review subsection of the introduction.

There is an element of cause and effect in the relation between this third process marked theme and the main clause in the sense that noting the fact led Richmond to an explanation for it. Gosden includes reference to the work of other researchers in the field in a category he calls *external validation*. However, he describes items in this category as indicating confirmation by others of the author’s own hypotheses and conclusions; whereas Harriss cites this historian’s view only to later counter it with his own opposing point of view.

Finally, there is one marked theme which signals exemplification by means of an infinitive clause.

To take a converse and more extreme example, there has arisen in recent years a school of thought among certain German historians that suggests that the ferocity of the Wehrmacht on the
eastern front in the latter part of the war - including, by implication, the killing of Soviet prisoners - arose from a high-minded desire to protect Western civilization from the ravages of the Slavic hordes.

7.6 SUMMARY

Since, unlike science, history is concerned with events involving human participants rather than inanimate physical phenomena, there is scarcely any reference in the history sample to inanimate physical entities. Accordingly, there is also comparatively little reference to location in space; the geographical location of historical events can often be established merely by mention of a comparatively large geographical area at the beginning of a comparatively long stretch of text. There is significantly more reference to discourse entities, though still not as much as in Gosden's sample. All of it is in the introduction or conclusions sections and is mostly Macro Discourse Entity reference rather than Interactive Discourse Entity reference, mainly by Whiting but also by Walker; there is no Micro Discourse Entity reference because there are no graphic illustrations in history journal articles. Reference to human participants takes the place in history discourse of reference to inanimate entities in science discourse, and accounts for the second highest proportion of sentence-initial themes overall. However, the claim by Eggins et al that history discourse is more concerned with groups or classes of people than individuals, a manifestation of the way history generalises, though supported by the findings for the entire sample, is only weakly so in two of the four texts.

In Gosden's science texts location in space accounts for 19.1% of the marked themes, comprising 14.9% realising real world location in space and 4.2% realising location within the discourse. Despite the concern in history with events in particular countries and frequently with historical personages located in particular areas of a country, the incidence of marked themes realising location in space is significantly lower in these history texts: 3.3% for real world location and only two instances of location within the discourse. If unmarked themes realising reference to location in the real world are also included, the total figure is only slightly different, as there are only five of these, one of which is a doubtful case. There is a substantial number of abstract spatial prepositional phrases expressing meanings other than place, which have been placed in other semantic categories. Gosden's sample consisted of texts from the hard sciences - physics, chemistry and biological sciences - which make observations about tangible objects in the real world, including their precise physical location, whereas history needs less frequent and generally less precisely focused reference to geographical location to situate the behaviours, events and developments it analyses.
CHAPTER 8 REASON, CONDITION AND ADDITION

Halliday and Hasan (1976) subsume condition under cause in their four-way classification of conjunctive relations, but cause and condition, along with concession, have also been viewed as forming a semantic spectrum according to whether the causal link is asserted, hypothesised or denied (Harriss 1988:71), and Quirk et al (1985) group adverbials of cause, reason, purpose, result, condition and concession together, under the term *contingency*. This chapter is concerned with marked themes and final free modifiers realising cause, reason, result, purpose and condition. Concession could also have been included, on the basis of the shared contingency relation, but, as it is also a type of contrast, it was decided to follow Gosden (1992) and Halliday and Hasan (1976) in discussing it alongside other contrast relations in the following chapter, particularly as it constitutes such a substantial semantic category in the history sample. The inclusion of addition in this chapter is less easily justified since additive relations can be used to support both reason and contrast relations in building an argument. it is in the interest of balance in the respective lengths of chapters that it has been included here rather than in a separate, dedicated chapter.

8.1 REASON

Since historians are believed to employ cause and effect analysis, as seen in Chapter 2, the role of reason theme and final free modifier choices in the history sample is of interest. But Martin (1993:235) says that causal relations in exposition are not picked up by analyses which focus on conjunctive relations, being realised within rather than between clauses by means of grammatical metaphor, and, indeed, Biber et al (1998:141) have found causative adverbial subordination to be quite rare in academic prose. Yet in Gosden’s (1992) study of marked themes in science research articles, reason and purpose together account for a substantial proportion (18.3%) of the total number of marked themes, and, as seen in Chapter 4, though the number of reason and purpose themes in the history texts is only half that, this was still the third largest category of marked themes, albeit not much larger than addition.

The use of the word *reason* in this section follows the example of Quirk *et al.* (1985:1103ff) in their discussion of subordinate clauses, where it is an umbrella term for relationships of cause and effect, reason and consequence, motivation and result, and circumstances and
consequence, though, when discussing prepositions (p695), they speak of a cause-purpose spectrum embracing cause, reason, motive, purpose, destination and target. In the analysis below, when the word *reason* starts with a capital letter, it is used in the umbrella sense, embracing all of the above types of relationship; otherwise it is used in the sense that distinguishes a reason or cause clause from, say, a purpose or a result clause.

Quirk *et al* distinguish reason clauses in a direct reason relationship with the matrix clause from those used more peripherally as style adjuncts in an indirect relationship where the reason is motivation for the implicit speech act of the utterance. Sweetser (1990:77ff) discusses causal conjunction in three pragmatically determined domains: real-world content causality (*John came back because he loved her*); epistemic causality (*John loved her, because he came back*), where the causality is between a premise and conclusion; and speech act causality/enablement (*What are you doing tonight, because there's a good movie on*), in which there is a causal explanation of the speech act being performed. Sweetser thus uses the term *epistemic* in a different sense from that in which it is used by MacDonald and in the analysis carried out in this study. Much of what Sweetser calls content and epistemic causality would come into the category of evaluation used in this study.

Rather surprisingly, given the importance placed on cause and effect relationships in history, the proportion of sentence-initial MTs realising Reason (including purpose) in the sample (9.9%) is not much more than half that in Gosden's findings. This is partly accounted for by the greater proportion of purpose MTs in his sample, particularly in the experimental (15.3%) and results (10.1%) sections; there are only four purpose MTs (0.8%) in the history texts, two of which refer to research purposes rather than the purposes of participants in the historical events under study. But the proportion of other Reason MTs is also lower, accounting for 9.1% of the total MTs, as opposed to Gosden's findings of 13.0% for science research articles. As shown in Table 13 in Appendix 2, in addition to the 49 sentence-initial Reason MTs (H 14, Wa 8, M 20, Wh 7), there are 47 Reason FFMs (H 19, Wa 8, M 9, Wh 11), making a total of 94 (H 31, Wa 16, M 29, Wh 18).

There is only a slight increase, to 11.1%, if 12 items realising Reason only as a secondary or tertiary semantic function are added. *When*- and *as*-clauses, for instance, frequently combine time and Reason elements, as illustrated by the *when*-clause in the following sentence, which gives the reason why Hitler flew into a rage:
In March 1944, when Hitler learned that seventy-six Allied officers had tunnelled their way out of Stalag Luft 111 at Sagan, he flew into a rage at the supposed incompetence of the Wehrmacht POW section and ordered Reichsfuhrer SS Heinrich Himmler to make sure that instead of being reincarcerated (in accordance with the terms of the Geneva Convention), all recaptured prisoners be "made an example of" by the Gestapo.

The following as-clauses provide reasons for the circumstances described in theme, in addition to indicating time.

As political society enlarged and government extended, such crises had ever widening repercussions....

As war became less popular the grants from subjects became fewer and more grudging.

These are examples of the multifunctionality of adverbial clauses noted by others with regard to conditionals (Downing 1991, Davies 1998).

If the focus is widened to include all Reason MTs, whether strict-initial or preceded by other items in theme (excluding multifunctional themes with another semantic function primary, such as those just discussed), and items occurring in clauses co-ordinated by colons, semi-colons, co-ordinating conjunctions or commas are included, the total number of items realising Reason is 121 (H.41, Wa 17, M 36, Wh 27), as shown in Table 8.1.

8.1.1 CLAUSES AND PHRASES

There are 75 instances of sentence-level Reason clauses or phrases functioning as either MTs or FFM$s, the latter (47) outnumbering the former (28). The MacKenzie text has the most (24) and the Walker text the least (10), with 17 in the Whiting text and 24 in the Harriss text. Only in the MacKenzie text do the MTs (15) outnumber the FFM$s (9); the Harriss, Whiting and Walker texts have 19, 11 and 8 FFM$s and 5, 6 and 2 MTs respectively. If the clause and...
Table 8.1
Number of marked themes and final free modifiers realising Reason at three levels of text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason/cause/result MTs</strong></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>z;</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>z;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict initial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceded by one MT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceded by two MTs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceded by three MTs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FFMs</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Purpose MTs (strict initial)** | S | z; | S | z; | S | z; | S | z; |
| **FFMs** | 1 | | | | | | | |
| **Overall Total** | 13 | 1 | 0 | 83 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 107 | 3 | 11 |

The phrase count is widened to include sentence level MT items preceded by one or more other MTs, and MTs and FFMs in clauses bounded by colons or semi-colons, as well as clauses beginning with medial and or but, the overall total increases to 94 (41MTs, 53FFMs). Of these 75, 68 (20 MTs, 48 FFMs) are clauses and 26 are phrases, three of them adjective phrases (all MTs) and the rest prepositional phrases (18MTs, 5FFMs).

8.1.1.1 REASON CLAUSES

The 68 Reason clauses (20 MTs, 48 FFMs) comprise 34 finite clauses (7MTs, 27FFMs), 23 -ing clauses (6MTs, 17FFMs), 5 -en clauses (2MTs, 3FFMs), 5 infinitive clauses (all MTs) and one verbless (FFM). What particularly swells the number of clausal FFMs is the use of -ing clauses in final position, though the Walker text has no -ing clause at all. The range of subordinators used for sentence-initial MT or FFM finite clauses is for (14 FFMs), since (8: 3MTs, 5FFMs), as (3 FFMs), because (1 MT), given that (1 MT), in light of the fact that (1 MT), in that (1 FFM), with the result that (1 FFM), with the consequence that (1 FFM). In addition, because is used with an MT finite clause after sentence-initial Yet and a verbless FFM clause, and since introduces a finite clause in parentheses in end position in the first of two main clauses co-ordinated by and.

The majority of Reason clauses in the history sample are in end position, but the proportion in end position (finite: 7MTs, 27FFMs; finite and non-finite: 19MTs, 49FFMs) is far smaller
than the 91.6% in Greenbaum and Nelson's (1996) sample of mixed spoken and written genres. The following table compares placement within independent clauses in the history sample with Quirk et al.'s (1985:1107) findings for a sample of writing from the LOB corpus, as regards the use of three particular conjunctions.

**Table 8.2**
Comparison with Quirk et al.'s (1985:1107) findings preposed and postposed *since*- *as-* and *because*-clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quirk et al</th>
<th>History sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>since</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>as</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>because</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*one finite and one verbless

In all except four cases, the 34 finite Reason clauses, whether MTs or FFM, merely elaborate on the content of the main clause; they do not summarise stretches of text, as do several *although*-clauses, or have a span beyond their own sentences. In two of these cases, an MT provides a framework for only two (M/B/2/8/3) or three sentences (Wh/I/1/5), albeit, in the second case, in a two-paragraph introduction section, while one FFM (H/B/2/6/12) provides an idea which is developed further only in the next sentence. In only one case (Wh/B/1/10/1) does a Reason finite clause, functioning as FFM, have a span over an entire paragraph, providing a generalisation which the rest of the paragraph expands upon. Yet most of these Reason finite clauses are longer, or heavier, than the main clauses they relate to, particularly the MTs, and all except the two from conclusion sections present information which is new to the reader, though in the case of three of the MTs it is not clear whether the information is new or given from the point of view of the historical participants.

All 7 MT finite clauses are heavier than their rhemes, in violation of the principle of end weight, with the result that the rhyme is thrown into relief. In three cases, additional detail is inserted in parentheses (M/B/1/18/3, M/C/2/5, Wh/I/1/5). The rhyme is foregrounded all the more when it is very crisp and short in comparison with the MT, as in M/B/1/18/3, M/B/2/3/4, M/C/2/5. M/B/1/18/3, a paragraph-final sentence, illustrates both the use of parentheses and a very brief rhyme.

**M/B/1/18/3** Since no formal peace treaty was ever signed - keeping it tantalisingly close but just out of reach proving a most effective means of prompting the Vichy government to think up new ways of ingratiating itself with the Reich - Germany was technically within its rights.
In M/C/2/5 there is even a postponement of the link with the theme in the previous sentence in order to foreground the theme of the new sentence.

M/C/2/4-5 Even when utilitarian considerations came to outweigh malevolent ideological imperatives, cost-benefit concerns usually meant that only the barest essentials to sustain life were provided and that prisoners were made to work to their maximum capacity regardless of humanitarian considerations. Since the enemy was regarded, ideologically speaking, as quite alien - in essence, as a hostile and contemptible “other” - such considerations did not apply.

One particularly heavy theme is a ‘double-barrelled’ theme, with repetition of the same type of clause, a device Harriss also employs with if-clauses (H/I/11/5):

H/C/2/5 Yet because government depended on a broad congruence of aim and method between monarch and subjects, and because subjects increasingly prescribed a role for monarchy as the guardian and symbol of the commonweal, any malfunction of the monarch, or any dissonance between crown and people, produced political crisis.

Apart from these two MTs from conclusion sections, the MT Reason finite clauses present information which is new for the reader, though in three cases from the MacKenzie text it is not clear whether the information is new or given from the point of view of the historical participants.

M/B/2/3/4 Since commissars would be sure to maltreat German prisoners and encourage “barbarous” methods of resistance, they were to be “eliminated” (i.e., shot when captured).

M/B/2/8/3 In light of the fact that the Soviet soldier was indoctrinated with Bolshevist hatred for National Socialism, an order governing the treatment of Russian POWs dated September 8 explained that “he loses all claims to treatment as an honorable soldier and according to the Geneva Convention”.

M/B/1/6/2 Given that the dead found on Sark had been shot while trying to flee after capture, Winston Churchill was able to convince his War Cabinet colleagues on October 8 that it was Germany that was misbehaving and that a counterthreat should be issued:...

These three MTs are examples of what may be called Real World use of Reason clauses, since the causality is presented as being in the minds of the historical participants rather than imposed on the facts by the historian. Another case, where the Reason clause is an FFM, is more ambiguous:

Wh/B/1/13/5 To risk more direct action was not regarded as worthwhile, particularly as bigger targets, such as nationalization, suggested the need to husband resources.

Of the 12 finite clause FFM, 10 are reason clauses, six of which are introduced by since, and two are result clauses. Only two have content whose relevance is not restricted to the
sentence the reason clause occurs in: one reason clause provides a generalisation which
governs the entire paragraph (Wh/B/1/10/1) and another provides an idea which is developed
further in the next sentence (H/B/2/6/12). There is not such a great contrast overall in the
relative weight of content between the reason clause and the main clause with these FFMs as
there is with the reason MTs. Only two Reason clauses are much heavier, both of which have
epistemic content (Wa/I/3/3, Wa/B/1/3/8). One of these provides a reason for the writer’s
choice of attribute, a justification for his evaluation.

Wa/I/3/3 The second objection is political, since there is some evidence that the kind of periodic
revisions in favour of the servants and trusted supporters of the Crown, practised by Henry VI’s
government in the 1450s and more extensively by Edward IV in the 1470s, was already being
attempted during the final years of Richard II’s reign.

Wa/B/1/3/8 The evidence is rarely so direct, with the consequence that the attitude and ambition of the
county’s magnates towards the peace commission must to a large extent be extrapolated from the
presence or absence of their servants and retainers among the justices.

Apart from Wh/B/1/10/1, which provides the topic proposition for the paragraph, these
Reason FFMS, even the three which are in paragraph-initial (M/B/1/20/1) or paragraph-final
(Wh/B/1/4/4) sentences, do not contribute to the organisation of the discourse. Only two
occur in prominent paragraphs, both from the introduction section in the Walker text
Wa/I/2/3, Wa/I/3/3). The finite Reason clauses, whether MTs or FFMs, mainly provide low
level detail relevant only to their own sentences. But in doing so, they do serve to pack
additional content into the text.

A distinctive feature of the medieval texts is the use of for-clause FFMs. Both functionally
and syntactically, for used in medial position resembles the co-ordinators and and but. It
differs from most subordinators in being sequentially fixed, introducing a clause which must
follow the other clause it is in relation with, and it cannot be preceded by another
conjunction. Like and and but, and also yet, for can begin a sentence, as in this example:

H/B/1/6/12-13 Even if that is misleading, a council was commonly acknowledged to be a necessary
adjunct to royal rule, and its function in the polity was to act as a bridge between the king and his
subjects. For though councillors were answerable only to the king, they were answerable for the good
governance of the realm, and in advising the king they were bidden to bear in mind the public good
and not merely the interests of the monarch.

The clauses in the history sample which this connector introduces contain foregrounded
information and are almost always in sentence-final position, where they receive end focus,
as in the following examples.
Much in the same vein could also be said of parliament, though less needs to be, for its emergence is recognised as highly characteristic of the late medieval polity.

He would not have been disappointed, for what survived the Wars of the Roses and the sharp legalism of the early Tudor state, was what had been shaping over the two preceding centuries: a political society deeply versed in government, and a system of government in which crown and subjects shared responsibility.

The *for*-clause in the second sentence is particularly foregrounded as a result of the weight of its content in comparison with that of the preceding clause. Both sentences are prominent in the text, the first being a paragraph-initial topic sentence and the second the penultimate sentence in the final paragraph of the conclusion section. The prominence of *for*-clauses, resulting from the importance of the information they contain and from end focus, is enhanced by the fact that the word *for*, like *thus* and *hence*, is marked in being a reason signal which is not used in everyday discourse, and being used to relate sentences expressing reason and consequence in reverse of the normal order for separate sentences. These clauses are candidates for being viewed as cases of parataxis rather than hypotaxis.

Harriss begins a sentence with *for* four times, the only writer to do this, and he uses it an additional eight times in medial position. Walker uses it in sentence-medial position four times, but Whiting only once and MacKenzie not at all. Harriss’s frequent use of *for*, which is noticeable for being rather formal, is, like his frequent use of *yet*, discussed in the next chapter, one of the features of his writing which contribute to the impression of his having a more rhetorical style. It is perhaps significant that it occurs several times in the other medieval text too whereas not at all in one and only once in the other of the modern history texts.

The one verbless (H/C/1/9) clause is an FFM in a paragraph-final sentence in a short conclusion section, but rather than modifying the main clause, it modifies an element which is itself a free modifier.

This close integration of monarchy and society determined the politics of England in the late medieval period, perhaps the first age in which this was so, because the first in which political society was sufficiently large and varied, but also sufficiently close-knit, to form a commonwealth.

There are 22 *-ing Reason clauses (5MTs, 17 FFMs). One FFM (H/B/3/1/4) occurs before a semi-colon and another (H/B/3/12/6) completes a sentence as FFM for a *while*-clause. Two other FFMs occur in the conclusion section of the text (H/C/1/9, M/C/3/1). Three of the MTs (H/B/3/9/7, H/B/2/5/2, M/B/1/9/2) contain 15, 19 and 41 words respectively, the second and
third of these being heavier than the main clause - in the third case because of the inclusion of material in brackets amounting to 18 words. These two, H/B/2/5/2 and M/B/1/9/2, together with M/B/2/11/2, realise mental processes (believing that..., recognising that..., overcoming his fears of).

8.1.1.1.1 Purpose

There is a blurring of the distinction between purpose and condition with to-infinitive clauses. The infinitive clause in the following sentence clearly expresses purpose.

M/B/1/16/3 The sudden influx of such a large number of prisoners posed enormous logistical problems for the German authorities, and, to relieve the strain, Germany over the summer and autumn released on parole all the Dutch, the Flemish Belgians, nine-tenths of the Poles, and nearly a third of the French captives into civilian life.

The following MT clearly expresses condition.

Wh/B/1/19/1 To be a 'potent weapon' the attention had to be kept on the exemption limit - which applied to all taxpayers - and away from the effects of allowances for wives and children on lessening burdens for family men.

It could be paraphrased as If it were to be a potent weapon... But the infinitive clause in another sentence could also be similarly paraphrased, as but if the best possible cost-benefit balance were to be achieved..., yet the use of a verb which takes a human agent as subject seems to tip the balance towards purpose.

M/B/1/16/3 Particular provisions of the Geneva Convention were regularly being violated, but to achieve the best possible cost-benefit balance - virtual slave labor - the code in its entirety would have to go.

Similarly, the following sentences can be interpreted as either purpose or condition (If we are to answer this question.... If we are to fully comprehend POW treatment.... If the Soviet people were to be encouraged to exert themselves...)

H/B/1/1/4 To answer this question we must shift our standpoint from the crown to that of the political community.

M/I/3/3 To fully comprehend POW treatment we need to understand not only the material context....

M/B/2/15/3 In order to encourage the Soviet people to exert themselves to the full in repelling the German invader and to willingly make the necessary sacrifices, the enemy had to be seen as uncompromisingly hostile and dangerous.

The ambiguity arises because the situation which must obtain in order for the purpose to be
achieved is still potential rather than realised, unlike that in the very first sentence (M/B/1/16/3), and in the following sentence, where the meaning of purpose is made particularly explicit by use of the verb seeking.

M/B/3/4/4 Seeking to reflect the new spirit of Japanese uniqueness and nationalism, while tightening discipline through brutality, the military authorities made their expectations more stringent.

In fact, all the above sentences, bar Wh/B/1/19/1 were treated as realising purpose in theme.

8.1.1.2 REASON PHRASES

Apart from MacKenzie's much more frequent use of Reason clause MTs, Reason MTs are more often phrases than clauses. Only 8 of the 26 Reason phrases have explicit signals of the Reason relation (6 because of, 2 as a result of); the most frequently occurring preposition with these phrases is with (7). Three of the Reason phrases are adjective phrases, all MTs and all in the MacKenzie text; two are sentence initial and another is preceded by two other sentence-initial MTs.

M/B/1/23/1 Desperate for political reasons to avoid sending 250,000 more French civilian workers to the Reich, Laval proposed...

M/B/1/28/3 Unwilling (and to an extent unable) to meet the high standards of the Geneva code in coping with this huge mass of humanity, the Allies took the opportunity....

M/B/1/11/1 Two months later, in May 1944, furious at the mass bombing of German cities and more recent strafing attacks by Allied fighters in which civilians had been killed, Hitler demanded....

There are 26 prepositional phrases realising Reason: 15 in sentence-initial or final position (9MTs, 6FFMs); five at sentence level preceded by another item in marked theme and one followed by another reason PP as FFM; and four MTs of clauses introduced by medial coordinators. These Reason PPs are introduced by with (7), because of (6), as a result of (2), without (1), as (1) by the nature of (1), at (1), by (1), in opposition to (1), in response to (1), in the expectation of (1). Whiting is the only writer who uses because of. It is interesting that with is the most frequently used preposition for introducing Reason PPs, rather than more explicit signals of Reason, such as because of. MacKenzie uses with three times, only in MTs, Whiting once, in an MT, and Harriss once in an MT and twice in FFM. Walker uses it twice in FFM as part of complex expressions (with the result that, with the consequence that) which have been treated above as conjunctions.
In all cases where a prepositional phrase is an MT it realises a reason or cause whereas most of the FFM prepositional phrases realise result, including all four introduced by *with*, as illustrated by the following sentences.

**M/B/1/15/2** With the danger of retaliation removed, the opportunity to interpret or break the rules in the national interest often proved too strong to resist.

**H/A/2/7** The abandonment of the eyre of central justices opened the way for magnates and local gentry to assume responsibility for local peace-keeping, with the attendant evils of venality, intimidation and open lawlessness.

**H/A/7/2** One sees the thrust towards centralised authority frustrated, either by feudal reaction or the strains of war, with the crown forced to surrender its authority to the local interests of the aristocracy.

In the second and third examples, featuring *with*-phrases as FFMs, the result sense is not as easily distinguished from the accompaniment sense expressed by *with* as it is in the phrases in which *with* forms part of a more explicit complex expression.

**War/B/1/3/8** Further additions to the justices' responsibilities in cases of riot, forcible entry and breaches of several contemporary statutes of livery followed in subsequent years, with the result that the justices of the peace enjoyed considerably increased powers of summary arrest and conviction by the end of Henry IV's reign.

**H/I/7/2** has both a cause PP and a result PP in final position, with the former congruently preceding the latter. In one of the two other cases of FFM PPs realising cause, this is signalled explicitly by *because of*. The other is a PP introduced by *as*:

**Wh/B/1/12/1** This opposition was initially concerned with increasing allowances for equipment and travel, as the most practical way of reducing liabilities.

Contrary to the findings for Reason clauses in the history sample, and to Quirk *et al*'s figures for the distribution of PPs in general in written material in the Survey of English Usage Corpus, the majority of Reason PPs in the history texts, taking into account all independent clauses, are in initial position (18MTs, 5FFMs), as are the three adjective phrases. This is also the case when only strictly sentence-initial PPs are considered (9MTs, 4FFMs).

### 8.1.2. CONJUNCTS

Whiting uses only one reason conjunct, *so*, and is the only author to use this item with this meaning, which he does once sentence-initially and three times preceded by *And*.

*Consequently* or *in consequence* occurs four times in the Walker text but only once in each of the Harris and MacKenzie texts. *Hence* occurs twice, in the MacKenzie text, and nowhere
else, as does As a result, in the Walker text. Harriss’s use of for to begin a sentence has already been noted as a particularly foregrounded reason signal. All uses of thus have also been included in the reason category though four occurrences in the Harriss article (H/B/1/8/1, H/B/2/2/11, H/B/2/6/14, H/B/3/4/7) seem to be cases of what Quirk et al (1985:635) call summative thus, and to have a discourse-organising function similar to that of some non-specific nouns and ‘unattended this’ when used to encapsulate the content of stretches of text.

8.2 CONDITION

8.2.1 OBSERVATIONS IN THE LITERATURE

Conditionals have been described as ‘a fascinatingly complex area of the relation between grammar and discourse’ (Downing 1991) because of their multifunctional potential, requiring a more delicate semantic categorisation (Davies 1997). They can exhibit an indirect relationship between form and meaning in which the notion of condition is combined with or replaced by some other contingency meaning’, whether temporal, spatial, result or concession (Downing 1991); Davies, for instance, notes how location is realised by conditionals in two argument texts.

Conditional constructions can be classified formally, according to whether the verb in the if-clause is in the present, past or past perfect tense; semantically, as either open conditions or hypothetical conditions, either unlikely or impossible (counter-factual); or functionally, as in Sweetser’s (1990) typology: content, epistemic, and speech-act conditionals. In a content, or real world, conditional construction the event or state of affairs described in the protasis is presented as a sufficient condition for the realisation of that described in the apodosis, the relationship between the two being one of enablement or causality. An epistemic conditional reflects a process of reasoning, in which a conclusion is drawn from evidence postulated in the protasis, as in If John went to that party, (then) he was trying to infuriate Miriam (Sweetser, ibid:116), with the causal link being at the epistemic level, not the content level. In a speech act conditional, such as If you are hungry, there’s some food in the fridge, there is no causal relationship.

Conditional items in initial position can perform important discourse-organising functions.
Roughly 65% of the if-clauses in the spoken and written sample examined by Greenbaum and Nelson (1996) were in initial position, and so in iconic relationship with the natural order, in which condition is followed by potential or hypothetical fulfilment. They note that, in the development of argumentation, initial placement of conditional clauses also establishes the common ground first. On the basis of cross-linguistic data, Haiman (1978) and Marchese (1987) also associate initial conditional clauses with given information and suggest they behave like topics of their sentences. Haiman sees the protasis realised by the initial conditional clause as forming a background against which a comment is proffered, while Marchese finds conditional clauses have a recapitulative function, summarising what has come before, and serving as frames for the text that follows.

Marchese finds a high number of conditional clauses in procedural texts in a West African language, with the important text-organising function of breaking the discourse into manageable units so that the procedure or process can be identified, remembered and carried out. Downing (1991) and Ramsay (1987) also observe the potential discourse-organising role of initial conditional clauses in guiding the reader when they have a span over extensive stretches of text. Ramsay finds subjects of initial if-clauses in a murder mystery novel linked anaphorically with preceding clauses varying from one (60%) to thirteen clauses distant, while Downing notes an initial conditional clause with a span of several paragraphs.

According to Ramsay, the initial if-clause connects or grounds the preceding discourse with respect to the material that follows; the greater the span, the greater the contribution to the dynamics of the sequencing of information. In contrast, sentence-final clauses in Downing's sample have no span, and Ramsay finds that almost 95% of the subjects of final if-clauses in his sample are linked anaphorically only with the immediately preceding main clause; and seem like parenthetical comment extending the semantic information in the main clause rather than part of the main line of the narrative. Greenbaum and Nelson observe that conditional clauses in their sample occurred in end position if the if-clause was a comment clause, or if the host clause was interrogative, imperative, elliptical or itself subordinate. But they also found that final if-clauses could sometimes be the focus of information.

As regards particular types of discourse or genres, conditional marked themes have been found to be characteristic of science discourse (Gosden 1992; Vande Kopple 1991; Eiler 1986; Taylor 1983, cited in Vande Kopple 1991), constituting the fifth largest semantic category in Gosden's data, after contrast, location in space, cause or reason, and time. Eiler finds they are most numerous in the description of experiments in a physics lecture written up
as a chapter of a book, but Gosden associates them with the results and discussion sections of scientific research articles, where they are used both for observations about phenomena in the real world and for presenting hypotheses based on observed phenomena, the latter being signalled not only by if-clauses but also by linguistic forms such as in principle, perhaps, conceivably, with such possibilities, assuming that. He claims that hypothetical conditional constructions allow the writer to imply personal opinions whilst remaining rhetorically objective and invisible. On the other hand, Eiler (1986) finds half the if-clauses in her sample occur with the pronoun we as main clause subject, thus realising author visibility in author-reader collaboration.

8.2.2 ANALYSIS

As can be seen in Table 16 in Appendix 2, there are 50 instances in the history journal articles of condition realised by either a marked theme or a final free modifier, with seven times as many condition MTs (44) as FFM (6). This includes a considerable number of prepositional phrases (20), all except one being MTs. If the focus in the present data is restricted to finite clauses, the proportion of conditional MTs is even greater, as there are no FFM finite clauses, as against 21 MTs. This is a far greater proportion of MTs than that found by Greenbaum and Nelson for conditional clauses in their corpus comprising both spoken and written genres, even allowing for the fact that the FFM category is slightly more restricted than their final-position category.

There are two finite clause marked themes beginning with where, which would be traditionally labelled as adverbial clauses of place but are more concerned with circumstances than with place and could be paraphrased as either when-clauses or if-clauses.

M/C/1/1 Where a sufficient degree of respect for the foe as part of a common humanity existed - that is, where ideological considerations tended toward benevolence - or, even more important, where concern existed for the well-being of friendly prisoners in enemy hands, as was mostly the case in the West and on the Allied side in the Far East, the 1929 Geneva Convention could in practice remain the standard by which treatment was measured.

M/C/2/3 Where such considerations were paramount, when the war was seen as truly total, then life itself for POWs could and did depend on the degree to which they were seen as better able to contribute to their captors’ war effort alive than dead.

Since both Gosden and Halliday classify phrases such as under these conditions and in these circumstances as realising condition, it seems consistent to treat these where-clauses in the same way for purposes of comparison with Gosden’s findings, and accordingly they have
been included in that category in the analysis in this chapter.

### 8.2.2.1 CONDITIONAL PHRASES

There are sixteen abstract prepositional phrases realising condition (H 3 Wa 3, M 8, Wh 1), fourteen beginning with the preposition in and the other two with under. In addition, there is one beginning with for which has been included with themes realising reference to people for the purpose of the primary analysis of sentence-initial themes. Most of these prepositional phrases are less transparently conditional in meaning than conditional clauses but they have been treated as cases of condition following the example of Gosden and Halliday and Hasan, thus facilitating comparison with Gosden’s findings. Conditional meaning is fairly straightforward in the first two examples: hypothetical from the point of view of the author in the case of Without allowances in the first sentence, and actually occurring circumstances in the case of in the absence of in the second sentence. These phrases could be paraphrased by if-clauses: If there had not been allowances... if there were no local magnate or bishop...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>M/B/2/6/1 Under these circumstances</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Wa/B/4/5/2 In many cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/3/4/3 In these circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/1/12/2 In many instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh/B/9</td>
<td>In these circumstances (FC)</td>
<td>Wa/B/1/4/6 In neither case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/C/2/8</td>
<td>Under such circumstances</td>
<td>M/B/3/1/3 In both cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/B/1/6/11 In this situation</td>
<td>H/B/3/8/3 In the case of gentry disputes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/B/1/7/11 In either context</td>
<td>M/B/1/12/1 In all such cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>Wa/B/1/2/1 For the aristocracy</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Wa/B/3/2/5 In practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/B/4/13 In reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/1/23/2 In theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/3/4/7 In theory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gosden provides under these conditions as an illustration of real condition while Halliday and Hasan classify under the circumstances as generalised condition. There is little difference in meaning between under the circumstances or under these conditions and under these circumstances, in these circumstances or under such circumstances in Group A above. And under these circumstances could be substituted for In this situation, also in Group A, as it occurs in the second of the following two sentences.
Its potential for governing was fully revealed by the absence or incapacity of the monarch. In this situation, the formal appointment of its members, the payment of wages, the regulation of procedures and the keeping of records convey an impression of institutional continuity.

The remaining item in Group A, *in either context* occurs in the second of the following two sentences, and could be replaced by *Whether there was co-operation or opposition: whether... or* is a signal of an alternative condition (Quirk *et al* 1985:1100).

Parliament was not, like the council, part of royal government, but provided a critical judgement of government, changing from co-operation to opposition in response to the character of kingship. In either context, parliament's existence meant that government was necessarily consensual, needing the support of an articulate and informed property class.

In either context seems little different in meaning from *in both cases* in Group B, yet Halliday and Hasan classify *in either case* as realising the dismissal type of adversative conjunctive relation. However, they classify *in that case* as emphatic condition and Gosden provides *in the case of* as an illustration of real condition, though Eiler labels *in that case* as focusing adjuncts. *In all such cases* seems little different from *in such an event,* which Halliday and Hasan also classify as emphatic condition, and is equivalent to *When this happened,* which could be alternatively expressed as *If this happened.* Accordingly, the phrases with *case or instance* in Group B are treated as condition in the present analysis. It seems consistent, therefore, to also treat the phrase in C, from the following sentence, as conditional since it can be replaced by a phrase beginning *in the case of.*

For the aristocracy, appointment as a justice of the peace did not entail constant attendance at the quarter sessions.

This may be contrasted with the 'From the point of view' meaning of a similar form in another sentence from the same text.

For the Commons, the greater responsibility for the work of the bench shown by the 'wiser and more discreet' of the county, with a corresponding decline in the influence exercised by the 'poorer and less sufficient' justices, was an essential precondition for the better maintenance of public order.

The items in Groups B appear to represent different points in a spectrum ranging from the 'whenever' sense of *in many cases* through to the isolated instance sense of *in that case or in the case of,* and from the notion of condition as a variable to condition meaning one particular circumstance. In the following example the 'whenever' sense is expressed by both a prepositional phrase and an *if*-clause.
In many instances, if they believed that what was being ordered by the fuhrer placed German POWs in enemy hands in potential danger, OKW staff officers could engage in what Colonel-General Alfred Jodl (OKW chief of operations staff) later described as “delaying tactics, a kind of passive resistance” involving interminable wrangling over the precise meaning and wording of Hitler’s verbal commands until the whole matter was forgotten.

Perhaps the most difficult item to see as conditional is in practice in Group D yet Gosden classifies this item as realising real condition, and in reality is identical in meaning. Gosden classifies in theory as expressing hypothetical meaning.

8.2.2.2 FOUR FUNCTIONAL TYPES OF CONDITIONAL FORMS

The fifty conditional forms are used for four main functions in the history journal articles, ranging along a continuum from objective reference to factual events at a low discourse level, where detail is presented, to foregrounding of the macro-thesis of the text. They are classified here as either Type 1, Recurrent temporal contingency (48%); Type 2, Historical participant viewpoint (14%); Type 3, Projected author viewpoint (18%); or Type 4, Research (20%). Table 12 in Appendix 2 indicates the incidence of these functions and the forms which realise them, with those occurring in prominent sentences highlighted in bold. Half (20) of the forty non-research conditional items are prepositional phrases, for the most part constituting complex conjuncts and realising the first of the four functions listed above. All of the epistemic conditional items are clauses, all except one (an -ing clause) finite.

Type 1: Recurrent temporal contingency

Twenty-four of the conditional elements (19MTs, 5FFMs), that is 48%, realise reference to real-world events or circumstances which actually obtained at one time or another and could be paraphrased by a clause beginning with whenever and be represented as being in the relation ‘Y when X’, as in the following example.

This is a case of what Downing calls an indirect relationship between form and meaning, in this case implying what she terms recurrent temporal contingency. Of the seven clauses of this type of condition in the sample, three are MTs and four are FFMIs. Two of the MTs are finite if-clauses while one begins with depending, as does one of the FFMIs. The other three
FFMs are verbless *whether*-clauses, accounting for all the occurrences of this type of clause in the sample.

**Type 2: Historical participant viewpoint**

Seven conditions, or 14% (6 MTs, 1 FFM), are presented as open or hypothetical from the point of view of individuals living in the historical period under study, as is the case with the following open condition, where there is a direct relationship between form and meaning.

*M/B/1/6/2* *Given that the dead found on Sark had been shot while trying to flee after capture, Winston Churchill was able to convince his War Cabinet colleagues on October 8 that it was Germany that was misbehaving and that a counterthreat should be issued: if the German authorities placed prisoners in chains, Britain would shackle an equal number of German POWs.*

Like the previous example, this *if*-clause realises reference to the world external to the text which is the object of analysis. All except one of the seven instances of this type of condition are MTs, one of which is the only prepositional phrase expressing condition, beginning with *without.*

**Type 3: Projected author viewpoint**

Nine conditional items, 18% (all MTs) realise a hypothetical conditions from the point of view of the author, looking back with hindsight on the period of history under study.

*M/B/1/31/4* *If Germany had won the war, these prisoners’ days would have been numbered.*

The consequent here is one posed by the author, not one perceived by the historical personages living through this period of history. The counterfactual condition is located in the world external to the text but there is rather more distance from the historical evidence under scrutiny than in the Type 2 example; the sentence is a statement of the author’s opinion rather than mere reporting of the facts. All the instances of this type of condition are MTs, two of which are infinitive clauses (*To be a ‘potent weapon’...*, *To be effective...*).

**Type 4: Research**

Ten conditional items, or 20% (all MTs) are either concerned with processes involved in historical analysis or explicitly signal interpretation of the evidence, by either the author or other historians. The following example also realises the viewpoint of the author but much
more obviously at the top level of interpretation of the evidence of developments in the historical period under study, the level at which the macro-thesis of the entire article is foregrounded.

H/I/11/10 However, if we view these aspects of government not as emanations of royal authority, but as the product of those involved in them, we can better appreciate the nature of, and the impetus for, the changes that occurred.

This sentence occurs in a very prominent position in the text, being the very last sentence of the introduction to the article, and of the two-paragraph final sub-section of the introduction, in which the author presents the thesis of the entire text, ending with a preview of the content and structure of the body of the article. It could not be more highly foregrounded. There is explicit reference to the adopting of a particular viewpoint, which is presented in contrast with the viewpoint of other historians, and also expression of author-reader collaboration by means of the subject pronoun we.

All the research conditional items are MTs and all finite clauses except for one -ing clause. These Type 4 clauses refer to either a process involved in analysis (H/I/11/5, Wh/B/2/1/3), an evaluation of an interpretation (H/B/1/6/12, Wa/C/4/5), a perspective to be adopted in order to make a certain interpretation (H/B/1/1/1, H/B/1/5/7), an interpretation (H/B/1/5/8), or more than one of these at the same time (H/I/11/10, Wa/C/4/1, H/B/3/11/3). Three (H/I/11/5, H/I/11/10, H/B/1/5/7) feature we as subject, expressing author-reader collaboration, and several play a prominent role in the reasoning put forward in support of the author's thesis. The fact that seven of the ten, and all three featuring we as subject, occur in the Harriss article, accounting for nearly half of the instances of condition in his article, is yet another manifestation of his more rhetorical style.

Overlapping with several of these four functions is that of concession. Seven of the conditional items (H/B/1/5/8, H/B/1/6/12, H/B/3/11/3, Wa/C/4/5, M/B/1/6/1, Wh/B/2/6/8, Wh/B/2/6/11) are concessive conditional and will also be discussed in the next chapter. Of these seven, three are used with the research function (H/B/1/5/8, H/B/1/6/12, H/B/3/11/3), one (Wa/C/6/5) with author hypothesis, and three (M/B/1/6/1, Wh/B/2/6/8, Wh/B/2/6/11) with hypothesis from the point of view of the participants in the historical events under study. Two are if-clauses, three are even if-clauses, two are whatever-clauses. Only one is an FFM.

It was noted earlier that in written science discourse conditional forms have been found to refer primarily to phenomena observed in experiments and hypotheses based on these
observations. In these history texts, as indicated in Table 13 in Appendix 2, the 21 MT or FFM conditional forms which are not associated with foregrounded interpretation by historians, evaluation of evidence or processes of analysis make reference primarily to human behaviour, whether reported by the author or speculated about by the author; less than half as often to what may loosely be called states of affairs, including nationality, political interests and effectiveness; and sometimes to mental states.

8.2.2.3 SALIENCE OF CONDITIONAL FORMS

Forty per cent of the conditional elements in either theme or final free modifier position occur in salient sentences. Of the 60% which do not, two are Type 4, leaving twenty-eight non-epistemic conditional forms: 14 Type 1, 7 Type 2 and 6 Type 3. Twelve of the 40 non-epistemic conditional items occur in prominent sentences: one participant viewpoint MT, three author viewpoint MTs, and eight real world circumstances (5MTs, 3FFMs). Six of these occur in paragraph-initial topic sentences, four of which have a span of between two and eight paragraphs; three in either introduction or conclusion section paragraphs, and three in paragraph-final sentences, only one of which is not in either an introduction or conclusion section.

The participant viewpoint MT, a concessive whatever clause, occurs in a paragraph-initial sentence (M/B/1/6/1) establishing the topic entity for three paragraphs. One author viewpoint MT infinitive clause occurs in a sentence (Wh/B/1/19/1) which provides a topic proposition governing a sequence of four paragraphs, while another occurs in a medial sentence (Wa/C/6/5), but in the final paragraph of a long conclusion section. An author viewpoint MT if-clause occurs in the final sentence (M/B/1/31/4) of the penultimate paragraph of a major section. Of the conditional forms referring to real world circumstances, one prepositional phrase MT (For the aristocracy) establishes a topic entity for a paragraph in the opening sentence (Wa/B/1/2/1); another (In all such cases) begins a paragraph-initial sentence (M/B/1/12/1) serving as topic sentence for two paragraphs; a third (Under these circumstances) a paragraph-initial sentence serving as a major topic sentence (M/B/2/6/1) for a much longer sequence of paragraphs, and a fourth (In these circumstances) begins the final sentence (Wh/I/8) of the first paragraph of a two-paragraph introduction section. An MT -ing clause occurs in the second sentence (M/I/1/2) in a two-sentence opening paragraph of an entire article, and together with the first sentence summarises the content of the entire article, while an FFM -ing clause occurs in a topic sentence (M/B/3/7/1). One of the three, FFM
verbless *whether* clauses ends a sentence (Wa/I/4/3) in the final paragraph of an introduction which indicates what the author is going to do in the body of the article, while a heavy *whether*-clause occurs in a paragraph final sentence (Wa/C/3/8) bringing to a close a subsection of a conclusion section.

Eight of the ten research conditional clauses occur in sentences with some degree of prominence, though not all as salient as the illustration provided earlier: there are degrees of prominence, of distance from the macro-thesis, and of explicitness of reference to viewpoint or the process of historical analysis. Of the two in sentences which have no prominence at all (H/B/1/6/12, Wh/B/2/1/3), perhaps the lowest on the scale is the only instance of a non-finite clause functioning as Type 4, also the only instance of Type 4 in the Whiting article.

**Wh/B/2/1/3** In 1913, assuming a halving of money income because of wartime inflation, the burden was roughly 6%.

The -ing clause refers to a minor process employed in historical analysis; it could be paraphrased by a finite clause with a passive form of the verb or an active form with the subject *we*, more explicitly realising author-reader collaboration (*if we assume...*).

The other non-prominent sentence with a Type 4 conditional has a concessive-conditional MT which anticipates potential negative evaluation of the content of the immediately preceding sentence.

**H/B/1/6/12** Even if that is misleading, a council was commonly acknowledged to be a necessary adjunct to royal rule and its function in the polity was to act as a bridge between the king and his subjects.

This conditional clause is one of only three *even if* clauses in the data: two finite MTs and one verbless FFM. It hedges an interpretation offered as supporting evidence which has already been presented tentatively in the preceding sentence with the phrase *convey an impression of* before offering alternative evidence, thus adroitly managing to make both points without risking unjustified commitment to the first one.

Another concessive-conditional MT which illustrates the use of concession to anticipate and demote negative evaluation of the content of the immediately preceding sentence has somewhat greater prominence since not only does it occur in a conclusion paragraph but also its main clause echoes the content of the immediately preceding sub-topic sentence for the bulk of the paragraph, so that the two sentences together could be viewed as joint sub-topic
sentences.

Wa/C/4/5 If this seems unremarkable, granted the considerable local influence the £1,500-worth of annuities charged on the Duchy of Lancaster estates in the county brought him, it should not obscure the skill with which Henry IV managed to marry the local aspirations of the gentry to his own cause.

Indirect reference to analysis carried out in the preceding two paragraphs, as well as to the interpretation based on this analysis, is achieved by means of the word then in the if-clause in the following sentence, which is a paragraph-initial topic sentence for the final sequence of three paragraphs in a conclusion section, and thus marks a significant boundary in text structure.

Wa/C/4/1 If the development of the Yorkshire commissions of the peace in these years was not, then, untypical of the changes taking place in the rest of the country, some more general observations seem to follow from the resolution of the questions with which this study began.

The conditional clause, together with then, is pivotal since it recapitulates what has gone before while providing a frame for introducing the topic of the new sub-section. It can thus be seen to function in a similar way to nominalisation and non-specific nouns.

Indirect reference to interpretation, this time by other historians, is also achieved by means of inverted commas in the following conditional themes in the Harris text.

H/B/1/5/7 If we speak of “public authority” or “public administration” in the late Middle Ages, it cannot simply be equated with the interests of the crown; it was indeed public, but in the sense of operating in response to the needs of an informed and articulate political community alongside the crown.

H/B/1/5/8 And if it was “subverted in their interests”, it was also refined and developed by them.

The phrase public authority occurred previously in the opening sentence of the third paragraph of the introduction, which summarised the stance taken by other historians, as well as in the opening sentence of the second paragraph of that subsection of the introduction where the author explicitly opposes this stance. The word authority re-occurs in the second sentence of the fourth paragraph and the opening sentence of the sixth paragraph, also in the introduction. These conditional clauses, the second of which is concessive, not only provide top-level comment on the content of the first sub-section of the body of the article, but also remind the reader of the interpretation by other historians reported in the introduction section, which the present author is countering, and participate in a restating of the author’s own thesis. Occurring in adjacent sentences, they exhibit parallelism which enhances the prominence of these sentences resulting from their being at the very end of the final
paragraph in this sub-section.

Reference to both the methodology of history and interpretation is made more directly by a whatever clause in a sentence which, though medial in its paragraph, has prominence because it occurs in a short pivotal paragraph combining both a conclusion to the preceding sequence of ten paragraphs and an introduction to the remaining sequence of three paragraphs in the final section of the body of the article. This conditional clause in MT position functions as the pivot between the two.

H/B/3/11/3 Whatever case can be made for this in the thirteenth century, after 1350 the operation of lordship within political society seems far more complex.

Another medial sentence with a conditional marked theme is nevertheless prominent by virtue of being in the final paragraph of the introduction section, where the author’s thesis is highly foregrounded. Moreover, it features parallelism in the conjoining of two heavy if-clauses in marked theme, both realising reference to a methodological process and author-reader collaboration by means of the pronoun we as subject. Since these two clauses together constitute one marked theme, they have been counted as one instance of condition in the analysis.

H/I/1/1/6 If we add to this landed society the gentlemen bureaucrats who serviced it with legal and administrative skills - local attorneys, solicitors and pleaders, land agents, stewards, bailiffs and household officers - and if we further add the richer clergy and their officials, and the urban merchants and substantial citizens, and even, in the capital, the small but influential group of royal bureaucrats and lawyers, we have an elite of greatly diversified interests and skills, many of whom were professionally articulate.

These sentences are either not only paragraph-initial but also section-initial (H/B/1/1/1) or sub-section-initial (Wa/C/4/1); or not only paragraph-final but also section-final (H/I/1/1/10) or sub-section-final (H/B/1/7/7-8); or occur in introduction or conclusion sections (Wa/C/4/5) or introductory or concluding paragraphs (H/I/1/5, H/B/3/11/3). Two are major or topic sentences (H/B/1/1/1, Wa/C/4/1). The conditional marked theme in H/B/1/1/1 has scope over an entire section of text in that it introduces the topic entity for that section; in Wa/C/4/1, the conditional clause recapitulates the content of the preceding two paragraphs as background for what is to come next, thus acting as a pivotal discourse organiser, as does the conditional clause in H/B/3/11/3. The conditional clause in H/I/1/1/10, the very last sentence of the introduction, has prospective scope over the entire remainder of the article. That in H/B/1/1/3, though not having prospective scope itself, is associated with a main clause which has prospective scope over the remaining two paragraphs of the final section of the body of the
article. Thus, there is support in the history texts for Marchese’s and Downing’s claims that conditional clauses can have a discourse-organising function, with span over extensive stretches of text, involving either recapitulative or prospective summary.

In the Harriss article, which often employs parallelism, six of the nine if-clauses occur in pairs: two conjoined in one MT (H/I/1/1/5); two MTs in adjacent paragraph-final sentences (H/B/1/5/7, H/B/1/5/8); and two MTs in adjacent independent clauses linked by a semi-colon and forming a sentence with two parts in balance (H/B/2/6/10). The first of these pairs occurs in a paragraph with another if-clause in the final sentence (H/B/1/1/1/10), so that there are three if-clauses altogether in this highly rhetorical final paragraph of the introduction section. Elsewhere, two if-clauses occur in the same paragraph but in sentences separated by one (M/B/1/12/2, M/B/1/12/4) or more (Wa/C/4/1, Wa/C/4/5) intervening sentences. In other paragraphs with more than one conditional form, these forms are not of the same type, though in adjacent sentences: a prepositional phrase MT and an if-clause MT (Wh/B/1/2/6/1, Wh/B/1/6/3), and, at the beginning of a paragraph, a whatever clause and an if-clause (M/B/1/6/1, M/B/1/6/2).

8.2.3 SUMMARY

The most interesting finding noted above is that conditional forms can be used in history discourse with a highly rhetorical function, and primarily so by the author with the most rhetorical style. All of the conditional forms concerned with analysis and interpretation of the evidence by historians are marked themes in this sample of texts, setting up a frame within which it is possible for the author to propose his own interpretation. Gosden suggests that this enables the writer to give a personal opinion without risking too strong a claim, and he claims that the use of a hypothetical conditional construction allows the author to remain invisible. However, this does not seem to apply in the case of these highly rhetorical uses of conditional clauses in the history sample; on the contrary, they frequently bring about awareness of the author, either by use of we as subject or by highlighting author opposition to other points of view. In addition to their contribution to the foregrounding of the author’s argument, conditional forms, both epistemic and non-epistemic (for instance, phrases such as in these circumstances) often make a contribution to discourse organisation and signposting by summarising the content of preceding stretches of text, and participate in signalling the topic of subsequent text, often with scope over extensive stretches of text. In this way they have functions in common with nominalisation, non-specific nouns and forms such as thus
and this used with a summative function.

8.3 ADDITION

8.3.1 OBSERVATIONS IN THE LITERATURE

Halliday and Hasan (1976) include comparison and apposition among additive conjunctive relations, which they classify into four categories, with the following illustrations:

Additive, simple: and, and also; nor, and...not; or, or else
Complex
emphatic: further, furthermore, again, moreover, besides, in addition, not only...but;
alternatively:
de-emphatic: incidentally, by the way
Apposition: that is, I mean, in other words; for instance, for example, thus
Comparison: likewise, similarly, in the same way; on the other hand, by contrast, conversely

The first category includes both internal and external conjunctive relations, whereas those in the other three are internal only. They note the ‘definite rhetorical flavour’ of the internal emphatic additive conjuncts further, again, moreover, besides, in addition, and not only that but, which have the sense that ‘there is yet another point to be taken in conjunction with the previous one’ (p246). Gosden includes indeed under emphatic addition. Quirk et al (1985) refer to such items as additive reinforcing, and to items such as similarly and equally as additive equative. Halliday and Hasan class on the other hand as both contrastive conjunction and additive dissimilarity stating that when on the one hand and on the other hand are used together ‘the sense of dissimilarity tends to be weakened and the effect is little more than a simple additive’ (p247). In the present analysis on the one hand...on the other hand and not only...but are discussed under contrast, in the next chapter, but labelled additive contrast. Sentence-initial nor is treated as emphatic addition.

8.3.2 ANALYSIS

There are 50 sentence-initial marked themes realising additive relations in the history sample; 226 if all main-clause-initial themes are taken into account; 62 and 227 respectively if items in second or third position in complex themes are also taken into account. Three as-clauses occurring in final position bring the overall total to 292. In addition, there are three signals of additive meaning included in themes which fall into the evaluation semantic categories:
equally specific (H/B/3/9/6), of equal importance (M/B/1/2/5), also important (Wh/B/1/26/1). These items fall into four categories of additive relations: addition (moreover, and), similarity (similarly, likewise), combining (together, together with), compatibility (in accordance with, as was to be expected).

Halliday and Hasan’s category of emphatic items has been extended to include items realising other additive relations besides those they term complex emphatic, as can be seen from Table 17 in Appendix 2. The sentence-initial themes are distributed across the four texts as follows, with the number of emphatic items in brackets:

**Table 8.3**
Number of sentence-initial themes realising addition in the history sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Addition</th>
<th>Similarity</th>
<th>Combining</th>
<th>Compatibility</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>11 (8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>16 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>13 (9)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>7 (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33 (22)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50 (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two thirds of the addition items and almost half of the total additive items are emphatic. The following table shows the distribution across the three major sections of the journal articles:

**Table 8.4**
Distribution of sentence-initial themes realising addition across the three research article sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>addition</td>
<td>2 (H)</td>
<td>31 (H 9, Wa 2, M 13, Wh 7)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similarity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 (H 3, Wa 1, M 5)</td>
<td>2 (Wa 1, Wh 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combining</td>
<td>1 (H)</td>
<td>1 (Wa)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compatibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (M)</td>
<td>1 (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Harriss and MacKenzie use the widest range of items (10), twice as many as Walker and Whiting (5).

Harriss: moreover (3), indeed (1), again (2), further (1), nor (1), and (3), similarly (2), just as (1), together (1), correspondingly (1).
Total 16

Walker: indeed (1), beside phrase (1), equally (1), as phrase (1), together with (1).
Total 5

MacKenzie: moreover (5), indeed (1), again (1), in phrase (1), quite apart from (1), and (4), likewise (1), as phrase (4), as clause (1), in accordance with (1), in line with (1).
Total 21

Whiting: moreover (2), indeed (1), in fact (1), and (3), equally (1).
Total 8
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The most frequently used sentence-initial items are *and* (10) and *moreover* (10). Both (except for one case of *and*) introduce the final point in a series of points related additively, but *moreover* has just one broad use - making an additional point in support of a more general statement - whereas only three of the ten instances of sentence-initial *and* are used in this way. *Moreover* has a more hectoring tone than *and*, having the sense ‘*and as if that is not enough, here is another point*’. Because it is more emphatic, unlike sentence-initial *and*, it can enter into an additive relation spanning intervening lower level detail related to the preceding point it is in relation with (M/B/1/3/4, M/B/1/12/4, Wh/B/3/3/5), and can be followed by one or two sentences of elaboration on the content of its own sentence (H/B/2/2/12, H/B/3/5/12, M/B/1/12/4, M/B/3/11/2), though three of the ten sentences beginning with *moreover* are paragraph-final (M/B/2/10/4, Wh/B/1/25/12, Wh/B/3/3/5). In two of the MacKenzie cases, *moreover* introduces the second of two points which are in contrast with a point in the final sentence of the paragraph; in one of these cases (M/B/1/3/4) the contrast is one of difference (between two negative points and one positive point) and in the other (M/B/2/14/3) it is concessive.

All except one (H/I/8/4) of the ten sentences beginning with *and* are either paragraph-final (H/B/1/5/8, M/B/1/28/6, M/B/3/10/4, Wh/B/1/23/9, Wh/B/3/8/9) paragraph-segment-final (M/B/1/2/4, M/B/2/5/3, Wh/B/3/8/5), or the penultimate sentence in an extended sequence of sentences (H/B/3/12/8). In six cases *and* is followed by a concessive theme beginning with either *if* (H/B/1/5/8), *while* (M/B/1/28/6, M/B/3/10/4, Wh/B/3/8/5) or *even* (H/B/3/12/8, M/B/2/5/3). Only three of the ten sentences provide points supporting the truth of a claim (H/I/8/4, H/B/3/12/8, M/B/2/5/3), in other words providing a reason for the claim. Four present either a result (M/B/3/10/4) or a logical conclusion/summarising interpretation of what has been presented in the preceding sentences (Wh/B/1/23/9, Wh/B/3/8/5, Wh/B/3/8/9); in the latter cases, *And* is immediately followed by *so* and the string *And so* could be replaced by *thus*. This accounts for all three uses of sentence-initial *and* in the Whiting text. H/B/1/5/8 is a paragraph-final sentence providing a second concluding top-level comment on the content of the paragraph, with both comments beginning with a concession realised by an *if*-clause. M/B/1/28/6 expands on the phrase *extremely harsh conditions* by detailing one of the ways in which conditions were harsh. M/B/1/2/4 provides a third fact about the *humanitarian ethos*, but not in support of or elaboration on the content of either of the two preceding sentences on this sub-topic.

This does not exhaust the cases of additive meaning in theme for it will be seen in the next
chapter that items which at first appearance seem to be signals of contrast are in fact used to provide additional supporting points.

8.4 CONCLUSION

Reason, condition and addition are important rhetorical functions in expository texts. Reason is realised by a variety of forms, of which the least transparent are prepositional phrases without explicit reason preposition signals and adverbial clauses traditionally called clauses of time, which are multifunctional. Similarly, condition is often realised subtly by prepositional phrases without explicit signals of conditional meaning, while clauses with explicit signals of condition may be concessive even without the presence of *even*. Four uses of clauses with conditional meaning have been identified in the corpus and perhaps the most interesting is the strongly argumentative use, which adds rhetorical flourish to the writing. Four types of additive meaning were identified, accounting for a fairly wide range of signals of addition in the history texts, but it will be seen in the next chapter that there are still other signals of addition.
CHAPTER 9  CONTRAST AND CONCESSION

The importance placed on contrast as a method of text development in academic argumentation (Barton 1995; Hunston 1993; Williams 1993, cited in Barton 1995; Gosden 1992, MacDonald 1987, Fries 1983, Chafe 1976) was noted in Chapter 2. New information is frequently presented within a framework of contrasts between the author’s own claims and those of previous scholarship, leading to refinement of knowledge within the discipline, and Hunston (1993) advocates that analysis of claims and counter-claims in research articles be carried out in a variety of fields. Analysis of research articles in the science field has found that contrastive marked themes play a key role in creating a ‘polarising tension’ which enables the justification of research opinions in science research articles, with contrast/concession accounting for the largest proportion of sentence-initial marked themes (Gosden 1992). This chapter examines the functions of contrast/concessive marked themes in history research articles, and, where possible, compares initial with final placement.

9.1  GENERAL FINDINGS

The following table shows the proportions of sentence-initial contrast/concessive marked themes for each section of each history article as well as for the corpus as a whole.

Table 9.1  
Distribution by section of contrast/concession MTs across the four history articles according to research article sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Corpus</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of contrast/concessive marked themes in the history sample is even greater (21.8%) than that in Gosden’s science articles (18.3%), supporting the view discussed in Chapter 2 that history discourse is contentious and argument is highly valued. And yet it is not the largest, being exceeded by that of time marked themes (26.1%). When all themes are taken into account, contrast/concession is the fourth largest category (9.3%), after attributes, reference to people, and time, in that order.
Of course, restricting the analysis to sentence-initial themes leaves many cases of contrast/concession out of account. Aside from contrast/concession realised by forms other than conjuncts, conjunctions and adjuncts - by *may* and *might*, for example - several items which occur in theme position also occur later in the sentence, as shown in the following table.

**Table 9.2**

Relative incidence of contrast/concession in various positions in the sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strict initial</th>
<th>Non-initial</th>
<th>Between S &amp; V</th>
<th>Between Aux &amp; Verb</th>
<th>Between V &amp; Comp</th>
<th>After Comp</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>35 MT</td>
<td>9 MT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>30 MT</td>
<td>9 MT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>13 MT</td>
<td>18 MT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>34 MT</td>
<td>5 MT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>192</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The free movement of *however*, in particular, makes a considerable contribution to this variation in placement of contrast signals.

**Table 9.3**

Distribution of *however* across various positions in the sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strict initial</th>
<th>Non-initial</th>
<th>Between S &amp; V</th>
<th>Between Aux &amp; Verb</th>
<th>Between V &amp; Comp</th>
<th>After Comp</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1 MT</td>
<td>0 MT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 MT</td>
<td>5 MT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 MT</td>
<td>11 MT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>3 MT</td>
<td>0 MT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A tendency to signal contrast later in the sentence can be a stylistic marker which gives an impression of less contentiousness. If only strict initial theme position is taken into account, there are markedly fewer instances of contrast/concession signals in the MacKenzie text, though it has the second-highest number of sentences. But MacKenzie makes more use of *however* in other positions in the sentence. This results in a less highly rhetorical style than that of the two medieval history texts, which frequently foreground *yet* and *but* in strict initial position. Whiting uses *but* in this position even more frequently, but never the more attention-catching *yet*. The flexibility of items such as *however* as regards placement must be borne in mind when attempting to characterise texts or genres according to the semantic
functions realised by marked themes, or in associating marked themes with the setting up of context frames.

Contrast markers have been associated with the rhetorical move of carving out a research space in introduction sections of research articles; they contribute to identifying a knowledge gap to be filled by signalling disagreement with or reservations about the claims of other researchers (Gosden 1992, Swales 1990). But Gosden’s results show almost the same incidence in the introduction (22.0%) and discussion (21.2%) sections in his science corpus and also a fairly high number in the results section (18.4%); only the experimental section (4.5%) has markedly fewer. And in the history corpus the overall incidence is the lowest in the introduction sections (17.5%); and highest in the conclusion sections (23.0%), though not much higher than in the body (22.1%). As regards particular articles, the Whiting introduction has the highest incidence (40.0%) (albeit only two out of a total of only three marked themes across 16 sentences divided between two paragraphs) yet Whiting makes no attempt to relate the article to previous research; the two signals of contrast (However, while) relate real world phenomena in the period under study rather than the interpretations of these events by other historians. But even in the other three introductions, which do carve out a research space, disagreement with previous research claims is more often expressed by means of subject and predicate than by marked themes.

Harriss, for instance, signals contention by means of infinitive clauses functioning as either grammatical subject or extraposed subject, in association with emotive adjectives.

H/I/8/6 ...and to present it as a contrasting and alternative option is misleading

H/I/9/1 It is similarly artificial to set up a polarity between the crown as a central and public authority, and the landlord classes as private and local powers.

H/I/9/6 ...while it would be naive to believe that the “public authority” of the crown was consistently exercised for the communal good.

Walker expresses disagreement more neutrally by means of non-specific noun GS.

Wa/I/3/1 Before such an interpretation, and the consequences that flow from it, can be fully accepted, certain objections, each of which casts doubt upon the degree of dominance the substantial gentry exercised over the commission of the peace, need to be resolved. The first is......The second objection......A third reservation......

Harriss uses the same device in association with a negative adjective in the predicate to make a more barbed assertion, albeit after a contrast marked theme, and MacKenzie uses it with
verbs with negative connotations:

H/I/8/1 Yet such antitheses have limited validity within the medieval context.

M/I/2/5 This view ignores, among other things, the fact that...

M/I/2/8 Such moral-cum-racial comparisons have tended to mislead as much as they enlighten.

MacKenzie’s first signal of a knowledge gap is by means of non-initial however (M/I/2/2), his first signal of contention by means of a clausal unmarked theme in conjunction with a sentence-final emotive adjective (M/I/2/3).

M/I/2/2-3 Both professional and lay historians, however, have tended to concentrate their attention on the experiences and behavior of the prisoners themselves. What analysis there has been of captor policy, moreover, has in many cases been somewhat biased, and on occasion quite xenophobic.

In fact, the only case of a contrast/concession MT in his introduction is non-initial according to the definition of a sentence used in this study, but after a colon (M/I/2/6). It may be expected that historians, inheriting a belle-lettres tradition, use a wider and often more flamboyant variety of signals of disagreement than academics in more prosaic fields. Certainly, these texts illustrate the point made by Thetela (1997:117) that history uses strikingly evaluative lexis.

MacKenzie uses markedly fewer contrast/concession markers than the other authors, but then, as already pointed out, he signals contrast later in the sentence so much more often than the others. Walker has a higher number of contrast/concession MTs in the body than in the other two sections, which are typically more rhetorical, but this can be partly explained by the fact that he so often draws contrasts between the three Ridings of Yorkshire as well as between the personnel within each Riding. Harriss has a markedly higher proportion of contrast/concession MTs in his conclusion than in the other two sections of the text, amounting to three out of seven MTs distributed across 19 sentences divided into two paragraphs. This is similar to the proportion in the Whiting introduction. Contrary to Gosden’s association of marked themes with more rhetorical stretches of text, there seems to be a tendency in the history sample for a high proportion of unmarked themes in introduction and conclusion sections, the only exception being the MacKenzie conclusion section. This is the case even with the lengthy, because more discursive, Harriss introduction and Walker conclusion.
9.2 TYPES OF CONTRAST

Gosden’s two-way division of contrast relations into contrast and concession is consistent with that between antithetic and concessive (Altenberg 1986), adversative and concessive (Rudolph 1988), or semantic opposition and denial of expectation (Lakoff 1971) contrast relations. Quirk et al. (1985) and Halliday and Hasan (1976), however, make a four-way division, into concessive, antithetic, reformulatory and replacive relations, and adversative, contrastive, correction and dismissal respectively. The terms adversative and concessive are roughly equivalent, as are contrastive and antithetic, but Halliday and Hasan’s correction of wording type of corrective relation (contrast between two different formulations of the same phenomenon, signalled by at least, rather, I mean) appears to embrace both Quirk et al.’s reformulatory (rather, better, more accurately, more precisely; in other words, alias, alternatively) and replacive (again, alternatively, rather, better, worse, on the other hand) contrastive relations, while their other type of correction relation, correction of meaning (contrast between two alternative phenomena, signalled by instead, rather, on the contrary), appears to correspond to Quirk et al.’s antithetic relation (instead, on the contrary, on the other hand, in comparison, then, by contrast). The last of these antithetic relation markers, by contrast, though, is classed by Halliday and Hasan as a signal of an additive conjunctive relation - dissimilarity - subsumed by the more general additive relation of comparison.

The present study also makes a four-way division of contrast relations. One type is concession. The straightforwardly contrastive non-concessive relations are termed displacement and difference. Less straightforwardly, some markers normally associated with contrast introduce material which fulfils more of an additive function in the discourse, functioning in a similar way to markers of addition; the relation in these cases is termed additive contrast. Displacement, difference and additive contrast fall into Lakoff’s (1971) category of semantic opposition, as opposed to denial of expectation, which is asymmetric and concessive. However occurs as both a concessive and a difference marker, which supports Halliday and Hasan (1976), who class it as signalling both adversative proper - corresponding to concessive contrast - and contrastive contrast, which corresponds to Quirk et al.’s antithetic relation, whereas Quirk et al list however only as a concessive contrast marker. Halliday and Hasan consider it to be emphatic in both uses.

Only the concession and displacement relations are used in the history sample for contending rhetoric. But, taking a broad view of the range of concessive relations and their markers, the
vast majority of contrast signals in the history texts are interpreted as marking concession (17.2% versus 4.7% for other types of contrast), as can be seen from the following tables. The first shows the incidence in sentence-initial main clauses (that is, excluding clauses following colons, semi-colons, or medial co-ordinators), while the second compares the incidence in sentence-initial main clauses with that in main clauses following a colon or semi-colon and that in clauses following a co-ordinating conjunction or a comma.

Table 9.4
Distribution of the four types of contrast/concession relations across various positions in the sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strict Initial MT</th>
<th>Non-initial MT</th>
<th>Between S &amp; V</th>
<th>Between Aux &amp; Verb</th>
<th>Between V &amp; Comp</th>
<th>After Comp</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contrast</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.5
Incidence of contrast at three levels of text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Displacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Difference</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Additive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Concession</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contrast</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This predominance of concession is consistent with the view that history discourse argues backwards and forwards over the same ground, offering competing interpretations for the same data, and with Barton’s findings that claims and counter-claims are frequently contrasted within a two-part structure. In what follows, the non-concessive markers will be discussed first since they can be dealt with comparatively briefly, leaving the major part of this chapter for discussion of concession markers.

9.3 NON-CONCESSIVE CONTRAST

9.3.1 DISPLACEMENT

The displacement relation, which Halliday and Hasan term corrective, or the not...but
relation, is one between mutually exclusive items, unlike the difference and additive contrast relations which are between two states of affairs which co-exist. The range of contrast markers signalling the 15 occurrences of this relation in the history texts is indicated in Table X in Appendix 2. It is signalled most often by instead (7) but also by but (3), rather (2), far from (2), and by contrast (1). Eight occurrences, with by contrast, instead [of], or far from, are either sentence-initial or immediately after a colon or semi-colon. Three are cases of medial but, two of instead after a co-ordinator, one of far from + -ing between subject and verb, and one of instead between auxiliary and main verb. Instead appears five times as a conjunct, once with of and an -ing clause complement (M/B/1/13/3) and once after a past participle as shown here.

* Dubbed instead “Surrendered Enemy Personnel” (SEP) by the British and “Disarmed Enemy Forces” (DEF) by the Americans, these prisoners often endured extremely harsh conditions.

* Instead combines with but once to mark the same displacement relation.

* Numbering over 550,000, these prisoners were never recognized as POWs but instead were dubbed “Italian Military Internees” (IMIs), even though Italy was soon at war again on the Allied side.

* Each time but or rather marks this displacement relation, the preceding clause contains not, never or neither...nor, as in the above example. Quirk et al (p.935) refer to use of not in such cases, as in the following example, as a repudiation in positive terms of what has been said or implied by negation in the first conjoin.

* It could not control society directly through its own agents, as does a modern government, but had to rely on local elites who exercised and often appropriated its authority.

* This sentence occurs in the sub-section of the introduction section where the author refutes the interpretation of other historians which he has just presented in a review of the literature and summarised in the preceding paragraph. Here he implicitly repudiates their assumption, stated in the opening topic sentence of the paragraph, that there was a polarity between central authority and local elites. Elsewhere, the displacement relation is used for more overt ‘correction’ of interpretation by means of by contrast, far from and rather.

* In tracing the growth of the medieval political order, we have to set aside our preconception of a centralized state in which government is the action of executive authority on individuals and power structures. By contrast, the English state of the late Middle Ages developed not just as an emanation of royal authority, but in response to the pressures from a widening political society.
Far from entrenching on the power of the crown, the growth of the political nation enhanced it, adding new fiscal and military resources, extending its authority into the localities, and introducing new techniques into government.

Thus the central organs of state in late medieval England, far from remaining static and fossilized, were changing in response to the needs of an increasingly wide body of users.

From an examination of each of the four groups of justices which constituted the Yorkshire commissions of the peace, the same conclusion seems to be justified; prosopographical analysis supports the procedural evidence in suggesting that the changes in the composition and powers of the commission in this period neither surrendered the initiative in local government to the county gentry nor weakened its resistance to the claims of ambitious magnates; rather, they considerably increased the ability of the royal administration to enforce its will in the localities.

This is not to argue that the Labour party’s interest in capital taxation (whether through a capital levy or upgraded death duties) was misplaced; rather, it is to suggest that the evidence is weak that such taxes would have the function of easing working class resentment at the inequalities of income in industry.

The first two sentences occur in the first of the two paragraphs in the Harriss conclusion section. By contrast introduces the author’s interpretation of the historical state of affairs, which is in contrast with what he believes to be a mistaken perception. Far from with -ing clause complement paraphrases an assumption held by other historians which the author states to be wrong preparatory to the statement of his own interpretation in the main clause. The third sentence, also featuring far from, is the first sentence in a two-sentence conclusion to the first section of the body of the same article. The far from + -ing clause echoes the question posed in the introduction to this section, to which the sentence is a direct response as well as constituting a summary of the content of the section: Did this form an ossifying and unwieldy bureaucracy, or was it responsive to changing demands and developments in these late medieval centuries?

The last two sentences, both with rather following a semi-colon, are particularly highly foregrounded. The first opens the short opening paragraph of a comparatively long conclusion section, which provides the first and most compact and comprehensive summary of the argument and evidence set forth in the body of the article. This author also counters an interpretation by other researchers, which was set out in the introduction to the article. The last of the above sentence is the very last sentence of the body of the Whiting article, preceding a conclusion section consisting of only one paragraph. Here the author corrects a possible misconception of his own interpretation of the evidence.

Altogether, six of the fifteen instances of displacement contrast function to provide correction of interpretation. These include the only case where by contrast is used for
displacement contrast, the only two occurrences of rather and the only two occurrences, both in the Harriss text, of far from; both rather and far from are fairly marked stylistically and catch the attention of the reader. Four of the six support Barton’s observation that claims are often presented contrastively within a two-part structure as a response to previous scholarship, since, in each case, what is ‘displaced’ is an interpretation by other historians which the author is countering. Of the four contrast relations identified in this chapter, in these history texts it is only displacement and concession which serve this function of countering claims by other researchers.

9.3.2 DIFFERENCE

There are 42 explicit signals of the difference contrast relation, that is more than twice as many as markers of the displacement relation in the history texts. As shown in Table X in Appendix 2, they are however (15), but (14), by contrast (4), while (5), whereas (1) unlike (1), on the one hand/on the other hand (2). The difference indicated most frequently is that between states of affairs obtaining at different periods of time (16), as in the following two sentences.

Wa/B/1/2/7 Peter, lord Mauley VI, had been a consistent attender at sessions until his death in 1383, but a suitable successor was hard to find.

Wh/B/12/4-5 In both 1917 and 1919 there was some refusal to pay income tax along with the demand to increase the exemption limit. However, by the autumn of 1919 a royal commission on income tax with working class representatives was sitting which had the exemption limit under review, and the issue was regarded as in abeyance except by those in South Wales.

The second most frequently indicated difference is between points of view held by historical personages or groups (6), but this is confined to the MacKenzie and Whiting texts. The third, mostly in the Walker article, is between individuals or groups of people(4). Other differences indicated are between types of behaviour (2), geographical areas (1) and hypothetical conditions (1). There is only one example of this contrastive relation in the Harriss journal article, signalled by but (H/B/2/4/7).

While used as a marker of this relation occurs with almost equal frequency in preposed and postposed clauses. In final position, the while-clause can be so foregrounded that it is in balance with the preceding main clause.

H/I/1/3 Some recent writing offers new explanations for what is perceived as its crisis of royal authority, while other historians have discerned elements of strength.
The small number of Japanese POWs held in Allied camps in North America and the antipodes were treated in complete accordance with the Geneva Convention, while the hundreds of thousands of Allied prisoners in Japanese camps scattered throughout the Japanese Empire lived, worked and often died under highly unsatisfactory conditions.

These sentences support Quirk et al's (1985: 15.43) observation that, in final position, clauses of contrast, introduced by while, whereas and whilst, are very similar to clauses co-ordinated by but. The two medieval historians make the most use of this balanced sentence pattern, mainly for additive contrast; this contributes to the impression that they are more concerned with the style of their writing. A while-clause in initial position, on the other hand, is backgrounded and nearly always concessive. There are only three cases in the data of initial while-clauses realising the difference relation and one of an initial whereas-clause and one of these four has, additionally, an overtone of concession. Interestingly, all four are preceded by conjuncts (instead, moreover, yet) or a co-ordinator (but), but there are too few examples to determine whether this is a typical occurrence with this use of while-clauses.

And so the interest of the Labour movement in the taxation of business profits was much exaggerated by both business and government, but whereas on the trade union side this was born out of frustration that such taxes never seemed to hit the target, the economists in the Labour party did see them having some effect, but doubted whether the consequences were desirable.

By c.1395, however, both Savile and Constable had retired from active work as a justice and no single gentleman emerged in either Riding to take their place; instead, while the quorum justices began to take on more of the bench’s business, the task of attendance at quarter sessions was shared out amongst a wider group of gentry justices.

Moreover, while possible accountability was dismissed when Japan seemed likely to win (“a victorious Japan,” as one camp officer put it, “will not have to explain”), looming defeat raised the specter (sic) of fanatical officers ordering the slaughter of prisoners rather than allowing them to be liberated by advancing Allied forces.

The basis for such a quorum existed, in the regular pairing of William Hungate and Hugh Ardern, two local stewards and men of business who were the most consistent attenders at quarter sessions. Yet while Ardern was appointed to the quorum of every East Riding commission after June 1394, Hungate, little different in experience and reputation and very nearly as assiduous in his attendance at sessions, did not become his regular partner as a quorum justice until as late as May.

A concessive relation between the two sentences in the last example is signalled by yet, which marks the concessive contrast between the fact that there was a basis for a quorum and the fact that this basis was not exploited. The relation between the two clauses making up the second sentence, signalled by while, has been interpreted primarily as one of difference between the treatment of the two men, but there is also a suggestion of failed expectation as regards the treatment of the second given what is known about the treatment of the first.
Unlike the displacement contrast relation, the difference relation does not contribute to the contending rhetoric in the history sample. Rather than opposing the author’s interpretation to those of others, it indicates differences between various phenomena under study. Only in the following case is there some association with research methodology but there is no opposition between the author’s interpretation and that of other historians.

M/B/2/4/1 The question was, Would the generals go along with this? M/B/2/4/2 In the West, as we have seen, the German military establishment had been at least partially successful in resisting moves likely to lead to the abandonment of the Geneva Convention....M/B/2/5/1 Contemporary evidence, however, suggests that many senior officers fully shared the views of their fuhrer concerning the Bolshevik menace and took no exception to what was being proposed.

The main clause subject and verb in the third of these sentences makes explicit reference to research tools and processes, but the contrast signalled by however is between the situation in the West and that in the East as regards compliance with the Geneva Convention, that is, phenomena in the real-world which are the subject matter of the historian’s analysis. The use of the past tense in the projecting clause preceding the question results in ambiguity as to whether the question is one merely in the mind of the historian or whether it was in the mind of the participants in the historical events under study.

9.3.3 ADDITIVE CONTRAST

Additive contrast is not contentious either, but serves to introduce additional evidence in support of the author’s points. Markers of additive contrast, indicated in Table X in Appendix 2, are while (30), but (10), not only (1), conversely (1), and the correlatives on the one hand (1), on the other hand (2), not merely...but (1). On the other hand - is also treated as a signal of an additive conjunctive relation by Halliday and Hasan.

But is accompanied by another, reinforcing signal (still, also, neither) in three of the following sentences.

H/B/3/6/5 Few verdicts were irreversible, for not merely did the law offer a variety of actions with which to counter an opponent, but all such tactics - legal, quasi-legal and corrupt - might be designed ultimately to secure an advantageous settlement out of court.

H/B/2/1/4 How far this crisis reflected not merely royal incompetence but a structural failure of crown finance is one question to be faced; but it raises the still broader question of what changes occurred in the political assumptions on which the financial, and particularly the tax, structure of the state rested.
But there was also the matter of how the tax system should be regarded, whether optimistically as a means of redistributing wealth or pessimistically as being essentially powerless to soften the injustices of the market.

But neither was the crown any more successful in securing acceptance of direct taxation for normal peacetime government.

Competition for status and influence was expressed in challenges to land ownership, while conversely disputes over legal title involved status and invoked lordship.

Most of the occurrences of while in the corpus appear to signal addition more than they do contrast; all except one (Wa/B/4/3/3) of these additive contrast while-clauses are postposed.

The information in the clauses introduced by while in the examples below seems in no way subordinate to that in the immediately preceding clauses; the while-clauses make parallel contributions of supporting points, just as clauses introduced by and would. In the first example, for instance, the while-clause introduces an additional reason:

Henry IV's advisers experimented with the appointment of two other local men to the quorum, Richard Beverley and Walter Rudstane of Hayton, and quickly discarded them both. Though an active and influential local attorney, Beverley occupied too prominent and controversial a position within the burgess oligarchy of Beverley to be entirely trustworthy, while Rudstane's legal practice, largely confined to knightly families like the Ughtreds of Kexby, proved too modest to justify a regular place on the bench.

The growing predominance of Westminster practitioners on the Yorkshire benches was nevertheless short-lived: under Henry V, Richard Gascoigne was replaced as doyen of the West Riding bench by the lesser figure of John Daway, under steward of the duchy of Tickhill; while the partnership of Waldeby and Ellerker in the East Riding soon gave way to a quorum dominated once again by two local lawyers, Guy Rouclif and Robert Rudstane.

The commonest configurations in Yorkshire nevertheless form two of the most characteristic patterns to be found in the country at large: the domination of the North Riding bench by the quorum justices found a parallel in both Kent and Hampshire, for example, while the close working relationship between a single knightly justice and a couple of lesser companions, observable in the east and West Riding during the 1390s was replicated in counties like Cambridgeshire and Oxfordshire.

War also removed troublemakers, while its cessation frequently brought crime waves or feudal disorder.

In fact, while could be replaced by and in each of these sentences; the motivation for using while instead in the first two sentences is merely that the connection is between parallel circumstances relating to two different entities rather than between circumstances relating to the same entity. In the third example, the use of and would be more suggestive of a causal connection than while. It has been noted that and can express a multiplicity of semantic relationships between clauses (Eiler 1985), while connectors associated with contrast are capable of varying degrees of semantic blending (Gosden 1992; Quirk et al 1985). These sentences from the sample texts, in which there is minimal difference in selecting either and
or *while*, suggest there is also semantic blending between addition and contrast.

The medieval historians make notably more use of *while* with this function. Of the thirty occurrences, eleven appear in the Harriss article, fifteen in the Walker article, only four in the MacKenzie article and none at all in the Whiting article. The balanced sentence phenomenon achieved by the use of *while*, as noted above, means that such frequent use of sentences with *while* in non-initial position makes a considerable contribution to conveying the impression of a more belletristic style in the two medieval history articles.

### 9.4 CONCESSION

Concession has been described as 'a particularly fruitful area to increase our understanding of the processes of clause-combining in grammar and discourse' (Harriss 1988). It is generally seen as involving a sense of failed expectation - an opposition between the expectation and the situation which actually occurs. Winter (1994) treats a concessive relationship as a combination of his logical sequence and matching relations: the second proposition is in a matching relation of incompatibility with an unstated proposition which would, if made explicit, give a possible (expected) logical consequence of the first.

Grote *et al.* (1997) identify three parts to a concession: A - the *although* part, B - the *because* part, and Not-C - the *nevertheless* part. A implies C while B implies Not-C, the latter relation being presented as the stronger; Not-C holds despite the fact that A holds. In the first of the following examples, B is not stated, while in the second, Not-C, perhaps the proposition that he should be employed, is not made explicit:

(A) *Despite the bad weather, (Not-C) we had a good time*

(A) *Granted; he failed the exam; (B) but he's a really good speaker.*

Grote *et al.* call the first a case of *violated-implication*, and treat the contrastive B statement in the second as a kind of substitution. The common ground shared by A and B - the unmentioned proposition C - distinguishes such cases of concession from the contrastive relations termed *displacement* and *difference* earlier in this chapter, where there is no C.

Grote *et al* see concession relations as consisting of a main and a minor act, the latter not
necessarily A. In the first sentence below, A performs the main act, informing.

Windows is cheap. That doesn’t mean I bought it, though, because it has many bugs.

The second sentence performs the minor act of denying the implicature between A and C (I bought it) by stating, as a kind of afterthought, Not C (I didn’t buy it) and the reason, B (it has many bugs). Winter (1994:128) notes that the writer has a choice of either signalling to the reader that a proposition is merely a concession and not an assertion, thus downgrading the informational weight of the conceded proposition, or introducing it simply as an unmarked proposition and only retrospectively categorising it as a concession in relation to the following assertion, thus maintaining a more equal balance of weight. Grote et al observe that, unlike concessive markers such as although, non-concessive markers such as but do not distinguish between the main and the minor act of the concession but give the same status to each element of the contrast, though a distinction may be made on the basis of linear order, with the final clause being the more important one. A general contrast marker such as but does not make explicit the additional nuance of failed expectation, but when the context permits a concessive interpretation a contrast can blend into a concession.

Drawing on the main act-minor act distinction and variations in linear order, Grote et al arrive at three discourse motives for conceding: to convince the hearer by paraphrasing previously mentioned counter-arguments or anticipating and conceding those not yet uttered while at the same time insisting on the dominance of one’s own argument (Concede 1); to prevent false implicature when introducing a new fact to the discourse which the hearer is not assumed to hold a specific attitude towards, by anticipating the inferences the hearer might draw and denying propositions not implied (Concede 2); to inform about surprising events and emphasise the unusualness of a correlation of events, without any notion of increasing positive regard or preventing false implicatures (Concede 3), which contrasts with Mann and Thompson’s (1988) view that any concession is a means of increasing the reader’s positive regard for a proposition. Concede 1 is viewed as an internal discourse relation and argumentative, Concede 3 as external or concerned with the subject matter, while Concede 2 can be either, depending on whether it is used in argument or for describing a state of affairs. However, it is difficult to see the difference between the first of the following examples, which they classify as Concede 1 and the second, which they classify as Concede 3.

Although the weather was bad, we nevertheless had a good time.
Although it was December, no snow fell and the temperature rose to 20 degrees.

Grote et al recognise a wide range of markers of concession, which they classify into three groups: conjunctive adjuncts (e.g. nevertheless, however, still, anyway), co-ordinating (e.g. but, yet), and subordinating conjunctions (e.g. although, while, even if, even though) and prepositions (e.g. despite, in spite of, notwithstanding). Rudolph (1988), on the other hand, does not class but, yet and however as markers of concession, maintaining that a concessive relation can only be signalled by a subordinating conjunction or preposition, while a contrast signalled by a co-ordinating conjunction is an adversative relation (presumably she would not recognise Grote et al’s substitution type of relation as concession). But is the most frequently used marker of a concessive relation in the history texts, occurring 64 times with this function. The next most frequent is (although (48), followed by however (27), yet (22), and while (18).

According to Grote et al, the selection of concessive contrast marker is constrained by the linear order and type of syntactic construction (hypotactic or paratactic) realising the concessive relation. The given information presented by Concede 1 is typically realised by preposed hypotactic constructions introduced by subordinating conjunctions, unless the counter-argument is complex, requiring independent clauses linked by a co-ordinating conjunction or separate sentences linked by a conjunctive adjunct. Prepositional phrases do not allow for the realisation of mood and modality which indicates the author’s own attitude towards the denied argument. Concede 2 involves a kind of afterthought, realised by an independent clause or a separate sentence, and therefore involving either a conjunctive adjunct or a co-ordinating concessive conjunction. With Concede 3 the minor act is usually mentioned first since it increases the relevance of communicating the main act. Prepositional phrases may be used, unless the minor act is complex, in which case it is realised by an independent sentence linked to the main act by means of a conjunctive adjunct. The final choice of a specific marker from any group depends on factors such as intensification, register, formality and whether or not any additional meaning, such as condition (even if) is involved. In the light of these claims for linear order, it is somewhat surprising that Greenbaum and Nelson (1996) found a marginal preference for end position for hypotactic concession clauses.

9.4.1 CONCESSION REALISED OTHER THAN BY MARKED THEMES

The present chapter is mainly concerned with marked themes and final free modifiers, but
there are a few cases in the history sample where concession is realised by unmarked theme, nonprototypical themes and modal auxiliaries.

**M/I/2/3** What analysis there has been of captor policy, moreover, has in many cases been somewhat biased, and on occasion quite xenophobic.

**H/B/1/1** If central government is seen in terms of the development of institutions, it is true that the main period of innovation was over by 1250, and was followed by one of professionalization and definition.

**Wh/B/2/5/2** It is true that a cost-of-living index which embodied taxable goods would assist at least a partial shifting of the taxes concerned, but these sliding scales did not necessarily determine the movement of pay very closely.

**Wh/B/3/6/5** It is true that the Labour M.P. William Graham, speaking in 1920 on the corporation tax introduced in that year's budget, suggested that 'it may be necessary in future for governments with a large social outlook to extend this tax' but such pronouncements were rare.

**M/B/3/3/1** There is a good deal of truth to the view that a belief system alien to the Western tradition was responsible for the ill-treatment of Allied POWs, but it needs to be emphasized that this was by no means an inevitable development.

**H/B/2/7/6** We may take different views on whether that was desirable or not, but the fact that English public finance represented and amalgam of the interests and actions of both crown and subjects reveals much about the dynamic of political development in the late Middle Ages.

**Wh/B/1/4/3** The loss from raising the tax limit to leave out the working class might have been small, but the true cost was much higher than £8 million, nearer £25 million, because of the effect of carrying newly granted allowances higher up the income scale if the exemption limit was to be raised.

All except the first two of these sentences feature *but* used concessively, constituting a second signal for the same concessive relation. In fact, the absence of *but* in the second sentence leads to hesitation in interpreting it as a case of concession: only the attentive reader is alert to the implicit **Not-C** - there were no developments worth speaking of in the period under study, which the author disputes.

### 9.4.2 CONCESSIVE CLAUSES

As indicated in Table X in *Appendix 2*, and contrary to Greenbaum and Nelson’s (1996) findings, hypotactic concessive clauses occur three times more often as marked themes than as final free modifiers. They are usually introduced by *although*, but also frequently by *while*, though only when sentence initial. Other subordinators which introduce concessive clauses, both MT and FFM, though only once as FFM in each case, are *even though*, *even if*, *if* and *despite the fact that*. MacKenzie and Whiting make much less use of hypotactic concessive clauses than Harriss and Walker. The concessive clauses they do use are more often *while*-clauses than *although*-clauses; in contrast, Harriss and Walker use *although*-
clauses much more often. However, as already noted, the latter make more frequent use of FFM while-clauses for contrastive difference and addition, which conveys an impression of balanced sentence structure.

9.4.2.1 (Al)though-clauses

Contrary to Greenbaum and Nelson's finding for concessive clauses in general, in these history texts preposed (al)though-clauses significantly outnumber those postposed. They also differ from Thompson's (1985) purpose clauses in two ways. They can have scope over more than one sentence in both initial and final position whereas only initial purpose clauses function in this way. And while initial purpose clauses have prospective scope and final purpose clauses have retrospective scope, the reverse is almost always the case with (al)though-clauses. Thirteen with scope over more than one sentence have a summarising function and occur at text boundaries, though only in three cases in topic sentences. Altogether, fifteen of the total of 48 (al)though clauses (31 MTs, 17 FFMs) occur in either the opening or closing sentences of paragraphs. Several (al)though clauses in the Harriss text make explicit something implied in the preceding text, but the majority in the history sample serve to pack new information into the text. Walker uses (al)though clauses far more than the other three authors, accounting for 27 (16 MTs, 12 FFMs) of the total of 48. Only 8 of the 48 are in the modern history texts, with only one of these in the MacKenzie article.

Fewer than half (14) of the 31 MT (al)though clauses start with though rather than although, as opposed to all except one of the 17 FFMs. The slightly shorter word attracts less attention, constituting less of an interruption, and is therefore more appropriate later in the sentence. Three MT (al)though -clauses (Wa/B/3/5/10, Wa/B/4/8/3, M/B/1/27/1) and one FFM clause (H/I/3/1) are verbless while one MT (Wh/B/1/16/4) and one FFM (Wa/C/6/6) are -en clauses. In one (al)though -clause though is preceded by a fronted complement:

Wa/B/4/6/11 Modest though such changes appear, they contributed to the complaint of the Commons in October 1399 that justices of the peace had been appointed per brocage.4

This is to be distinguished from the five cases where though is used as a conjunct in the main clause realising Not-C, as in the following example.

H/B/2/3/6 Essentially, though, the tax system became the victim of its own success.

Table 23 in Appendix 2 shows the thirteen (al)though clauses (8 MTs, 5 FFMs) with scope
over more than one sentence, three with a span over an entire section (2 MTs, 1 FFM), five over an entire paragraph, and five over a paragraph segment. All occur in either initial or final sentences in these stretches of text. The MTs have retrospective scope while all except one FFM have prospective scope. Only one of the MTs occurs in a topic sentence (Wa/B/1/3/1); having retrospective scope, it does not participate in the specification of the topic but provides a cohesive link with the previous paragraph. FFM (al)though clauses, on the other hand, having the capacity for prospective scope, can contribute to signalling of the topic.

The two MTs with retrospective scope over an entire section or more occur in summary paragraphs serving as conclusions, in which every sentence summarises an aspect of the content of the preceding section: Wa/C/1/3 occurs in the highly foregrounded first paragraph of the conclusion section, which summarises the author's argument, and so has retrospective scope over the entire body of the article; Wa/B/1/5/2 occurs in the summarising concluding paragraph of the first section of the body of the article. Five of the MTs occur at paragraph boundaries. Two of these are in paragraph-final sentences (H/I/3/6, Wh/B/1/16/4) which retrospectively summarise the content of their paragraphs; H/I/3/6 provides strong closure for the paragraph by reiterating the information in the opening topic sentence, with the MT (al)though clause mirroring the content of an FFM (al)though clause in the opening sentence.

The other three (al)though clauses at paragraph boundaries occur in paragraph-initial sentences: the one in M/B/1/27/1 indirectly provides evaluative comment on the content of the previous paragraph by modifying the main clause subject of its own sentence, which is an anaphoric label together with demonstrative this which encapsulates the content of the previous paragraph; those in H/B/3/10/1 and Wa/B/1/3/1 each summarise the content of part of the preceding paragraph. Wa/B/1/3/1 is a particularly prominent sentence being the topic sentence of its own paragraph, with the MT concessive clause providing a cohesive link with the previous paragraph. The remaining MT (al)though clause with scope extending beyond its own sentence, in Wa/B/4/6/9, occurs midway in its paragraph and functions as the closing sentence of the first part of the paragraph. It contains a summarising anaphoric label together with such in its own clause, and, like M/B/1/27/1, it provides evaluative comment on the content of this stretch of text.

Two FFM (al)though clauses in paragraph-initial topic sentences provide information about the paragraph topic. Wa/B/2/1/1 is a major topic sentence, for an entire section of the body of the article, with the FFM concessive clause both summarising the content of the section
and providing a link with the previous section by participating in a relation of comparison. H/I/3/1 provides a more general statement of the topic proposition for the paragraph, a more specific statement appearing in the penultimate sentence, while, as already indicated, the final sentence reiterates the content of the opening sentence and begins with an MT (although clause whose content mirrors that in the FFM (although clause in the opening sentence. It is the FFM concessive clause in the opening sentence which has content specific to this paragraph, in the form of a summary of the paragraph; the preceding main clause repeats the topic proposition of the previous paragraph but relates it to a new topic entity - a different historian. Two other FFM (although clauses occur in paragraph-medial sentences (H/I/4/10, Wa/B/1/1/7) which provide sub-topic statements for parts of paragraphs; the FFM concessive clause in the latter has content which is echoed in the final sentence of the paragraph. The remaining FFM (although clause with scope over several sentences occurs in a paragraph-final sentence, Wh/B/1/23/9 and is the only one to have retrospective scope, over its entire paragraph.

Overall, as shown in Table 24 in Appendix 2, fifteen (although clauses occur in either the opening (5 MTs, 4 FFM)s or closing (4 MTs, 2 FFM)s sentences of paragraphs. The ones with scope over several sentences are indicated by asterisks; they either summarise or provide evaluative comment on the content of stretches of text. Of the remaining seven, the MT in the paragraph-final Wa/B/4/6/13 paraphrases information in the (although clause in marked theme in the immediately preceding sentence. But the other six, like the great majority of (although clauses, serve to pack additional new information into the text, in the form of conceded points downplayed to throw the author’s main assertion into relief in the case of MTs (17), and of qualification often with a degree of prominence conferred by final position in the case of FFM/s (12). Tables 25 and 26 in Appendix 2 indicate the various text strategies realised by means of (although clauses.

The five summarising FFM (although clauses with scope over several sentences which occur in opening sentences also introduce new information. However, the remaining 12 FFM (although clauses, which do not have scope beyond their own sentences, are able to carry much more information as they are not constrained in length by the need to perform discourse-organising functions for which shorter text segments permit clearer signalling. They appear to function as qualifications of the content of their preceding main clauses, and at the same time as a means of packing as much information into the text as possible. They often have the character of an afterthought, though Grote et al associate afterthoughts with
independent clauses linked to the preceding clauses by either concessive adjuncts or coordinating concessive conjunctions. Even an FFM (al)though clause in a concluding paragraph which summarises an entire section (Wa/B/1/5/3) does not itself have a summarising function, but evaluates part of this content by putting it into perspective in relation to a state of affairs in a later period of history than that which is under study in the article.

Wa/B/1/5/3 The rapid accretion, at different times, of servants of Alexander Neville and Henry Percy on the North and East Riding benches indicates that some magnates also desired to exercise a more permanent supervision over the work of the justices than they could obtain by their personal presence alone, though their concern for the personnel of the commissions as yet lacked the jealous vigilance it was to acquire in the Yorkist period.

All except one of the MT clauses which add new information are cohesively linked with preceding text, either by means of a co-reference device in the concessive clause itself or by means of an accompanying thematic element making up a composite marked theme, as in Wa/B/1/2/3. Thus the MT (al)though clause in paragraph-initial Wh/B/1/4/1 features lexical cohesion with the preceding text. In paragraph-final Wa/B/3/3/9 both the initial concessive clause adding new information and the main clause have cohesive links with the rhyme of the previous sentence. Though the concessive clause only enters into this local cohesive link, the content of the main clause provides illustration of the topic proposition stated in the paragraph-opening sentence and its form, a cleft construction, in alerting the reader to the fact that the content is significant, points to the relevance of this content to the topic proposition. The cleft construction, together with the echo of the content of the opening topic sentence, provides strong closure for the paragraph. The exception to the cohesive linking between MT (al)though clauses adding new content and the preceding text, is in paragraph-initial Wh/B/1/17/1, where there is only a cataphoric link with the main clause of its own sentence, by means of the pronoun it. This clause causes something of a hiccup in the flow of the text as it is a little difficult at first to grasp that it is co-referential with the entire main clause rather than a noun.

That MTs adding new information constitute the majority of the MT (al)though clauses is due to the fact that Walker favours this text strategy so much. Harriss, on the other hand, makes more use of MT (al)though clauses to make explicit something which the reader might be expected to infer from the preceding text, and is the only one of the four authors who uses this text strategy. For example, in H/B/2/2/3 the concessive clause makes explicit the inference that taxation developed as a wartime measure could not be sustained at wartime
level indefinitely. Four MT concessive clauses make bridging inferences explicit: in H/B/1/6/8 between the council’s function as provider of advice to the king and the king’s discretion as to how much business he remitted to the council; in H/B/1/6/13 between the council’s function as provider of advice to the king and its being answerable only to the king; in H/B/2/2/7 between popular opposition to taxation, the burden of taxation and economic hardship; and in H/B/3/7/6 between gentry violence and intimidation.

There is a difference in the degree of backgrounding according to whether the FFM is T-unit final or sentence-final. All but three (H/B/1/7/1, Wa/B/3/1/3, Wa/B/4/8/1) of the FFM’s are sentence final rather than merely T-unit final. Two of these three occur in compound(-complex) sentences linked by co-ordinating conjunctions (for, and), for being treated in the present analysis as a co-ordinating conjunction for the reasons already given; the other (Wa/B/4/8/1) occurs in a sentence in which three T-units, two with subject ellipsis, are linked to one another in a list by semi-colons, the list being linked to a preceding T-unit by a colon.

H/B/1/7/1 Much in the same vein could also be said of parliament, though less needs to be, for its emergence is recognised as highly characteristic of the late medieval polity.

Wa/B/3/1/3 Until November 1389, the peace commission lacked any statutory authority to determine offences, though in practice many certainly did so, and the powers of the quorum were limited merely to the hearing of indictments.

Wa/B/4/8/1 Whenever statutory powers were conferred upon the commissions of the peace, the Yorkshire justices were quick to exercise them: they assigned coroners and heard the appeals of approvers, though both actions were technically reserved to the sheriff; delivered royal goals; remitted suspected felons to prison by their record; and exacted sureties of the peace.

These non-sentence-final concessive clauses have the character of asides. In contrast, the sentence-final concessive clauses have more force. They are more markedly separate from the main clause, provide closure for the sentence, and the reader has more leisure to linger on them, since all the other material in the sentence is out of the way. They are particularly foregrounded when the concessive clause is a lengthy one, carrying a substantial amount of new information, as in the following example.

Wa/B/4/1/2 These were uncontroversial demands, on which both the royal administration and the parliamentary Commons were prepared to agree, though the Commons sought, unsuccessfully, to impose certain further restrictions upon the type of justice appointed at the start of Richard II’s majority, chiefly that magnate stewards were to be excluded from the commissions and that the justices were to be “assigned and nominated” in Parliament rather than, as was usual, chosen by the Chancellor and the Council.

Some MT (although) clauses are also fairly heavy in terms of length and information content.
Wa/B/4/2/7: although Sir Thomas Brounflete's duties as controller and keeper of Henry IV's wardrobe detained him in London for most of the year and caused him to shift his principal residence to Bedfordshire, he was still careful to maintain his worship in his native East Riding by continuing to attend occasional sessions of the peace there.

But with (al)though clauses in theme position, both the information content and the grammatical status are subordinate. They realise the author's strategy of conceding but downplaying a point in order to throw his own, main point, into relief. Several of the FFMs, on the other hand, when sentence-final in a topic sentence, are foregrounded and participate in establishing the topic of a paragraph or even a section of text.

The majority of MT (al)though clauses in the sample, particularly those with the function of packing additional information into the text, appear to satisfy Grote et al's definition of Concede 3 concessions, since they inform about the events in the historical period under study. But presumably they would classify five (H/I/3/6, Wa/I/3/6, Wa/B/4/6/8, Wa/B/4/6/12, Wa/C/2/5) which refer directly or indirectly to the research process or the views of other historians as Concede I, an 'argumentative' type of concession employed when the goal is to convince someone of a particular point. Yet it could be said that all the concessive clauses in the texts perform a role in convincing the reader of the thesis of the journal article by participating in the marshalling of evidence for and against the overall argument. It is difficult to know where to draw the line between what Grote et al call internal and external uses of these clauses. A history journal article is as much a vehicle for informing about new facts gleaned from research as one for arguing a case; argument provides a rhetorical framework, or organising principle, for this new information.

The FFM (al)though clauses appear in some cases to have more of the character of an afterthought, particularly when they are short, as in H/B/1/7/1 and Wa/C/6/6. Grote et al (1997) view their Concede 2 type of concessions as involving a kind of afterthought, denying a false implicature after the main act, with the denied implicature stated in an independent clause, either paratactically linked to the preceding clause or in a separate clause complex, and the concessive relation accordingly realised by either a co-ordinating concessive conjunction or a conjunctive adjunct. Yet of the two illustrations they give for this type of concession, one features a hypotactic clause linked by though, which is not dissimilar to some of the examples of FFM concessive clauses in the present data.

*The classrooms are small, though not unsuitable.*
This inconsistency may reflect the conflict discussed in Chapter 3 between the traditional association of hypotactic grammatical status with subordinate information status and the intuition that sometimes hypotactic clauses in end position appear to function more like paratactic clauses. It is difficult to classify the (al)though clauses in the present data according to Grote et al's taxonomy without seeing their analysis of a greater number of illustrations, particularly from formal writing.

In summary, the most common function of (al)though clauses in the data is to pack additional information into the text, but only because Walker favours this use of these clauses so much. Clauses realising this function have the character of concession when they occur as marked theme and qualification when in final position. In marked theme, the importance of the content of the (al)though clause is downplayed and that of the assertion made by the main clause correspondingly enhanced; there can be different degrees of prominence in the case of FFM (al)though clauses according to whether they are T-unit or sentence-final, whether they are lexicogrammatically and informationally `heavy', and whether they occur in prominent sentences such as paragraph-initial topic sentences or paragraph-final sentences which also end major sections of text. Other (al)though clauses have discourse-organising functions: they either encapsulate the content of stretches of text by summarising or commenting on it, or they make explicit something that has previously been implicit. The latter text strategy is employed only by Harriss. Indeed, (al)though clauses are used very infrequently by the two modern history journal article authors. The density and function differences in the deployment of these clauses can thus be viewed as a style marker distinguishing different authors within a comparatively narrow range of genre and register.

Contrary to Greenbaum and Nelson's (1996) finding for concessive clauses in general, there is a significant difference between the number of concessive clauses in initial position and those in final position in the present data, with the former predominating. Contrary to Thompson's (1985) findings for initial and final purpose clauses, both initial and final (al)though clauses can have scope over more than one sentence, and initial (al)though clauses do not establish context frames with a prospective span but operate only retrospectively; it is the final (al)though clauses which generally have prospective scope. Unsurprisingly, the clauses with retrospective or prospective scope over several sentences occur at text boundaries, where, if they are FFM, they can participate in establishing the topic of the following text, and if they are MTs they can provide a cohesive link with preceding text.
while the main clause establishes the topic.

9.4.2.2 While-clauses

The correlation between initial placement of while clauses and concessive meaning is very strong in the data, though, as has been seen, an initial while clause can also signal the contrast relation of difference and it is not always easy to determine which of these two types of contrast relation is being realised. Concession is more obviously paramount in the following example.

A concessive sense is apparent if reversal of the linear order of the while clause and the main clause is attempted.

In the second version, while takes on the character of a co-ordinating conjunction rather than a subordinating conjunction, and the proposition realised by the clause it introduces appears more like nucleus than satellite information. The meaning realised by while here seems more that of compatible co-existence and the notion of concession is lost; the relation is that of additive contrast.

A while-clause in initial position is more backgrounded than one in final position, though less so than an (al)though clause in initial position. Because of its origins and continuing use as a connective signalling the temporal relation of co-occurrence between states of affairs, while gives the impression of less emphasis on the negation of an entailment relation between one proposition and another than is signalled by (al)though and of leaning more towards a sense of two states of affairs co-existing.

There are no cases in the data of non-finite clauses being introduced by while, and only one
case of a verbless clause.

While unable to do much about the Sagan affair - where authority was taken out of Wehrmacht hands by Himmler - or about Bormann's orders to party officials and the Volkischer Beobachter piece, OKW managed to tie up the order to withhold Wehrmacht protection from downed airmen and thus helped prevent wholesale murder (as the swelling Stalag Luft population testified).

Slightly more than half of the concessive while clauses (11) carry new information. Three (H/B/2/2/11, Wh/B/3/4/1, Wh/B/3/8/5) summarise information already conveyed earlier in the text. One of these summarising while clauses is in the opening sentence of a paragraph, Wh/B/3/4/1, and summarises the content of the previous five-sentence paragraph; the one in Wh/B/3/8/5 summarises the content of the first four sentences of its own paragraph as well as that of the previous seven-sentence paragraph; and that in H/B/2/2/11 is the last sentence in a nine-sentence sequence that forms the main part of the paragraph. The remaining five (H/1/8/4, H/B/3/5/11, Wa/B/1/4/15, Wa/C/2/2, M/B/1/12/3) express information that might be expected the reader could infer or assume from what has gone before, though in at least two cases (Wa/C/2/2, M/B/1/12/3) this might appear to be stretching a point. In five cases (Wa/B/1/3/10, Wa/B/1/4/15, Wa/B/4/2/1, Wa/C/2/2, M/B/1/28/6), there is more or less explicit reference to the interpretation of evidence by historians, and in (H/I/8/4) Harriss employs a concessive while clause in one of the paragraphs where he is most obviously refuting the views of other historians. Thus, concessive while-clauses perform the same functions as those already seen to be performed by initial (al)though-clauses, as can be seen in Table 25 in Appendix 2.

9.4.2.3 Even though, if, even if, whatever

Even though realises reference to established fact, and so can add new information to the text, whereas if, even if and whatever are conditional. Even though gives emphasis to the concessive contrast as even expresses a scalar extreme; it puts the emphasis more on the failed expectation sense of concession: the assertion made in the main clause holds whatever the A.. There are only three examples in the data: one MT and two FFMs.

Even though there had been sharp reductions in wages during 1920-2, this deflation was regarded as abnormal:....

Numbering over 550,000 these prisoners were never recognized as POWs but instead were dubbed 'Italian Military Internees' (IMIs), even though Italy was soon at war again on the Allied side.
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At a time when business interests were keen to reverse the trend of direct taxation being responsible for a greater share of revenues, this view of the tax authorities of the risks of such development was an important advance for labour, even though the ability to resist was unevenly spread across the workforce.

These all introduce new information into the text, but, being comparatively short, do not pack in as much information as many other concessive clauses. But the MT even though clause is more foregrounded than MT (al)though clauses and appears more argumentative and forceful, while the FFM even if clauses attract comparatively little attention.

A non-prototypical equivalent of even though is the following:

Much as they would have liked, the Tudor monarchs were unable to change the medieval character of direct taxation as occasional and extraordinary, and establish it on a permanent, non-consensual basis.

Harriss (1988:71) notes a semantic spectrum ranging from causal clauses, in which the causal link is asserted, via conditional sentences, in which the causal link is hypothesised, to concessive clauses, in which the causal link between protasis and apodosis is denied, and that concessive conditionals, signalled by even if, provide the semantic link between conditionals and concessives. However, as indicated in Section 9.1.3 on conditionals, there are clear instances in the sample texts of if by itself, rather than in conjunction with even, being used concessively.

And if it was "subverted" in their interests, it was also refined and developed by them.

If this seems unremarkable, granted the considerable local influence the £1,500-worth of annuities charged on the Duchy of Lancaster estates in the county brought him, it should not obscure the skill with which Henry IV managed to marry the local aspirations of the gentry to his own cause.

These two examples do not support Sweetser’s (1990:136) contention that in all examples of concessive if the protasis represents a relatively extreme possibility from among the possible conditions which can be expected to occur in opposition to the truth or the fulfilment of the apodosis, involving an inherent feeling of scale, as with even if examples. But she is right in stating that "only pragmatic context can determine the choice between a normal and a concessive if reading, since it is a pragmatic question whether the set of circumstances expressed in a given protasis are favorable or unfavorable to a given apodosis'.

Sweetser cites Haiman’s claim that concessive if clauses usually follow their apodoses but seem freed from this ordering restraint if they are given a "contemptuous squeal" intonation.
pattern: strong stress and high pitch on the final portion of the concessive clause, followed by an abrupt pitch drop in the apodosis. This avoids backgrounding of the initial clause and makes it simultaneously emphasised and dubitative. Sweetser finds the same marked intonation contour to be common to both if and even if clauses, but the examples in the present data, albeit very limited in number, do not support this view. The if-clauses in the above examples do not require a 'contemptuous squeal' intonation contour, which is consistent with the fact that they do not realise extreme conditions. They each reasonably concede a point while the main clause nevertheless maintains the author's own argument. It is true, though, that they are not backgrounded to the same extent as the MT (al)though clauses in the data; there is more of a balance between the initial and the main clause, similar to that in sentences with an initial while-clause.

Both of these concessive if-clauses have epistemic meaning in that they realise reference to the process of historical research. In the first the quotation marks indicate reference to the negative interpretation of developments in this period by other historians, while in the second reference is made to potential evaluation by the reader of evidence just given. Sweetser would presumably label these speech-act conditionals, and the first probably also a metalinguistic conditional because of the quotation marks. Both can be classed as examples of interpersonal metadiscourse. They would seem to illustrate Hunston's (2000:179) observation that some concessions are a type of attribution because they are treated by the writer as if they had been uttered by a debating partner.

The subordinator even if combines the concessive force of even with the conditional force of if. Sweetser notes that even forces a conditional meaning because it is an explicitly scalar expression. She reinterprets Haiman's 'contemptuous squeal' as 'the emphasis and tonal rise which mark the presentation of an assertion which is perceived as extreme, or end of scale, in some way'. There are only three examples of even if-clauses in the data: two MTs and one FFM.

H/B/1/6/12 Even if that is misleading, a council was commonly acknowledged to be a necessary adjunct to royal rule and its function in the polity was to act as a bridge between the king and his subjects.

Wh/B/2/6/8 Even if there was to be a diminution of real pay, (Quote)

Wh/B/2/6/11 But, increasingly, pragmatic questions of power and the economy had become part of the argument: would the trade unions be able to shift the tax by putting up wages, and what would the costs of such efforts be, even if ultimately successful?
The first of these, like the second concessive *if* clause above, is an example of interpersonal metadiscourse. The short verbless FFM *even if* clause in the third sentence is no more foregrounded than the MT *even if* clauses.

*Whatever* is used to introduce universal conditional-concessive clauses, of which there are two examples in the sample:

H/B/3/11/3 *Whatever case can be made for this in the thirteenth century, after 1350 the operation of lordship within political society seems far more complex.*

M/B/1/6/1 *Whatever interpretation was made of the ambiguous clauses of the Geneva Convention concerning the securing of prisoners on the battlefield, reprisals against POWs were specifically banned.*

These seven conditional/concessive clauses, with *if, even if,* or *whatever,* do not function to pack additional information into the text. Three (Wh/B/2/6/8, Wh/B/2/6/11, M/B/1/6/1) are concerned with real world conditions in the historical period under study. The other four are concerned with the disciplinary research process of analysis and interpretation. Two (H/B/1/6/12, Wa/C/4/5) of these four anticipate negative evaluation by the reader of preceding statements or suggestions made by the author. One (H/B/1/5/11) refers to known interpretation by other historians, and one (H/B/3/11/3) refers to any potential interpretation, whether by the author or by other historians. These four seem to be candidates for Grote *et al*’s Concede I type of concession, which is internal and interpersonal, conceding points to opponents, rather than external, concerned only with the factual subject matter of the analysis.

### 9.4.3 OTHER HYPOTACTIC CONCESSIVE ITEMS

Concessive prepositional phrases are infrequent in these texts and are all used for contrasts between the information the author is presenting rather than between his own claims and those of fellow researchers. They are all MTs, apart from a *despite* phrase embedded in a complex FFM *-ing* clause in the Walker article (Wa/B/1/1/10). Concessive prepositional phrases prototypically begin with *despite,* and two of the three functioning as MTs in the data feature this concession marker. One is in the MacKenzie text and realises a proposition which would be part of the general knowledge of the reader rather than informing the reader of new facts.
Despite their status as racial enemies, these prisoners - in stark contrast to the victims of the Holocaust - were segregated and forced to wear the star of David but otherwise were usually treated no differently than their gentile compatriots.

MacKenzie also has the only occurrence in the texts of despite being used in a way in which it can be viewed as forming part of a complex subordinating conjunction.

Hence, despite the fact that in both the Commonwealth and the United States the Japanese were regarded as analogous to monkeys and that at the front helpless Japanese soldiers were often killed out of hand, Allied governments did everything possible to run POW camps for the very small number of Japanese captured and sent back in the early years of the war according to the convention and employed every possible channel to communicate this to Tokyo.

While the first part of this clause might present information which is not new to some readers, the second part is more informative. The other despite phrase is in the Harriss text:

Despite these inherent limitations, magnate lordship was both attractive and influential.

Here it can be seen that concessive phrases can also have retrospective scope and a summarising function. Harriss has another concessive MT prepositional phrase with no explicit signal of concession:

At the cost of some elasticity, the crown was guaranteed speedy collection and full enjoyment of its taxes, with administrative costs under 3 per cent.

This concessive phrase does introduce new information but it is very much backgrounded because of the brevity of the phrase, as is the concessive force of the phrase, not only because of the brevity but also because of the lack of an explicit marker of concession. MacKenzie has a concessive MT -ing clause with no explicit marker of concession:

Overcoming his fears of racial pollution, Hitler ordered that “even the labor capacity of Russian prisoners of war must be placed at the disposal of the German war economy on a large scale,” thereby raising the novel prospect of “adequate nutrition”.

This could be paraphrased as Despite his fears of racial pollution but the participle overcoming results in a subtle difference in meaning, suggesting the fears are less prominent in Hitler’s mind, and thus resulting in less concessive force. There is an -ing clause beginning with despite in the Harriss text which, though in final position, is embedded within a final -ing clause realising reason:
Again, it is better defined by its functions than by its institutional form: its authority to legislate, tax and present grievances on behalf of the realm being constitutionally recognised, despite it having no autonomous existence and only a rudimentary organisation.

Postposing the concessive -ing clause permits the reason for the assertion in the main clause to be kept close to the main clause. This -ing clause is some distance further along the background-foreground continuum than the MT -ing clause above and the MT concessive prepositional phrases, and presents information which might be new to the reader who is less informed about the development of parliament. But it does not have the weight of a final (al)though clause. The fact that there are so few concessive phrases and non-finite concessive clauses in comparison to the number of concessive finite clauses supports the impression that concession realised by hypotactic elements serves mainly to add new information to academic text.

9.4.4 CONCESSIVE CONJUNCTS AND CO-ORDINATING CONJUNCTIONS

According to Grote et al, co-ordinating conjunctions and conjunctive adjuncts can signal all three of the concession types they identify: they occur with Concede I and Concede 3, when A is complex and so requires an independent clause, and they are the only options with Concede 2. As will be seen, the ability of conjuncts to link sentences and even sentence sequences permits the writer to give due status to new information he is providing even when it does not support his overall thesis, and thus to range backwards and forwards between one side of a question and another, weaving in much new information, and frequently arriving at a balance between conflicting factors. These markers of concession frequently function as a pivot, switching direction in the middle of a paragraph or even a sequence of paragraphs.

Table 22 in Appendix 2 shows the incidence of concessive use of these items in the history texts. But, yet and however are the main means of signalling concession paratactically within a continuum of contrast in which concession shades into non-concessive contrast or vice versa. This continuum seems to correspond to a functional continuum ranging across the conceding of points, qualification of the author’s own points, countering arguments or evidence and providing a balance of evidence and counter-evidence.
9.4.4.1 Miscellaneous concessive conjuncts

A miscellaneous group of concessive conjuncts occur infrequently, and at various positions in the sentence. They may be grouped according to whether they occur in the clause expressing the conceded point - true (Wh/B/3/2/2), it was true (M/B/1/30/3) to be sure (M/B/2/4/3), admittedly (M/B/2/9/1), nevertheless (Wa/B/4/2/7, Wa/B/4/6/12, Wa/C/2/6), at least (Wa/B/1/3/10, Wa/B/3/3/6), even so (H/B/3/1/3), still (M/B/1/32/1), at the same time (M/B/2/1/2), in any case (M/B/1/17/3), otherwise (M/B/1/14/7), in fact (Wh/B/1/21/1). Nevertheless and at least in particular tend to appear as reinforcement of the concession, that is in conjunction with an earlier concessive signal. True and it was true are slight variants of the same item, but the latter would seem marginally less preferable in initial position and the former decidedly odd in second place in a composite marked theme, probably because a one-syllable word does not appear heavy enough to justify the interruption of an intonation contour. As was seen above, it is/was true can also occur with a concessive sense in an extraposed construction.

In most cases the concessive meaning of these items is readily apparent without the benefit of context. Several, however, depend very much on context for a concessive interpretation. Of the three occurrences of at the same time, only the following is concessive,

M/B/2/1/1-2 The Slavic peoples, in the Nazi scheme of things, were racial inferiors, Untermenschen fit only to be ruled by German Herrenvolk. At the same time, they posed a threat in the form of the Soviet Union, where the Jewish-Bolshevik enemy lay in wait to seize any opportunity to undermine its greatest foe.

Elsewhere the same author uses this conjunct with the meaning of time as well as addition.

M/B/2/3/2-3 On May 19, guidelines for the conduct of troops in Russia were issued that reiterated the message that the most ruthless action was to be taken against the Jewish-Bolshevik cadres and all resistance smashed by whatever means was necessary. At the same time, secret special instructions dealing with the treatment of political commissars were being drawn up, ready for circulation on June 6.

In fact might more often be treated as a marker of emphatic condition, but here the meaning is clearly concessive. It expresses the idea that, despite the intentions of the tax authorities (A), Not-C obtained.

Wh/B/1/20/1 The tax authorities were particularly keen to use the allowance for a wife to differentiate between the single and married men and so exploit what was thought to be a powerful division in working class society...Wh/B/1/21/1 In fact the wife's allowance had little impact upon the South Wales agitation.
In another context, *otherwise* might lend itself to a conditional interpretation - *if not* - but here it has the meaning *apart from*.

M/B/1/14/7  Despite their status as racial enemies, these prisoners - in stark contrast to the victims of the Holocaust - were segregated and forced to wear the star of David but otherwise were usually treated no differently than their gentile companions.

Winter (1994:130) comments that the use of *admittedly* rather than *although* gives an overtone of dialogue with the reader, with the writer conducting the argument against the imagined objections of the interlocutor. There is one use of this item in the sample:

M/B/2/9/1  *There were those, admittedly, who were aghast at the way Soviet prisoners were being handled.*

9.4.4.2 **However**

*However* is extremely versatile because it can signal contrast between stretches of text, frequently acts as a pivot within a paragraph and its flexibility as regards placement permits additional cohesion by means of other items which have a better claim to thematic status. It is classed as a concessive marker by Halliday and Hasan (1976), Quirk *et al* (1985) and Grote *et al* (1997), the latter seeing it as the most general of the concessive conjuncts, able to replace any of the others. But the present analysis finds that in 15 of the 41 occurrences of *however* it appears to be a marker of a difference relation rather than a concession relation. Harriss uses it only once and in a concessive sense, and MacKenzie, who uses *however* far more often than the other authors, uses it in a concessive sense in 20 of the total of 27 cases, but Walker uses it concessively only 4 times out of 9, and Whiting 1 out of 4. Concessive *however* occurs in only one of the four cases of *however* in strict sentence-initial position.

The following is a particularly straightforward case of *however* used concessively.

M/B/2/10/1-2  *These were cogent arguments, and similar ones had often had a positive effect on POW treatment in the West. In relation to POWs in the East, however, they made little or no headway, especially with Hitler.*

It can be paraphrased with *although* thus:

*Although these were cogent arguments and similar ones had often had a positive effect on POW treatment in the West, in relation to POWs in the East they made little or no headway, especially with Hitler.*
A less straightforward example has a suggestion of additive contrast: the co-existence of a difference and a similarity.

M/B/3/1/1 The treatment of POWs in the war against Japan was a study in contrasts...M/B/3/1/3 In both cases, however, as in the European theaters, POW treatment was the result of a combination of ideological and utilitarian factors.

On the other hand, a concessive interpretation is possible if the implicature being denied is seen to be an assumption that if treatment of Allied POWs held by the Japanese and Japanese POWs held by the Allies was a study in contrasts, there was no common denominator.

Less straightforward still is the use of however in M/B/1/7/5, which is in a relation of contrast with the opening sentence of its paragraph, M/B/1/7/1, after three intervening sentences providing supporting material for the statement made by this opening sentence. The final sentence in the paragraph, M/B/1/7/6, provides supporting material for the content of M/B/1/7/5.

M/B/1/7/1 The stage now seemed set for another round of reprisals...M/B/1/7/5-6 Over the following weeks, however, as the situation was assessed rationally, official opinion began to shift away from further escalation. The unpalatable truth was that if the retaliatory cycle continued, if neither side backed down, then prisoners in enemy hands might soon be in serious jeopardy.

Interpreted as non-concessive contrast, the relation can be seen to be one of difference between the state of affairs at one period of time (The stage now seemed set for a further round of reprisals) and the state of affairs at a slightly later period of time (official opinion began to shift away from further escalation). On the other hand, it could also be the sentence could also be paraphrased using although - Although the stage now seemed set for another round of reprisals, over the following weeks, as the situation was assessed rationally, official opinion began to shift away from further escalation, with the paragraph-final sentence providing the B (because) member of the concession relation. There is a sense of denial of expectation together with mutual exclusivity between C and Not-C. Although the distinction between concessive and non-concessive contrast is blurred here, the possibility of a concessive interpretation means that in the present analysis the relation has been treated as one of concessive contrast.

Similarly, H/I/11/10 in the Harriss article could be interpreted as a relation of difference between the views of other historians and Harriss’s own view.
In each respect the crown is commonly held to have demonstrated a loss of will and surrendered its rights. However, if we view these aspects of government not as emanations of royal authority, but as the product of those involved in them, we can better appreciate the nature of, and the impetus for, the changes that occurred.

On the other hand, the if-clause could be seen as having a similar function to the cause clause in a concession relation consisting of A, B and Not-C. The relation could then be expressed as ‘Although there is a consensus that the crown demonstrated a loss of will and surrendered its rights, which would lead you to assume that this is the correct explanation, there is still an alternative explanation, if you take a different view of the three aspects of late medieval government on which debate has centred’. Again, because of this nuance of concession, however has been given a concessive interpretation in the present analysis.

However is a useful means of signalling a concession relation when there is considerable distance between the initial statement of A and that of either B or Not-C, as in paragraph B/3/2 in the Walker article. The third sentence in this paragraph realises A, which is that it was deliberate Chancery policy to increase the proportion of Westminster practitioners within the quorum. The next, fairly lengthy, sentence provides evidence of this. This is followed by the sentence realising B - a constraint on increase in the proportion of Westminster practitioners - with the concessive relation signalled by however. The very next sentence concedes a point which counters this B, so that there is a sequence of A, B, and a different A, though without any explicit signal of concession. But the last sentence of the paragraph provides Not-C both for this A and the preceding B. Again, there is no explicit marker of concession, though the word neither in the independent clause verbalising the Not-C signals concession indirectly.

However here signals a contrast between two causal relationships, that between Chancery policy and the increase in Westminster practitioners and that between the fact that the supply of Westminster practitioners was not endless and the fact that there was some need for reliance upon local men. This relation of contrast could be paraphrased as:

(A) Although there was an increase in the proportion of Westminster practitioners as a result of deliberate Chancery policy, (Not-C) there was still a need to rely upon local men (B) because the supply of Westminster practitioners with local connections was not endless.

But this downplays the A member too much; the two propositions and the causal relationship between them constituting the A of the concession are topic propositions for the entire
section. Nor is the alternative paraphrase below satisfactory.

(A) Although the fact that the supply of Westminster practitioners with local connections was not endless meant there was still a need to rely upon local men, (Not-C) there was an increase in the proportion of Westminster practitioners (B) as a result of deliberate Chancery policy.

This also downplays the importance of the material here presented as A too much, since the rest of the section sets forth an interplay between the factor of Chancery policy and the opposing factor of there not being an endless supply of suitable candidates for the quorum with Westminster experience in order to explain variations in the composition of the bench. The final sentence of this paragraph in effect brings these two factors into balance, and the use of however to mark the contrast between them earlier in the paragraph permits the A of the earlier paraphrase due status by permitting its realisation in a separate sentence, followed by a second sentence with supporting information.

Harriss uses however to begin the very last sentence of the introduction section, a very prominent position. The direct contrast is with the content of the rheme of the immediately preceding sentence, but the sentence sums up the content of five earlier paragraphs, the refutation of which is the thesis of the entire article, while the conditional clause immediately following however sums up the author’s own interpretation. Thus however here occurs at a major text boundary and where the discourse theme is most highly foregrounded. The foregrounding and boundary marking is all the more marked because however is the very first element in the sentence, whereas in all the other instances of concessive use of however the conjunct is preceded by another element in marked theme position.

The other instances of however used concessively also appear in prominent sentences. M/B/1/12/1 is a paragraph-initial topic sentence for a sequence of two paragraphs. M/B/2/10/2 is a second sentence topic sentence. M/B/1/30/2 is a second sentence retrospectively summarising a major theme in the content of most of a major section of text. M/B/1/3/1/3 occurs in the short introductory paragraph for a major section of text, each sentence of which summarises the content of this section. Wa/B/3/2/5, as has been seen, though paragraph-medial, introduces a sequence of three sentences which present a qualification of the topic propositions for all of a major section of text apart from the opening paragraph, a qualification which has almost equal status with these topic propositions. M/B/1/7/5 and M/B/2/16/6, have much more local significance but still some significance within their paragraphs. M/B/1/7/5 provides a culmination point for most of the content of its paragraph; M/B/2/16/6 begins a paragraph sub-section comprising three sentences.
Since however can link sentences and even stretches of text consisting of more than one sentence, it lends itself to arguing backwards and forwards across conflicting evidence of equal or almost equal importance. Frequently there is alternation of information, detracting information, and information supporting the earlier information, reflected in alternation of contrast relations, with the different types of contrast relations signalled by means of successive occurrences of the same contrast marker, as in paragraph B/2/16 from the MacKenzie article. The paragraph starts with information about the extremely high death rate amongst German POWs at one period of time but then contrasts this, in a relation of difference signalled by however, with a later period of time, when there was a mitigating factor, the fact that a severe shortage of labour meant the POWs began to be seen as a useful resource. However, this mitigating factor in turn constitutes A for the Not-C expressed in the following sentence, with this concessive relation also signalled by however.

M/B/2/16/6 As in Germany, however, this did not mean that POWs were treated even remotely in accordance with the Geneva Convention.

Here the implicature which is denied is that the usefulness of the POWs as labour would mean they would receive more than just minimally better treatment. This paragraph illustrates the way history academic discourse integrates three dimensions: detailed new information about the period under study, the chronological sequence of narrative, and the relations of contrast characteristic of reasoning. The use of however permits due status to be given to each item of new information, whether for or against the over-riding thesis, without preventing the author from returning to the main line of reasoning.

How do these examples of the concessive uses of however tally with Grote et al’s (1997) taxonomy of pragmatic reasons for conceding? As regards the linearisation criterion, these cases are compatible with all three motivations since all either require or allow the conceded member of the relation to precede the author’s own argument. All three also allow the relation to be marked by a conjunctive adjunct. It is less easy to identify the examples from the history journal articles according to the illocutionary uses Grote et al associate with their three types of concession. In none of these cases does the denial of a false implicature have the character of an afterthought after the main act, associated with Concede II, which, in any case, Grote et al say is mostly found in spoken discourse. This leaves Concede I, the main act of which is convincing, or Concede III, the main act of which is informing. The goal of the former is to convince the receiver of a particular point by paraphrasing counter-
arguments already mentioned or anticipating those not yet uttered and conceding them while insisting on the dominance of one’s own arguments. This is the argumentative type of concession and it is therefore internal. The primary communicative intention of Concede III is merely to inform about events in the world external to the text and emphasise the unusualness of their correlation. The minor act is the one that increases the relevance of stating the main act. This concessive relation is to do with the subject matter rather than the making of an argument and is therefore external.

According to this characterisation of Concede I and Concede II the Harriss example of concessive use of *however* appears to be Concede I as it makes explicit reference to the interpretation of subject matter by historians and argues for the author’s opposing interpretation. In the other cases the concessive use of *however* appears to involve statements about relations between events in the world outside the text, historical events or states of affairs in the period of history under study. But it is difficult to accept that none of these other examples is a case of concession used argumentatively when they appear in places in the text where the author is foregrounding his thesis. For instance, *M/B/1/30/2* reiterates a major theme of the discourse in a retrospective summary towards the end of a major section of text. Similarly, *M/B/3/1/3* restates a major discourse theme governing the entire article in a summary paragraph serving as introduction to a major section of text. The other examples also serve to support the author’s main argument, even if at much lower levels in the hierarchical structure of the text. There is a case for saying that the overall argumentative function of an academic journal article such as these on history entails that all the concessive relations in the text play a part in making an argument and are therefore all Concede I. But, if so, Grote *et al* appear to be using the term *internal* in a much wider sense than it is usually used.

**9.4.4.3 Yet**

*Yet* occurs twenty times in the medieval history texts but only twice in the MacKenzie modern history text and not at all in the Whiting text. Its more frequent occurrence in the medieval history texts, together with that of *while*, gives the impression of a more literary style. Harriss uses *yet* eleven times and always to begin a sentence, which contributes to the declamatory tone of his writing, since sentence-initial *yet* is quite emphatic, suggesting an image of the author holding his finger up for dramatic effect. The points it introduces are therefore foregrounded and it frequently functions as a pivot in the argument.
Halliday and Hasan (1976), Quirk et al (1985) and Grote et al (1997) all list *yet* only as a marker of concessive contrast. This is supported for the most part by the present analysis, but one sentence suggests an antithetic relation which could be expressed by *on the other hand*, *yet* Halliday and Hasan state that *yet* does not occur in this sense, which they call contrastive, or the "as against" sense as opposed to the "in spite of" sense.

Believing that the essence of the English constitution lay in the free assent of parliament to laws and taxes, he condemned taxation at will on the French model as tyrannical. Yet if the crown were denied taxation by its subjects to meet its needs, it would surely seek to enrich itself by "exquisite" (that is prerogative) measures.

For Grote et al and Gosden (1992) *yet* is a co-ordinating conjunction while for Quirk et al it is a sentence adverbial, though the latter recognise that it resembles co-ordinators in some respects (pp927, 1615). In the present data *yet* occurs only once after a comma (Wa/C/4/12) rather than beginning a sentence, or coming after a colon (M/I/2/6). This is a case of asyndetic co-ordination, where, Quirk et al (1985:923), suggest, there is an optional merger of the co-ordinator and with *yet*.

It was not, therefore, inevitable that the Gascoigne family should cleave so promptly and firmly to the Lancastrian cause on Henry’s return to England in June 1399, yet the new king was tactful and generous enough to make the transition appear a natural extension of their previous loyalties.

There is one illustration of Halliday and Hasan’s observation that *yet* sometimes introduces the conceded member of the concessive relation, corresponding to an although clause in a hypotactic structure:

Fourthly, as Brymor Pugh pointed out and particular studies have confirmed, most magnates spent no more than 10 per cent of their income on retaining fees, and at £10 or 10 marks a head baronial retinue would have numbered less than two dozen and a comital retinue not more than twice that. Yet the class of potential retainers with incomes upward of £10 per annum numbered four thousand or more.

One paragraph (H/B/2/3) has a concession embedded within a concession, both signalled by *yet*. The opening topic sentence, beginning with *yet*, is followed by two sentences providing supporting points, but these two sentences constitute the concession part of the relation between them and the fourth and fifth sentences, the fourth also beginning with *yet*. These fourth and fifth sentences in turn constitute the concession in the relation with the sixth sentence, which supports the opening topic sentence. The second *yet* is necessary because the concessive part of the relation is made up of two points requiring two separate sentences.
But, in any case, because these two points support the main line of the argument, it would be inappropriate for them to be backgrounded in an although-clause. At the same time, the deviation from the main line of the argument in the sentence beginning with this second yet is itself an important point from the author’s point of view.

It is not always the case that, as was seen with although and nevertheless, two signals of concession in the same sentence both signal the same concession relation, as the following sentences illustrate.

H/B/3/5/10-11 At a local level, where J.P.s would often belong to a lord’s affinity, the confusion of magistracy and lordship could lead to abuse, particularly in taking indictments for riot or forcible entry in magnate or gentry quarrels. Yet while this conferred an initial advantage, such cases would normally be removed from the local sphere by transference to King’s Bench, while any serious disturbances would bring the intervention of the royal justices or the council.

The first while marks the relation between its own, subordinate, clause and the main clause in the same sentence, while yet marks the relation between this sentence and the previous sentence. The major act in the concession is the same in both cases but the minor act is different. However, there is a very close relation between these two minor acts: the existence of abuse implies that there must be some advantage to be gained from the abuse.

Four of the twenty-two instances of yet occur in topic sentences. Three of these four (H/I/8/1, H/B/2/3/1, M/B/1/3/1) are opening sentences, one of which (H/I/8/1) is highly foregrounded as it introduces, in the introduction section, the author’s refutation of views held by other historians presented in the preceding literature review, and thus functions as a pivot between sub-sections. The other topic sentence beginning with yet (Wa/B/4/4/3) is the third sentence in its paragraph. One non-topic sentence with yet (H/B/3/9/10) reiterates in the second-to-last sentence of the paragraph the second of the governing topic propositions in the paragraph. Two others are in concluding paragraphs which summarise the preceding text: Wa/B/1/5/5 is the very last sentence of a major sub-section of the body of the article, closing a concluding paragraph which summarises the content of this sub-section; H/C/2/5 is one of the sentences in the first paragraph of the conclusion section which summarise the content of the entire article. Several of the other sentences containing yet (Wa/B/1/4/12, Wa/B/4/6/10, Wa/C/4/8) provide turning points in their paragraphs. Wa/B/2/3/4 brings the discourse back onto the main line of reasoning after the diversion created by the second and third sentences which jointly constitute the conceded point for this concession relation.
9.4.4.4 But

Lakoff (1971) distinguishes two main uses of but: ‘semantic opposition’ and ‘denial of expectation’. The former includes what in the present analysis is called ‘displacement’, ‘difference’ and ‘additive contrast’, while the latter is the concessive use of but. As Lakoff puts it, with the former use, ‘there is no reason to assume that since the first part of the sentence is true the second should be false; no conclusion about the second member is derivable from the first. Simply two items are directly opposed to each other in a particular property’ whereas with denial of expectation but ‘a sentence is composed of an assertion plus a presupposition...The presupposition may involve a general tendency or expectation’. She views semantic opposition but as symmetric in that the two members of the relation are reversible, while denial of expectation but is asymmetric. Sweetser (1990) states that asymmetric but ‘conjoins a causally or logically prior first conjunct, and a second conjunct which is in contrast to the normal result of causal or logical sequence from the first conjunct’. This is the type of denial of expectation relation in which both A and Not-C are verbalised. However, as Grote et al have pointed out, there are instances of concessive relations in which Not-C is not verbalised and the contrastive marker conjoins the A and B members of the relation. The vast majority of the cases of conjunction of clauses or sentences by means of but in the history journal articles are cases of the denial of expectation relation: 68 as against 2 displacement contrast, 11 difference contrast, and 7 additive contrast.

All the examples of concessive but in the data can be interpreted as having both A and Not-C present, rather than only A and B present. The first sentence below has only A and Not-C present, while the second has B as well as A, and Not-C:

H/II/5/1 Such consensus on the fate of late medieval English government is impressive, but it has not gone unchallenged.

Wa/B/3/4/5 The active gentry members of the West Riding quorum thus consisted of no more than three men, but their legal distinction and regular attendance at quarter sessions ensured that the local bench posed few problems for the Chancery.

But is sentence-initial in 30 of these 68 occurrences. It is the only contrast marker, apart from one occurrence of True, which Whiting uses to link sentences, whereas Harriss and Walker also make considerable use of yet and MacKenzie of however; this contributes to the impression that the Whiting text is less rhetorical in tone. Harriss makes more use of but sentence-initially than Walker, who uses it only half as often sentence-initially as sentence-medially, and MacKenzie, who uses it to begin a sentence only four times as opposed to 15 sentence-medial occurrences.
9.4.5 CONCESSION SIGNALLED BY EVEN

*Even* does not rank formally as an independent constituent of theme in relation to the main clause and can occur in either marked or unmarked theme, and in themes from a variety of semantic categories other than contrast/concession. But it is a significant signal of concession and, in addition to those cases already discussed in this and the previous chapter, there are a further 23 occurrences of *even* in theme. Most of these occurrences (8) are in the Harriss text, with 6, 5 and 4 in the MacKenzie, Walker and Whiting texts respectively.

*Even* conveys the idea that the truth of the author's assertions holds in extreme cases, and so expresses contrast more emphatically, than *though* or *although*. In addition to forming part of the complex conjunctions and conjunct *even if*, *even though* and *even so* discussed earlier, *even* occurs as a focusing subjunct with clauses, phrases, adverbs and comparative forms of adjectives in these history texts. It is used in marked theme nine times as a focusing subjunct with a clause (e.g. *Even where the identity of affinity and shire officers can be established*), nine times as a phrase (e.g. *even in Germany*), three times as an adverb (e.g. *even thereafter*) and twice with the comparative form of an adjective (e.g. *Even more important*). There is only one occurrence of *even* in final position, with a prepositional phrase.

Wh/B/3/3/1 The simple solution of continuing the duty into peacetime was not a real possibility, even apart from its special identity as a war tax.

*Even* is most often used with a clause, phrase or adverb realising time reference (13 times). All three adverbs are time adverbs (H/B/3/9/15, Wa/B/1/4/19, M/B/1/30/2). Time is realised by all but two of the nine finite clauses (H/B/2/3/6, Wa/B/1/1/3, Wa/B/1/1/11, M/B/3/9/3, M/C/2/4, Wh/B/1/21/2, Wh/B/3/8/1), the remaining two being *where*-clauses (H/B/3/9/13, H/B/3/12/11). Three of the nine phrases featuring *even* realise time (H/B/2/2/8, H/B/2/3/5, M/B/1/21/1), but the majority, five, realise reference to people by means of abstract spatial prepositional phrases (H/B/3/4/8, H/B/3/7/14, Wa/B/1/4/12, Wa/C/6/8, Wh/B/1/24/1), and the remaining one realises perspective (Wh/B/1/25/10). The two comparative adjective phrases are fronted complements realising evaluation in topic sentences, both from the MacKenzie text (M/B/1/13/1, M/B/1/14/6).
The above analysis confirms the importance of contrast as a method of development in academic discourse, and in history in particular, though it is not the most dominant semantic category of themes. Four types of contrast relations have been identified: displacement, difference, additive contrast, and concession, of which concession is by far the most frequent. It is the displacement and concession contrast relations which contribute to the contending rhetoric of history discourse. The displacement relation can set up an opposing interpretation in order to counter it, and is particularly useful when the author summarises his argument and reminds the reader of the interpretation he is opposing. Concessive contrast is a means of weighing the value of one piece of evidence against another, setting up new claims against those in the literature, and weaving much new information into the discourse in the process.

The placement of contrast clauses, whether in initial or final position, affects the meaning of these clauses, the choice of contrast marker, the degree to which they are foregrounded, their discourse function and the extent of their scope. Although and though can occur with both preposed and postposed clauses, though there is a distinct preference for although with preposed clauses and though with postposed clauses. While-clauses are concessive only when preposed; and almost always used for additive contrast only when postposed. They may participate in the difference relation in either position, but are never used to realise the displacement relation. They are mainly concessive when preposed and usually used for additive contrast when postposed. They occur most often in final position, mostly for additive contrast, but are frequently used concessively in initial position. Contrary to Greenbaum and Nelson’s (1996) finding for concessive clauses in general, in the history sample there is a marked preference for initial placement of concessive clauses.

The content of MT concessive clauses is backgrounded and that of the main clause correspondingly thrown into relief, but there can be different degrees of prominence in the case of FFM concessive clauses according to whether they are T-unit or sentence-final, whether they are lexicogrammatically and informationally ‘heavy’, and whether they occur in prominent sentences such as paragraph-initial topic sentences or paragraph-final sentences which also end major sections of text. Furthermore, while there is congruence between syntactic subordination and satellite information status when dependent concessive clauses are preposed, those which are postposed frequently realise information which has the character more of nucleus than satellite. In final position the while-clause can be so
foregrounded that *while* seems to function like a co-ordinator and often seems interchangeable with *and*, suggesting a semantic blending between addition and contrast. The effect is one of balanced sentence structure, giving the impression of a more literary style.

Unlike Thompson’s (1985) purpose clauses, both initial and final concessive clauses can have scope over more than one sentence, and the direction of scope is the reverse of that she found for purpose clauses. Concessive clauses in theme position have retrospective scope, frequently extending over lengthy stretches of preceding text; postposed concessive clauses, when they occur in sentences beginning new segments of text, can have a forward scope over sentence sequences embedded in paragraphs, entire paragraphs and even a series of paragraphs.

Contrary to Grote et al.’s assertion that subordinate concessive clauses realising their Concede III type of concession are either preposed or postposed according to whether they express new or old information, both preposed and postposed concessive clauses in the history texts usually do convey new information. Indeed, their primary function is to pack historical detail into text, though largely because Walker uses them so much for this purpose. Clauses realising this function have the character of concession when they occur as marked theme and of qualification when in final position. Other concessive clauses either encapsulate the content of stretches of text in summarising or commenting on it, or they make explicit something that has previously been implicit, a text strategy employed by Harriss. Unsurprisingly, the clauses with retrospective or prospective scope over extended stretches of text occur at text boundaries, where, if they are FFMFs, they can participate in establishing the topic of the following text, and if they are MTs they can provide a cohesive link with preceding text while the main clause establishes the topic. These MTs have a summarising function, providing both topic continuity and transitions from what has gone before to what is going to come next, or clarifying the content of preceding text, or making explicit an inference or assumption which the content of the preceding text might trigger.

The choice and positioning of concessive and other contrast signals are style markers, distinguishing between texts within the same genre and discipline. Of particular interest is the highly argumentative use of conditional concessive clauses for contrasting the interpretations of other historians with that of the author, especially in prominent positions in text. More frequent use of sentence-initial *yet* and *but*, and sentence-final *while*-clauses is
characteristic of the two medieval history texts, while in the two modern history texts there is more frequent use of concessive MT while-clauses and less use of (al)though clauses. Frequent use of sentence-initial but, and particularly yet, contribute to an impression of a more highly rhetorical and contentious style than reliance on however, which almost always occurs later in the sentence, and which is used far more frequently by MacKenzie than by the other authors. Mainly used for concession, but occasionally also for difference, contrary to Quirk et al's (1985) mention of it only as a concessive marker, however is extremely versatile because it can signal contrast across stretches of text, frequently acts as a pivot within a paragraph and its flexibility as regards placement permits additional cohesion by means of other items which have a better claim to thematic status.
CHAPTER 10 CONCLUSION

This study has taken thematisation as a broad framework within which to integrate several perspectives on the sentence in order to investigate the discourse functions of lexicogrammatical choices in academic writing. It contributes evidence from an under-researched context: writing in the humanities, and in the discipline of history in particular. Two types of categorisation are original in the analysis. One is the use of a non-prototypical category alongside the standard division into marked and unmarked themes. The other is the three-way classification of grammatical subjects according to whether they are used for explicit reference to research, for evaluation or for direct reporting of real world phenomena without interpretation. The investigation has revealed a number of interesting uses of particular lexicogrammatical devices which have received little or no attention in the literature. It has also identified several linguistic devices and choices regarding their placement which serve as style markers distinguishing between authors writing within the same genre and disciplinary field, as well as providing some insight into how lexicogrammatical choices reflect the methodology of historians. The various findings are summarised below in relation to the six research questions which were posed at the outset.

10.1 RELATIVE PROPORTIONS OF MARKED, UNMARKED AND NON-PROTOTYPICAL THEMES

Unmarked themes were found to outnumber marked themes but not to the extent found in Gosden’s (1992) science research articles. In the latter, the experimental section has a particularly high proportion of unmarked themes and, conversely, the lowest proportion of marked themes, while the relative proportions in the introduction and results sections are much the same and not very much different from those in the discussion section. In the history sample, however, it is the introduction section which has a much higher proportion of unmarked themes, the two other sections having almost identical proportions.

Gosden associates the relatively low number of marked themes in the science experimental section with lower rhetorical multifunctionality and more matter-of-fact reporting of scientific procedures. It may seem somewhat surprising, therefore, that in the history
sample the proportion of marked themes should be so much lower in the introduction section than in the other two sections since it is in the introduction section, and also in the conclusion section, that the historian might be expected to foreground his argument and be least matter-of-fact. One reason for the higher number of marked themes in the body than in the other two sections of the history articles is the frequent occurrence of themes realising reference to real world time which introduce supporting detail, but frequency of time reference in theme is even higher in the science experimental section. However, another reason is that, in the history sample, unmarked themes are associated with crisp and forceful argument, when they take the form of simple noun phrase subjects, and with the authoritative presentation of presupposed background material, when they are complex noun phrases, as well as with a high degree of explicit reference to research participants and products.

10.2 RELATIVE PROPORTIONS OF THEMES OF DIFFERENT SEMANTIC CATEGORIES

Marked themes were considered separately for the purpose of comparison with Gosden’s findings for science research articles. Predictably, reference to real world time constitutes the largest category of marked themes in the history sample, whereas in the science sample it is contrast/concession and reason plus purpose, both occurring with equal frequency. Contrast/concession accounts for the second largest proportion of marked themes in the history texts although it occurs more frequently than in the science articles being fairly evenly spread over the three history article sections, while there is little call for it in the science experimental section. Both time and contrast/concession each far outnumber the marked themes in other semantic categories in the history articles, whereas in the science articles there is a much more gradual decline from the largest to the smallest category. Thus real world time and contrast/concession are particularly prominent in marked theme in history academic discourse. Reason plus purpose, in fourth place (when, following Gosden, fronting is excluded - otherwise it is very slightly exceeded by addition), is much less frequent than these two, and much less frequent than in the science texts, despite the claims made for the role of cause/effect relationships in history discourse. But it is important to note that there are many cases in the history sample where the same marked theme realises multiple semantic functions; for instance, Reason is occasionally also realised in a marked theme which has been treated as primarily realising time reference.
When all sentence-initial themes - marked, unmarked and non-prototypical - are taken into account, by far the largest semantic category is that of attributes, in the sense in which MacDonald (1994) uses the term: for reference to human behaviour, developments, states of affairs, concepts and qualities. The second largest category is reference to human participants, mainly in groups. Thus there is support for the claim by Martin (1991) and Eggins et al (1987) that history discourse deals in abstractions and generalisations. The third largest category is reference to real world time. Therefore, as predicted in the literature, historians’ concern with human participants in historical events and in the timing of events is reflected in the choices for initial position sentences; this study also shows that reference to the former is more frequent than reference to the latter. The fourth largest category is contrast/concession, which is more than double that of addition, in fifth place, and of Reason, almost as frequent as addition. The fact that real world time themes outnumber contrast/concession themes might suggest that narrative is more important than argument in history discourse but, in fact, time themes frequently introduce supporting detail and so narrative is subordinated within a framework of contrast/concession.

Following MacDonald, explicit reference to research participants processes, tools and products realised by grammatical subjects was distinguished from reference to real world phenomena. It was found to be less frequent in this corpus than in MacDonald’s history research articles, while attributes realised by grammatical subjects were much more frequent than in her corpus. It appears then that these articles are less concerned with epistemic accounting than MacDonald’s but more abstract. There is also a considerably lower proportion of groups in this more diverse corpus than in hers, which comprised articles all from the same subfield, the social history of colonial New England, one in which groups might be expected to figure particularly prominently. The articles examined in the present study are rather more diverse.

Where the categorisation in the present study differs from MacDonald’s is in the division of phenomenal subjects into those which incorporate author evaluation of the data and those which report the phenomena under study without an overlay of interpretation on the part of the historian. This evaluation category corresponds with Davies’ (1988) Objectivised Viewpoint category and, even if Gosden’s Hypothesised and Objectivised domain is taken to be more restrictive, subjects in this domain in the history articles far outnumber those in his
science sample. Research and evaluation together account for slightly more than half of the grammatical subjects and the majority of the remaining phenomenal subjects make reference to groups rather than particulars. Thus, an overwhelming majority of grammatical subjects realise abstraction or generalisation, in line with the claims made by Martin and Eggins et al for history discourse.

10.3 DISCOURSE FUNCTIONS OF VARIOUS TYPES OF THEMES

The investigation arrived at a four-way functional categorisation for each of four different groups of lexicogrammatical devices: those realising additive relations, those realising contrast, conditional constructions and clefts. It also found a high number of items with multiple semantic functions, permitting economical realisation of semantic richness, and that prepositional phrases without explicit markers of, for instance, cause and effect, provide a more subtle means of realising various meanings than finite clauses. A particularly crucial contribution to coherence is made by the summarising function of many of the lexicogrammatical choices investigated in this study, especially when they incorporate non-specific nouns and this used as either a determiner or a pro-form. Placement of linguistic devices with summarising potential at paragraph boundaries can be a powerful means of organising the discourse, either ensuring the cohesion of large chunks of text, signalling topic or reiterating the discourse theme, often while also contributing to richness of information content.

Four types of additive relations were identified: addition, similarity, combining and compatibility; and also four types of contrast relations: displacement, difference, additive contrast, and concession, of which by far the most frequent is concession. The realisation of additive contrast by clauses in which there is minimal difference in meaning regardless of whether and or while is selected suggests a semantic blending between addition and contrast. Contrary to Quirk et al (1985), who appear to regard it only as a signal of concession, however occurs as both a concessive and a non-concessive marker. The contrast relations which participate in contending rhetoric are concessive contrast and displacement relations, which are the means of weighing the value of one piece of evidence against another, setting up an opposing interpretation in order to counter it, and weaving much new information into the discourse in the process. Particularly interesting is the highly
argumentative use of conditional concessive clauses for contrasting the interpretations of other historians with that of the author in prominent positions in text. Concessive clauses are also able to summarise the content of stretches of text, and so provide cohesive linking with what follows, and, as final free modifiers, to participate in signalling the topic of subsequent text. Another function is their use to make explicit something implied in preceding text. But the main use of concessive clauses is to pack new information into the text.

Conditional clauses were also found to have four main functions, which corresponded with the broad division of unmarked themes into research transparency, evaluation and real world reference. These are: reporting recurrent temporal contingency, reporting historical participant viewpoint, projecting author viewpoint, and making reference to research. Conditionals are also able to organise the discourse by summarising the content of preceding stretches of text and participating in signalling the topic of subsequent stretches of text, often with extensive scope. Contrary to Gosden’s (1992) observation about the use of conditional constructions in science research articles for author invisibility, but in accordance with Eiler’s (1986) finding for conditionals in science discourse, several concessive conditional clauses are used with we as grammatical subject inclusive of both author and reader to forcefully present the author’s views in opposition to those of other researchers.

Evaluation is particularly strongly correlated with non-prototypical themes, which divide into two groups. Extraposited and existential-there constructions facilitate compliance with unmarked information packaging, and so it is unsurprising that they are more numerous. Clefts, pseudoclefts, interrogatives and fronted themes occur infrequently but are salient in text and so suitable vehicles for foregrounding information, especially when their power is further enhanced by the use of this and non-specific nouns to retrospectively or prospectively summarise large stretches of text. All but a few of the constructions in these two groups are used either for explicit reference to research or for evaluation, with the former being the main function of extraposited constructions and interrogatives used for rhetorical questions. Extraposited constructions are used to evaluate the truth of propositions and the importance of evidence or analytic procedures. Interrogatives perform a powerful discourse-organising function in highlighting the discourse theme while summarising large stretches of text both retrospectively and prospectively, thus acting as pivots at major text
boundaries. Fronting occurs more frequently than clefts, pseudoclefts or interrogatives, and is mainly used for evaluation. MacKenzie mainly uses fronting for quoting historical participants, and, in conjunction with comparative adjectives, in topic sentences. He also uses existential-\textit{there} constructions in topic sentences, though they are not marked informationally, albeit marked syntactically.

There is support for the observation that clefts outnumber pseudoclefts in written text, mainly because of Walker’s much greater use of them. Both constructions sometimes occur with primarily given information in both constituents, a phenomenon not hitherto reported in the literature, and which results in a four-way rather than the usual three-way classification of clefts. The claim that highlighting the discourse themes is probably the most general and widespread function of pseudoclefts and clefts receives more support in the former case than in the latter.

All eight pseudoclefts in the history texts are basic pseudoclefts, which supports Quirk \textit{et al}’s claim that this type is more common rather than Collins’s claim that the reverse is the case. They are used for evaluation and impose the historian’s interpretation on the phenomena under study by identifying broad themes, characterising periods of history, and evaluating their significance. They highlight theme in final rather than initial position, bringing a segment of text to a close with a climax. Thus they differ from the illustrations provided by Jones and Jones (1985). Related to this use of pseudoclefts at the end of a segment of text is their ability to raise the discourse level back up to a higher level, which can be achieved by providing a stepping stone in the form of a local tie between the \textit{wh}-clause and an antecedent in the immediately preceding sentence. Also related are the capacity of pseudoclefts to summarise large chunks of text, and the function of restating given information in a more salient form. They tend to occur after a mass of evidence has been accumulated and the reader has been reminded of the overall thesis several times already; the pseudocleft permits yet further reiteration, in a yet more salient form, providing the final nail in the argument when used at the very end of a conclusion section. The combination of these functions - summarising, providing closure, foregrounding - makes pseudoclefts a particularly useful tool in organising lengthy and complex discourse, such as academic writing.
In the type of cleft in which both constituents consist of given information, it is the relation between the constituents that carries the main message. In some cases clefts of this type make a completely new assertion; in others they restate a proposition in a more emphatic way with the only new information being the concept of uniqueness. Clefts are also used to relate lower-level information to the paragraph topic, raising the discourse back to a higher level, and to raise an out-of-focus entity in the marked theme of the same sentence to the status of sentence topic. Contrary to the illustrations provided by Jones and Jones, clefts in the history texts are more often used not as topic sentences but to provide closure in the form of a final comment or culmination point, or to echo or indirectly reiterate a topic without themselves constituting topic sentences. The data do not support Delin and Oberlander’s claim that topic clause clefts close a discourse segment while comment clause clefts open one, or that the latter provide background information.

The wide range of marked themes in the history sample, includes many which are informationally dense or multifunctional and thus make economical contributions to depth of meaning. But much of the burden of the author’s argument throughout the texts is carried by evaluative abstractions functioning as grammatical subjects, which integrate interpretation with narrative presentation of supporting detail. Grammatical subjects as unmarked themes, particularly in the introduction section, are associated with a high degree of explicit reference to research participants and products, with crisp and forceful argument by means of simple noun phrase subjects, and, in complex noun phrases, with the authoritative presentation of presupposed background material.

10.4 VARIATION IN FUNCTION ACCORDING TO PLACEMENT

Variation in placement of clauses in either initial or final position was often found to affect the extent and direction of their scope, the choice of connector, the semantic function, the discourse use and the degree to which they are foregrounded. Postposed hypotactic clauses introduced by for, while, until, and even (al)though can contain information which is so foregrounded that it appears more nuclear than satellite. While-clauses are generally concessive as marked themes but not in sentence-final position. (Al)though clauses have the character of concession as marked themes, but often of qualification in final position. The
marked preference for initial placement of concessive clauses in the history sample is contrary to Greenbaum and Nelson’s (1996) finding for concessive clauses in general. Also, contrary to Grote et al’s (1997) assertion that subordinate concessive clauses realising their Concede 3 type of concession are either preposed or postposed according to whether they express new or old information, both preposed and postposed concessive clauses in the history texts usually convey new information; indeed, this is their primary function. There are no sentence-final finite conditional clauses in the history texts, contrary to Greenbaum and Nelson’s finding for condition clauses, and, contrary to Quirk et al’s (1985) findings for the distribution of prepositional phrases in written discourse; the majority of Reason prepositional phrases in the history texts are in initial position.

10.5 CHOICES WHICH DISTINGUISH ONE AUTHOR FROM ANOTHER

Certain lexicogrammatical choices which distinguish one author from another are to do with differences in subject matter. Thus, there is a comparatively high proportion of reference to particulars in the Walker article, which is concerned with prosopographical analysis of groups of justices of the peace. In the modern history texts, where there is a greater concern with specific incidents and the pronouncements and behaviour of individuals within a much narrower time frame, as well as access to more documentary evidence, there is a greater proportion of time themes, and reference to specific dates and specific years outnumbers reference to periods of time compared with the medieval history texts. Access to more substantial documentary sources in the study of the more recent past also gives rise to more use of direct quotation, accounting for many of the fronted themes and citing marked themes in the modern history texts.

Other choices reflect differences in format. For instance, Harriss provides a much more extensive literature review than the other authors and therefore makes most reference in theme to other members of the disciplinary community. Whiting provides no literature review nor any indication of how his own work relates to the research field at all, so he has the lowest proportion of references to research in his introduction section, which consists of only two paragraphs, and all his references to research are text-referential, and particularly frequent in his conclusion section, which consists of only one paragraph. Similarly,
MacKenzie has the highest proportion of references to research in his introduction section, which consists of only three paragraphs, though the lowest proportion overall.

But certain choices do represent stylistic preferences. Most contentious and rhetorical in tone is the Harriss article, which is characterised by use of first-person pronouns, sentence-initial for and yet, rhetorical questions, concessive if-clauses in prominent positions, to-infinitives combined with strongly deprecatory adjectives for reference to the interpretations of other researchers, short punchy simple noun phrases as unmarked themes in paragraphs where the thesis is presented most saliently, and reiteration of the discourse theme in paragraph-final sentences. The use of parallelism and deployment of Type 4 clefts for reiteration with greater emphasis also contribute to the more rhetorical style of this text. Harriss and the other medieval historian, Walker, exploit clefts and (al)though-clauses for different discourse functions. Both tend not to use clefts in segment-final position but Walker uses mainly Type 2 clefts and Harriss mainly Type 3. Walker makes much more use of (al)though clauses to pack additional information into the text, while Harriss is the only author to employ them to make explicit something that has previously been implicit.

(Al)though clauses are used very infrequently by the two modern historians. Both favour paragraph-final clefts, with MacKenzie using only Type 1 and Whiting using no Type 3 clefts. Both make much more use of there-constructions than the medieval historians. Though both also make much more use of quoted material, Whiting usually introduces it with citing marked themes or, when it is extensive, separates it orthographically from his own material, while MacKenzie makes more use of fronting, with shorter quoted material interrupted by the author’s own reporting verb and grammatical subject, and integrated within the author’s own paragraphs. The MacKenzie text is characterised by use of however for signalling contrast later in the sentence rather than initially, of fronted comparative forms with inversion for paragraph-initial topic-signalling and cohesive linking between paragraphs, and the exploitation of paragraph-final position for signalling the topic of subsequent paragraphs, therefore favouring this position for constructions which foreground information, such as clefts, pseudoclefts, presentational there-constructions and signals of contrast.
10.6 TOWARDS A CHARACTERISATION OF HISTORY DISCOURSE

Although the sample is too small to permit a definitive characterisation of academic history discourse, it gives rise to certain observations which seem relevant to the methodology of this discipline. Unlike science research papers, in which content is separated according to function and spread across several sections (materials and methods, results and discussion), in history articles, everything other than the introduction and conclusion is contained within the same section, the body of the article. Here, evaluative noun phrases interweave the argument with detailed information from the archive, frequently contained in densely packed hypotactic constructions such as concessive clauses. The historian presents a thesis and adopts a static framework for organising the information - for instance, comparison between geographical areas - which divides a subject into broad aspects corresponding to the division of the body of the text into sections and sub-sections. Within the various parts of that framework, he or she uses primarily contrast, and secondarily reason and addition, as methods of development; organising the supporting detail which constitutes the various parts of the contrast, reason or addition relation chronologically. The detailed new information about the period under study is integrated with the chronological sequence of narrative, and the relations of contrast characteristic of reasoning. Stretches of chronological sequence, though numerous, are fairly brief, usually constituting no more than a sequence of two or three sentences between generalisations which provide topics and sub-topics for paragraphs. Thus, though accounting for a considerable proportion of the text, narrative is firmly subordinated to analysis and interpretation within a hierarchical organisational framework based first on more or less broad aspects of the topic, then contrastive development at a lower level, below that addition, and below that narrative, providing supporting detail.

The data support the claims that history generalises and abstracts and is concerned with human participants and location in time, since attributes are by far the most numerous type of strict initial theme, followed by reference to people, primarily in groups, and then reference to real world time. Since contrast/concession is much more frequent in theme than Reason, history discourse appears more concerned with debating the issues within a framework of contrast than with identifying cause and effect relationships, contrary to some claims made for the methodology of the discipline. The vast majority of contrast signals mark concession, which is consistent with the view that historians argue backwards and
forwards over the same ground, offering competing interpretations for the same data, and that claims and counter-claims are frequently contrasted within a two-part structure. The displacement contrast relation is also used to counter claims by other researchers, contributing to the so-called contending rhetoric of the discipline. Clefts, pseudoclefts, interrogatives and fronted themes are particularly useful in history discourse because of their salience. The forcefulness with which clefts and pseudoclefts reiterate a point contributes to a rhetorical style which is valued in this discipline.

It is even less possible to make strong claims about distinctions between subfields of history on the basis of only two research articles from each subfield. Nevertheless, it is interesting that the two medieval history texts share characteristics which distinguish them from the two modern history texts. Both make greater use of *yet* and of clefts and pseudoclefts, which provide a more emphatic tone. They also share the use of foregrounded postposed *for-*clauses and weighty postposed *while-*clauses in balance with the preceding main clause, which contributes to a more belletristic style. On the other hand, the modern history texts make more use of non-salient extraposed and existential-*there* constructions, more frequent reference to specific dates and years within a more limited time frame, and much use of quoted material, reflecting their access to more recent and therefore less fragmentary data.

### 10.7 SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Had time and space permitted, it would have been interesting to examine thematisation above the sentence level. These four writers differ in the extent to which they exploit initial or final placement in paragraphs for highlighting theme and signalling movement between levels in text structure. The Harriss text is particularly reader-friendly in this regard, with constant reminders of the discourse theme and the main ideas of sub-sections. In addition to previews of what is to come at the beginnings of sections and sub-sections and summaries at the end, Harriss frequently exploits paragraph-final position for reiteration of the discourse theme. In the history sample the final sentence is often a culminating point in a development over chronological time. Final sentences are also used to provide top-level comment on the content of the paragraph, though Walker’s paragraph-final sentences are usually elaborations on lower-level propositions in the paragraph. MacKenzie makes frequent use of final sentences in paragraphs to introduce the topic of subsequent
paragraphs. Another device he favours is the use of fronted comparative themes to introduce the topic at the beginning of paragraphs.

It would also have been useful to investigate the role played by complex noun phrases and nominalisation in these texts. The Walker article, in particular, has heavy noun phrases in theme which carry much information content. The first paragraph of his conclusion section is a particularly good illustration of the usefulness of nominalisation as a tool as it performs various functions in this paragraph, such as wrapping up the entire content of the body of the article and relating it to the conclusion by means of the first noun phrase with the nominalisation examination as its head, and by permitting the presentation of information in list form in the second sentence. An investigation of the role played by non-specific nouns, often nominalisations, would also have been useful, and of the role played by other summarising discourse organising devices, such as this and thus. It would also have been interesting to see whether the claims made by Thompson (1983) for -ing clauses in end position in the sentence were true of these history texts. And an investigation of thematic progression and method of development in these texts would be of relevance to the question of the extent to which history discourse makes use of narrative and of argument; there appear to be very short sequences of linear progression associated with chronological sequencing interrupting constant theme progression associated with expository organisation of text. Finally, the Harriss text has frequent examples of parallelism which merit closer examination. These are all possible topics for further investigation.
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POLITICAL SOCIETY AND THE GROWTH OF GOVERNMENT IN LATE MEDIEVAL ENGLAND

In the development of the English state the late Middle Ages have seldom been thought to have particular significance. For the most part it has been seen as a period of retreat and stagnation after the achievements of the Angevins and first Plantagenets, an ebb tide before the next forward surge under the Tudors. Some recent writing offers new explanations for what is perceived as its crisis of royal authority, while other historians have discerned elements of strength. I want first to summarize these views, and then to suggest that late medieval government had its own dynamic, an appreciation of which leads to a better understanding of developments in this period.

1 Richard Kaeuper, in War, Justice and Public Order, has argued that in the century after 1272 England changed from the "law state" created by the Angevins to the "war state" of the later Plantagenets. Angevin creativity had furnished the state with central financial, secretarial and judicial agencies, while the crown had extended its authority into the localities by asserting royal rights, intervening through its justices to protect property, and offering redress against its officials. It was from the crown that the drive for effective government came, through royal authority that the realm achieved a sense of unity, and on the king that men's expectations of justice centred. All this was jeopardized and ultimately negated by the wars of the three Edwards, for these imposed a crippling burden on a faltering economy and forced the crown to depend on the wealth and goodwill of its subjects. War overextended the crown's capacity; it could not both wage war with all its resources and maintain the entente of state-building. The impetus for the further extension of the crown's authority was lost, and the image of the king as the dispenser of justice yielded to that of the warrior. The abandonment of the eye of central justices opened the way for magnates and local gentry to assume responsibility for local peace-keeping, with the attendant evils of venality, intimidation and open lawlessness. The reputation of kingship suffered, and in society the chivalric ethos triumphed over the legal and bureaucratic: the "war state" replaced the "law state".

2 Peter Coss has similarly argued that the growth of state power as an emanation of the crown's public authority suffered a setback, though at a slightly earlier point, and from different causes.

3 He sees the Angevin judicial reforms, which offered the protection of the courts to all freemen, as posing a direct challenge to feudal lordship, undermining already fragile honorial structures, and threatening the magnate class as a whole with social extinction. It reacted with a series of reflexes to ensure its survival and pre-eminence. Its continued dominance over local society was secured by creating a web of clientage among the middling and lesser landowners, which eventually embraced not only the crown's growing number of local officials, such as sheriffs and escheators, but the local courts and justices. Bastard feudalism was not just an alternative mode of social organization; it was the subversion and control of the public authority of the crown by private and privatized agents, and its effect was to deflect and pervert the development of the centralized state. Though Coss sees this process as prior to, and independent of, the rise of the "war state", and attributes it to a power struggle between crown and magnates, like Kaeuper he is in no doubt about the baleful consequences of the crown's surrender of government to local powers.

4 That late medieval government was shaped by the demands of war is also the belief of J. R. Lander, writing from the perspective of its demise in the Wars of the Roses. In lectures on The Limitations of the English Monarchy, Lander defined two areas in which the crown's authority had been "emasculated" by 1485.

---

1. Richard W. Kaeuper, War, Justice and Public Order: England and France in the Later Middle Ages (Oxford, 1988). For this discussion I have treated Kaeuper's


3. Coss, "Bastard Feudalism Revised: Reply", pp. 192-3: "the invasion and subversion of law courts and offices of administration ... lies at the heart of bastard feudalism."
The first was its capacity to raise money by taxation. Although war developed the practice of taxation, it also linked it specifically to military needs, and the crown could expect between the ages of the Edwards and that of the Henries. As war became less popular, the grants from subjects became fewer and more grudging, and the crown found that "it could not afford an aggressive foreign policy which involved anything like prolonged campaigning". The Hundred Years War petered out in the aborted expeditions of 1474-5 and 1492: the "war state" had exhausted itself. In consequence the monarchy was forced into the strait-jacket of its insufficient landed endowment, and perpetually threatened with insolvency. It could afford nothing like a standing army, a police force or an extended bureaucracy— all the basic equipment of the emergent absolutist regimes on the continent. The second major limitation of the late medieval monarchy followed from this, though it represented an independent development. This was its dependence on the landed owning class for administration and justice in the localities. In agreement with Kaevser and Coss, Lander sees the delivery of these functions to the magnates and gentry as "a major and permanent capitulation by central government". Government in the localities came to be a function of property. The monarchy had surrendered the initiative to its subjects, and lost the power to reform the country's institutions or govern effectively. Its power was "limited, restricted and precarious".

Such consensus on the failure of late medieval English government is impressive, but it has not gone unchallenged. The argument that war made the crown the prisoner of its subjects, forcing it to bargain royal rights to win their support, has been rebutted by W. M. Ormrod with regard to Edward III, the archetypal warrior king. He has argued that, on the contrary, the middle years of the reign— those of the great military victories also saw "a planned and consistent attempt by the crown to preserve its rights" and "extend the king's financial interests and political authority". Edward's success in obtaining taxation for his wars in fact owed more to his relentless pressure on the parliamentary Commons than to his concessions to them. Nor did the crown hand over its judicial responsibilities to local amateurs, for the J.P.s acted under the supervision of professional judges. Ormrod suggests that war provided the stimulus for strong monarchy, not its dissolution— as the subsequent reign of Henry V confirmed.

In a stimulating survey of the ensuing period, from 1369 to 1422, frequently seen as one of acute political, social and spiritual crises, John Gillingham also denies that the crown's authority was undermined or that its resources declined. The high level of taxation, direct and indirect, which the monarchy still obtained, showed continued support from the political community for royal policy. The involvement of that community in government, both centrally in the development of parliament and locally in shire administration, gave strength and resilience to monarchical rule. It forged a tradition of co-operation which was a barrier to absolutism and removed the financial burden of a professional bureaucracy from the crown, and hence from its subjects. By the nature of political society the crown had to persuade and lead where it could not compel. Richard II failed because he swam against the tide of English politics, and the Lancastrian usurpation strengthened the monarchy in that it aimed to restore the tradition of Edward III. A similar assessment underlies the concluding remarks of Colin Richmond in an article on the significance of 1485. Noting that both the Lancastrian and Yorkist dynasties founedered amid factious quarrels of the nobility, Richmond blames this on the failure of the monarchy to lead the nation in an effective war. Foreign war brought stability at home by absorbing the energies of the military class in honourable ventures and stimulating loyalty to the crown. When kings abandoned war, and with it the right to require taxation, they were forced back on piecemeal and unpopular exploitation of their prerogative rights. Under Edward III and Henry V the "war state" had enlarged and consolidated royal authority; it was still viable at the end of the fifteenth century given the right king to lead it. The limitations were those of the monarchs, not of the monarchy.
Two views of the development of late medieval government thus stand in opposition to each other. One sees the thrust towards centralized authority frustrated, either by feudal reaction or the strains of war, with the crown forced to surrender authority to the local interests of the aristocracy; the other sees the crown, partly under the pressures of war, mobilizing the resources of the realm in partnership with a political élite and enhancing its reputation and authority by successful leadership. Each provides a plausible interpretation, recognizably related to events. The first sees the “war state” as a perversion, and fundamentally flawed; the second attributes its collapse to personal inadequancies and historical circumstances. The issues in debate are familiar and recurrent: was state-building advanced more by war or peace, and did war strengthen or weaken royal authority; is devolved or centralized government the more effective, and absolutist or limited monarchy strongest?

Yet such antitheses have limited validity within the medieval context. Neither conceptually nor in practice did war stand in opposition to law. The ruler’s sword symbolized his role as both warrior and justiciar, for ethically war was waged to enforce legal rights where justice had been denied, and its aim was a just peace.

And while war itself was necessarily brutalizing and disruptive, the chivalric code sought to discipline the knightly class by its emphasis on service, honour and loyalty. War also removed troublemakers, while its cessation frequently brought crime waves or feudal disorder. In short war was a normal and integral element in the medieval polity, and to present it as a contrasting and alternative option to state-building is misleading. It is similarly artificial to set up a polarity between the crown as a central and public authority, and the landlord classes as private and local powers. Any late medieval government, however developed its central administration, was limited by local particularism, slow communications, and communal and family loyalties. It could not control society directly through its own agents, as does a modern government, but had to rely on local élites who exercised and often appropriated its authority.


Leading churchmen were a governing class, the king’s natural councillors, with a residual responsibility for good governance. Should the monarch fail. Below them existed a magistracy whose position rested on a combination of wealth, communal tradition and delegated jurisdiction. They might indeed be corrupted by private interests, but so were royal bureaucrats, while it would be naive to believe that the “public authority” of the crown was consistently exercised for the common good. Subjects as often saw royal power as arbitrary and exploitative, and its officials as oppressive, as they believed it to be the remedy for disorders and a curb on local interests.

This suggests that to attribute the development of late medieval government solely to royal policy, and to measure it by the growth of central institutions or the enlargement of royal power, is to mistake its nature and miss its essential dynamic. This, I believe, is to be found in the development of the society which government 3 had to serve. Government was moulded more by pressures from within political society than by the efforts of kings or officials to direct it from above. It was these pressures which shaped the institutions of government, the conventions of governing, and the capacity of kings to govern effectively.

Approached from this angle, the major development of the period from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century was the emergence of a political society containing the middling landowners. Free society had evolved into an elaborately structured élite of earls, barons, knights, esquires and gentlemen, with yeomen and husbandmen below. All ranks of this society came to be involved in the activity of governing. The county gentry monopolized the shire offices as sheriffs, parliamentary representatives, J.P.s, escheators and commissioners of many kinds, while parish gentry served as coroners, hundred bailiffs, tax collectors and purveyors, with husbandmen performing duties as constables and jurymen which brought social recognition and were stepping-stones to

---

If we add to this landed society the gentlemen bureaucrats who serviced it with legal and administrative skills — local attorneys, solicitors and pleaders, land agents, stewards, bailiffs and household officers — and if we further add the richer clergy and their officials, and the urban merchants and substantial citizens, and even, in the capital, the small but influential group of royal bureaucrats and lawyers, we have an elite of greatly diversified interests and skills, many of whom were professionally articulate. This was the political society which had to be gov-
erned, and these men were themselves the channels along which government had to flow. How did this affect its development and function? I want to examine three aspects of late medieval government on which debate has centered: first, the atrophy of central institutions and their failure to develop or adapt to changing pressures; secondly, the financial viability of the late medieval state; and thirdly, the effectiveness of its judicial system and peace-keeping. In each respect the crown is commonly held to have demonstrated a loss of will and surrendered its rights. However, if we view these aspects of government as not the emanations of royal authority, but as the product of those involved in them, we can better appreciate the nature of, and the impetus for, the changes that occurred.

I

If central government is seen in terms of the development of institutions, it is true that the main period of innovation was over by 1250, and was followed by one of professionalization and definition. The existing offices of state — chancery, privy seal, exchequer and the courts of law — developed as an integrated governmental system, with normative routines and elaborate records, becoming permanently established at Westminster as the administrative capital of the realm. Did this form an ossifying and unwieldy bureaucracy, or was it responsive to changing demands and developments in these late medieval centuries? To answer this question we must shift our standpoint from the crown to that of the political community.

By the mid-fourteenth century, on A. L. Brown’s estimate, the three writing offices of chancery, privy seal and signet were issuing some thirty to forty thousand letters a year, some open and formal, others closed and personal. Many administrative orders were in standard forms, such as appointments to offices, commissions of different kinds and payments, all initiated by the king and council. But many others were grants, dispensations and licences which arose from requests and pressures from subjects, who were using the machinery of government to advance or protect their interests. Competition for favours was reflected in an increasing variety of clauses granting land or offices in anticipation, in reversion or in survivorship, and with a variety of benefits and safeguards. Officers of the chancery, privy seal and court could all assist a petitioner in his search for advantage and security, while a developing hierarchy of warrants — signet or sign manual, and privy seal — witnessed the personal authorization of the king or that of the council. Probably the greater part of the work of the writing offices was thus devoted to coping with subjects’ concerns.

The same was true on a more restricted scale in the financial offices. The Hundred Years War transformed the operations of the medieval exchequer. Recurrent taxation, direct and indirect, demanded an elaborate machinery of collection in towns, vills and ports, matched by a distribution of revenue to military and naval forces and all who supplied them. The development of a system of promissory assignments spread tentacles throughout landed and mercantile society and involved myriads of subjects in competition for public revenues, and thus for the patronage and influence that gave access to them. It was at and through the

17 Ibid., pp. 44-52.
The pressures from below — from thousands of landowners seeking to defend or extend their property rights — led to the emergence of new legal procedures and new courts. It was the receipt of quarels, or plaints, which extended the crown's criminal jurisdiction beyond felony to embrace many trespasses. This was the third and final phase of the judicial revolution which transformed the governance of England between 1150 and 1400. Similarly, it was the persistent demand of plaintiffs for legal advantage that spawned the hordes of attorneys and private lawyers, and led to an explosion in the types of common-law writs available in legal process. The sheer volume of litigation is a telling indication of the kind of society which the law served: it has been estimated that by the end of the Middle Ages the many central courts were handling three thousand new suits each year, involving many times that number of litigants. The other major development in the legal system, the beginnings of an equitable jurisdiction, likewise flowed from the presentation of a vernacular bill of plaint to the council or chancellor, alleging that the plaintiff was unable to secure remedy at common law. Concieved jurisdiction developed as much from pressures by suitors as from the summary authority delegated by the crown. In sum, then, many thousands of the king's subjects had dealings each year with the central offices of government, either as agents of the crown or, more usually, for their own purposes.

It is worth reflecting on the consequences of this. Familiarity with officials and official procedures, with their legal and financial formulae, must have been widespread. This produced a service industry of local lawyers, attorneys and petty officials through whom subjects often dealt with the centre, and it necessarily engendered much intrigue and petty corruption. Knowledge of who to approach — where, when and through whom — was part of the worldly wisdom needed to survive and progress. Government thus ceased to be arcane or remote, something handed down by officials; it became something in which subjects were involved, something they learned to manipulate, criticize and even change. If we speak of "public authority" or "public administration" in the late Middle Ages, it cannot simply be equated with the interests of the crown; it was indeed public, but in the sense of operating in response to the needs of an informed and articulate political community alongside the crown. And if it was "subverted" in their interests, it was also refined and developed by them.

While these old institutions were changing their character under pressure from an expanding political society, major new institutions of government were appearing. It is perhaps significant that these, council and parliament, were political rather than administrative in function; that is, not executive agencies of the king's will, but meeting-points for the interests of the crown and realm. The council stood closer to the king, and, as an institution, was less defined. Before 1300 kings habitually took counsel in two ways: informally in a domestic context, and formally in semi-public assembly. That remained true throughout the Middle Ages, for nothing could constrain the king's right to take advice where and from whom he wished. But a more continuous body, known as "the council" or (later) "the continual council", operated alongside these and gradually acquired an identity and an identifiable role. The volume and technicality of royal business meant

---

25 See the concluding remarks in Harris, Parliament and Public Finance, p. 517, regarding the public character of royal finance.
26 For good summaries of the work of the council, see Brown, Governance of Late Medieval England, ch. 2; Ormrod, Reign of Edward III, pp. 77-7.
that the council performed executive and administrative functions, instructing ambassadors, inditing troops for a campaign, issuing commissions and from the latter part of the fourteenth century developing its own jurisdiction: all habitual and necessary aspects of government. Although the king remitted to the council what and how much business he chose, an active and competent monarch would rely heavily on the experience and expertise of his councillors. By 1500 the first of its specialist committees, the “council learned”, had appeared, and it was set to become the prime institution of Tudor government. Its potential for governing was fully realized by the absence or incapacity of the monarch. In this situation the formal appointment of its members, the payment of wages, the regulation of procedures and the keeping of records convey an impression of institutional continuity. Even if that is misleading, a council was commonly acknowledged to be a necessary adjunct to royal rule, and its function in the polity was to act as a bridge between the king and his subjects.

For though councillors were answerable only to the king, they were answerable for the good government of the realm, and in advising the king they were bid to bear in mind the public good and not merely the interests of the monarch. At any crisis of confidence in royal government the Commons turned naturally to a council for remedy and reform. The council was thus the nodal point for the three elements of late medieval government: the royal will, the administrative machine and the concern of subjects for good governance. It was adaptable to changes in the balance between these, and was a product both of the professionalization of government and of its increasingly public character.

Much in the same vein could also be said of parliament, though


less needs to be, for its emergence is recognized as highly charac-
2 teristic of the late medieval polity. Again, it is better defined by its functions than by its institutional forms: its authority to legislate, tax and present grievances on behalf of the realm being constitutionally recognized, despite it having no autonomous existence and only a rudimentary organization. It developed out of a combination of royal initiative and pressure from subjects, and was notably influenced both by the demands of war and political disputes. As a vehicle for mobilizing the resources of the realm — financial, military and political — its support could add vastly to the crown’s authority. At the same time it directly reflected the wealth and influence of the political class for whom membership of it became part of the cursus honorum. Among the Commons were men who moved easily within the court and central government, and were leaders and governors of their communities. Frequent assembly provided the opportunity for political discourse with the king and ministers and for a dialogue between centre and localities. Parliament thus knit together the interests of the crown, the political nation and the communities.

The Commons, though subordinate in status to the Lords, were spokesmen for the community of the whole realm, embracing governors and governed. Parliament was not, like the council, part of royal government, but provided a critical judgement of government, changing from co-operation to opposition in response to the character of kingship. In either context parliament’s existence meant that government was necessarily consensual, needing the support of an articulate and informed propertied class.

1 Thus the central organs of the state in late medieval England, far from remaining static and fossilized, were changing in response to the needs of an increasingly wide body of users. As the reach of government extended, and familiarity with its machinery broadened, so new procedures and new institutions were developed under pressures from both above and below, from rulers and ruled.

30 The literature on parliament is vast, but R. G. Davies and J. H. Denton (eds.), The English Parliament in the Middle Ages (Manchester, 1981), covers the whole period.

II
FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The capacity of a state to finance the needs of internal government and external defence is rightly taken as a measure of its strength. The bankruptcy of Lancastrian government by 1450 undeniably contributed to its overthrow, and initiated a shift in the financial basis of government. How far this crisis reflected not merely royal incompetence but a structural failure of crown finance is one question to be faced; but it raises the still broader question of what changes occurred in the political assumptions on which the financial, and particularly the tax, structure of the state rested.

Late medieval England was a highly developed tax state. Over the period from 1336 to 1453 more than three-quarters of revenue came from direct and indirect taxation. This was the direct consequence of war. Taxation of personal property was developed in the thirteenth century as an obligation upon all subjects to contribute to the defence of the realm when war threatened the common safety. Kings quickly exploited this enhancement of their authority, introducing nationwide taxation on their subjects' goods. Under Edward I these levies proved remarkably lucrative, each yielding on average over £59,000, and, together with the maletoll on wool after 1294, gave the means to mount costly campaigns in Wales, Gascony, Flanders and Scotland. Indirect taxation on the export of wool was even more lucrative, and in expectation of gigantic profits from a royal monopoly over wool exports Edward III created an expensive anti-French alliance with the Low Countries' rulers in 1339-40. Such enterprises were vastly overambitious even on the basis of these new resources, and the resultant failures, debts and political reaction set limits to the level of future taxation. By 1334 the tax on movable property had been stabilized at almost £38,000, and after 1353 the crown accepted a regular export tax on wool, fixed by parliament. This went hand in hand with a different pattern of warfare. Edward III stepped back from the leadership of large-scale armies, organized and financed through the wardrobe on a credit basis, in favour of smaller raiding expeditions which his captains contracted to lead for cash in hand. Direct taxation on property came to be granted specifically for these campaigns, the cost of which could be estimated on the basis of the contracts made. Indirect taxation came to be assigned to the permanent charges of defence, the border garrisons and safeguard of the sea.

It has been shown that in the period 1368-81, when the war was actively resumed, the yield of these taxes was sufficient to meet the crown's military commitments. Forty years later they were still adequate for Henry V to launch, and for a short period sustain, the most ambitious military enterprise of the Middle Ages, the conquest of Normandy. Up to this point, although taxation at wartime level could not be sustained indefinitely, war was sufficiently in balance with taxable capacity to make it a politically feasible option — one that did not either bankrupt the monarchy or provoke the opposition of the political classes. Taxation was, of course, at issue in most of the parliamentary crises of this period, both as a convenient charge against royal ministers and favourites, and as an index of the competence of royal government. But the need for taxation was broadly accepted by the political nation. More serious was the threat, and occasional eruption, of popular opposition. Yet here again, although taxation bore heavily in times of economic hardship, its overall level must have been broadly consistent with the level of rural wealth.

Even in the aftermath of the Black Death taxes were collected in full, and the only major tax revolt of the late Middle Ages, in 1381, was occasioned by a series of unprecedentedly onerous...
levies and the enforcement of a novel direct assessment. Lacking a local bureaucracy of tax gatherers, the crown had in 1334 wisely abandoned direct assessment in favour of fixed quotas from each community, which became hallowed by tradition and were appor-
tioned by local initiative. Further, agrarian society was cushioned against intolerable taxation by the productive tax on wool exports which underpinned the crown’s war finance. Thus while taxation produced complaint, it was very rarely met by refusal or revolt.

Moreover in its own terms the late medieval tax system was remarkabery efficient. At the cost of some elasticity, the crown was guaranteed speedy collection and full enjoyment of its taxes, with administrative costs under 3 per cent. To have won acceptance of taxation for war on this normative basis was a major achievement of royal government and one which had far-reaching consequences.

Yet the system had inherent constraints which became apparent after Henry V’s death. It had always rested on a basic identity of purpose between the crown and the political class, but with royal authority in abeyance the commitment to war faded. At the same time agrarian decline and a sharp fall in wool exports brought a reduction of the tax base. Yet even in its last phase the system still delivered regular if reluctant grants of taxation to underpin twenty-five years of gruelling defensive war in France.

Even after the English had been expelled from their conquests in France (except Calais) and were developing a new insularity of outlook, parliament would grant adequate taxation for offensive campaigns provided these were occasional and short, as in 1475.

Essentially, though, the tax system became the victim of its own success. Its very effectiveness in financing war, when money and political unity were vital, deterred the medieval monarchy from repeated attempts to extend direct taxation to peacetime or to make new assessments of taxable wealth. Similarly the ease and profitability of wool taxation removed any incentive to develop cumbersome sales taxes, or to exploit the monarchy’s landed feudal revenues. Only as the “war state” faded in the mid-fifteenth century was the need for alternative revenues and modes of taxation acutely felt, and by then taxation was deeply rooted in political conventions which proved hard to change.

The early Tudor period, when war became both intermittent and more costly, brought the crisis of the medieval tax system into the open. The new and heavier forms of taxation required to meet the steeply rising costs of sixteenth-century warfare could only have been acceptable within a new national consensus for military expansion, which the monarchy never generated.

Repeated attempts to remodel the tax system, by directly assessed subsidies and prerogative and non-consensual levies, encountered obstruction and opposition at all levels of the community which limited their effectiveness. But neither was the crown any more successful in securing acceptance of direct taxation for normal peacetime government. To adapt a tax system designed for the occasional demands of war to the recurrent needs of government in time of peace involved a conceptual and constitutional leap.

The first was perhaps not insuperable, in that a king who ruled for the benefit of his subjects (peace being recognized as the greatest benefit he could bring) should evince their love and assistance. But constitutionally direct taxation had always been granted in respect of a specific necessity, not a habitual need, and had become the occasion for reciprocal benefits from the king.

The normalizing of taxation for the recurrent expenses of government threatened to undermine both the consent and the bargaining power of parliament. Much as they would have liked, the Tudor monarchs were unable to change the medieval character of direct taxation as occasional and extraordinary, and establish it on a permanent, non-consensual basis.

---


The problem of how the recurrent needs of government were to be met, when the crown's hereditary resources could at best support its domestic expenses, had already presented itself to Sir John Fortescue in the late fifteenth century. Believing that the essence of the English constitution lay in the free assent of parliament to laws and taxes, he condemned taxation at will on the French model as tyrannical. Yet if the crown were denied taxation by its subjects to meet its needs, it would surely seek to enrich itself by "exquisite" (that is prerogative) measures. Fortescue's solution was a landed re-endowment of the monarchy, mainly by resumption supplemented, if need be, by the once-for-all grant of a subsidy. In this way the king would govern from his own resources and subjects would live freely on theirs. He would not need to tax them except occasionally for war, nor entrench on their rights through prerogative. The collegial quality of their relationship would be retained. Fortescue's diagnosis was broadly vindicated in the century after 1460, when war became intermittent. The crown developed its landed and prerogative revenues, government becoming more "regal" and less consensual, with fewer parliaments, while grants of taxes were rarer if heavier and required justification in elaborate preambles. Only with the last decades of the sixteenth century was there something of a return to the medieval pattern of habitual if lighter levies, with parliament acknowledging its obligation to provide against a continuing threat of war. Essentially, therefore, the Tudor state perpetuated the late medieval basis of taxation, without changing its principles and assumptions, until the tax system collapsed along with the political consensus in the English Civil War.

As the tax system rested on a political dialogue between crown and subjects, so too did the expenditure of revenue. By the mid-fourteenth century the exchequer controlled the collection and disbursement of all crown revenues, and continued to do so until the rise of the chamber under the Yorkist and Tudor kings. Its financial administration has often been condemned by historians as cumbersome and hidebound, and its records (concerned with the charge and discharge of creditors) as ill-suited to reveal the actual state of royal finance at any juncture. Yet as we have seen, it was the focal agency for the financial concerns of the crown and its creditors, an open and busy place. Already at the start of the fourteenth century the exchequer was being called on to provide statements of its income and expenditure, and following Treasurer Edington's reorganization in the mid-century it was able to produce detailed statements of annual revenue and expenditure from the receipt and issue rolls, and use triennial averages to make credible estimates for future planning. By the fifteenth century such evidence was being used by the council to draw up a financial strategy to meet the growing strains of insolvency, by allocating preferential assignments of revenue to domestic or military charges. Policy and finance were thus coordinated at the highest level. Financial strains within an increasingly politicized society meant that individual creditors and payees of the exchequer would likewise press their claims for preferential payments. The treasurer had to be alert not only to the national needs of the crown, but to the political reaction of its creditors. If he were tempted to issue more tallies of assignment than the revenue would bear, he could precipitate a crisis in its credit; if he balanced preferential treatment for too many, his planning would collapse. Every fifteenth-century treasurer walked a tightrope fraught with financial, political and even military dangers if he got it wrong. Financial planning could even become the subject of political controversy, as the parliamentary Commons expressed concern that the taxes they granted should be properly spent, and criticized the extravagance of the royal household and the administration. The appointment, in the late fourteenth century, of treasurers to manage the subsidy and render account, and of commissions to investigate and review crown revenue and expenditure, was followed in the fifteenth century by attempts to limit household expenditure and resume royal grants for its main...
The late medieval state needed an effective system for raising 2 taxes and controlling expenditure in order to fight its wars. In 3 England this became the concern not only of the crown, but of 4 the political community. Grants of taxation expressed a consensus 5 on military and commercial policies, and their expenditure 6 provided the occasion for a critical review of royal government as a whole. Consensus, criticism and control became deeply ingrained in the relations of king and parliament. When the conditions on which the tax structure had been built began to change, with the decline of a tradition of aggressive war in the fifteenth century, the crown found its attempts to reshape the system limited by the political conventions on which it rested. We may take different views on whether that was desirable or not, but the fact that English public finance represented an amalgam of the interests and actions of both crown and subjects reveals much about the dynamic of political development in the late Middle Ages.

III
LAW AND SOCIETY

The most frequently cited evidence for the weakness of late medieval government is the chronic lawlessness and the corruption of the judicial system. Recent investigations into the nature of the social tensions behind law-breaking, and the rituals and conventions of dispute settlement, are modifying this picture. Even so it is evident that the early fourteenth century faced two interlocking problems. There was a short-term crisis of local criminal disorders, arising from war and economic dislocation; and there was the longer-term question of the effect of an expanding propertyed class on the law and the legal profession. In dealing with these the crown is said to have surrendered its responsibilities for law-enforcement to magnates and gentry, as J.P.s, thereby reinforcing the power of local elites to use the law as a weapon of social control while flouting it in their own interests. How accurate is this picture?

1 The crown’s immediate response to the spate of robberies and armed gangs was to resort to its professional justices, appointing punitive commissions (of “trailbaston”) 1305, attempting to revive the eyre in 1328-9, and making available to plaintiffs special commissions of oyer and terminer. Each of these was ultimately discredited by being exploited either by the crown, for 3 money, or by powerful plaintiffs against their adversaries. Only the steadily enlarging criminal jurisdiction of the justices of assize, who were organized into six circuits in 1328-9 and given responsibility for gaol delivery, proved more acceptable and enduring.

4 At the same time the crown invoked the older tradition of seigneurial law-keeping in manorial and franchial courts. From the latter thirteenth century the gentry had been appointed as keepers of the peace, while early in Edward III’s reign lords were named as local justices or supervisors of counties. When Edward left England for Brabant in 1338 he included lords and gentry, along with royal justices, in commissions of the peace with power to try felonies. In the following decades the Commons, in granting taxation, pressed for this as a permanent solution.

1 Recent research has interpreted this less as a struggle to wrest control of local peace-keeping from the crown and its justices, and more as a long period of experimentation leading to an agreed solution. For the gentry, though better informed about local problems than royal justices, lacked the power and impartiality to enforce the law against members of their own class, and lacked the expertise to sit in judgement. Magnates were needed on peace commissions to deal with major disturbances, and royal justices were needed to maintain legal standards. It took another half-century of argument and experiment before these problems were resolved, by dovetailing the assize justices, with their power of gaol delivery, into the peace commissions where they were of the quorum for trying felonies. This met the concern of the professional judiciary for legal standards, and that of the landowning classes for rule in the shires. The solution expressed the consen-

ual nature of the late medieval polity, and its permanence provides the clearest evidence of the political maturity of crown, lords and gentry.48

The peace commissions thus extended and legitimized, under royal authority, the traditional responsibility of the landowning class for social control. From 1388 the J.P.s were paid wages on a daily basis; in 1414 a statute regulated the times of quarter sessions; their jurisdiction in criminal offences came to supersede that of private courts, and eventually that of the sheriff's tour; while their investigative and policing role was developed with the extension of their jurisdiction to cover liversies, counterfeiting, Lollardy and riots.49 At the same time they steadily lost ground as criminal judges to the justices of assize and gaol delivery to whom the more serious felonies were referred, and who increasingly exercised supervisory powers over J.P.s. Perhaps for this reason most of the routine work of quarter sessions was done not by the leading shire gentry but by a handful of assiduous J.P.s, mainly lesser gentry and local lawyers, who dealt almost wholly with petty crime, committed overwhelmingly by those of yeoman rank and below.50 Yet even at this level justice involved political society at its widest, namely those whose property of 40 s. a year qualified them for jury service. Recent investigations have shown the capacity of juries in this period to mitigate verdicts and punishments to accord with social norms.51 Thus, on the one hand, the crown's responsibilities for public order were being extended, as the biannual assizes and the quarter sessions brought more regular and penetrating visitations into the shires; on the other, all degrees of political society were being caught up in the process and problems of law-keeping. By 1500 England had been equipped with a system of local justice compounded of local magistracy and central supervision which was to stand the test of time.52

But law not only functioned as a means of social control; within political society it was used to claim or defend property rights. In that society lordship, influence and status rested primarily on land, the title to which was largely governed by common-law rules of inheritance. Competition for status and influence was expressed in challenges to landownership, while conversely disputes over legal title involved status and invoked lordship. Law and lordship were thus intimately linked, both in the substance of many disputes and in their modes of prosecution and settlement. Contemporaries were alive to the ill effects of this as also to the tension between law as justice and law as litigation for self-interest. In litigation lordship led to the retaining or bribery of justices and the maintenance of the suits of a lord's clients. Both were fostered by a rapidly growing lay legal profession which made a living from the disputes of political society. But by 1400 criticism and complaint, together perhaps with the wider availability of legal counsel, had brought to an end the formal retaining of royal justices, and fifteenth-century evidence for direct bribery of judges is rare. The profession was beginning to regulate itself, and its senior members to emphasize their dignity and repute.53

At a local level, where J.P.s would often belong to a lord's affinity, the confusion of magistracy and lordship could lead to abuse, particularly in taking indictments for riot or forcible entry in magnate and gentry quarrels. Yet while this conferred an initial advantage, such cases would normally be removed from the local sphere by transference to King's Bench, while any serious disturbance would bring the intervention of royal justices or the
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Juries were the most vulnerable element in the legal system, both in their selection by the sheriff and through bribery, favour or intimidation by litigants. But in litigation over property and breaches of the peace — the two often went together — false verdicts were more likely to be a stage in the battle than the final settlement of the issue. Few verdicts were irreversible, for not merely did the law offer a variety of actions with which to counter an opponent, but all such tactics — legal, quasi-legal and corrupt — might be designed ultimately to secure an advantageous settlement out of court. Litigation was an elaborate and prolonged contest, with multiple opportunities for manoeuvre; it offered a resolution of property disputes in terms of law and lordship, but not necessarily justice. It met some of the requirements for settling disputes over land, but it was only one of a range of options from violence, through social arbitration, to appeal to royal authority, which were available to political society.

Late medieval England’s reputation for violence is easy to understand, based as it is on some well-publicized instances. But historians have accepted the fruitlessness of any attempt to quantify violence in this period, and have begun to ask how it was regarded by contemporaries. Gentry violence occurred predominantly as an accommodation to litigation, though much of the violence described in legal records could be legal fiction or ritual acts, even forcible entry being a technical means of asserting title or making an opponent declare his. Actual violence to persons and property had two fundamental limitations. First, although in the short term it might intimidate, it could not establish title and might prejudice the case at law. Secondly, society viewed violence in terms akin to war, sanctioning its use by due authority for a rightful cause, but reproving recourse to it which was unauthorized or in self-interest. To resort to unlawful violence was thus to put one’s reputation and status at risk. It was frequently the last resort of those deprived of lawful remedy, the losers and those outside the system. Those able to bend the law had less occasion to break it. Significantly, men of standing like John of Gaunt, Ralph Lord Cromwell and Sir John Fastolf all consciously eschewed violence, preferring to manipulate the law to their own ends. The lesser gentry were more prone to use violence, since their own status and influence was smaller while their need to protect and extend their inheritances was just as great. But even at this level the social constraints on violence in a propertied society were bound to be considerable, and in the main property interests were regulated through networks of neighbourhood, family, friends and lordship.

A principal device for dispute settlement was thus arbitration. This occurred at all levels of society under the auspices of an appropriate superior authority. In the case of gentry disputes this might be a local magnate or bishop, in the absence of whom the gentry elite might itself arrange and enforce a loveday. Lords settled the disputes of their retainers, as guilds did those of their members. The gentry, often as J.P.s, regulated the quarrels of freeholders and husbandsmen. Clergy of all degrees were favoured as mediators, and professional lawyers were widely employed both in arbitration and in drawing up a legal settlement which

56 For example, see C. Cherry, "Inheritance and Local Politics in the Later Middle Ages: The Case of Ralph Lord Cromwell and the Heriz Inheritance", Nottingham Medieval Studies, xxx (1986), pp. 67-96.
Public order and dispute settlement were thus largely regulated by local hierarchies, but just as J.P.s came under the surveillance of the crown's justices, so might gentry disputes need to be determined by the crown’s authority. The king was the symbol of justice which, by his coronation oath, he was bound to render to all subjects. It was his duty to ensure that his officers, notably his judicial officers, were incorrupt, and kings occasionally took exemplary action against guilty judges and others. Equally specific was his punishment of those who broke the peace, whether by fine and imprisonment of individuals, or by the dispatch of commissions of oyer and terminer or justices of the King's Bench to disturbed regions. But all such interventions into local society from above and outside were ad hoc responses to a perceived crisis, and were virtually always on appeal by one party to the crown. This was the seed of that jurisdiction dispensed by the chancellor's Court of Conscience which, originating in the late fourteenth century, came to full flowering under Wolsey. Dealing alike with civil and criminal causes, and enforcing fiduciary agreements outside the common law, it provided a channel for speedy and equitable solutions which could be formalized by arbitration or even through common-law actions. The same attributes of authority and informality, made conciliatory jurisdiction suitable for dealing with gentry riot and forcible entry. A procedure for summoning before the council those arrested and indicted or
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certified by the J.P.s for committing a riot, was evolved from the end of the fourteenth century and formalized in the Statute of 1014. Yet even where the public peace had been broken, process had to be commenced by individual complaint either to the J.P. or to the council. Not until the Star Chamber Act of 1487 was there provision for prosecution by the crown on its own initiative, and even thereafter such cases were rare.62

Although the crown undoubtedly had a residuary responsibility for public order and the concept of justice, it mostly exercised this only when invoked by subjects. Society had in the main to regulate its own conflicts, and gradually it did so. For in a society which "went to law as part of everyday routine, [in which] litigation was commonplace, almost instinctive", law-mindedness came imperceptibly to colour social relationships and ideals.63 By the fifteenth century the legal mentality was already displacing the chivalric. Towards the end of his life Fastolf complained to his secretary, William Worcester, that the armigerous class was more habituated to office-holding and the courts of law than to the field of battle. Among his circle in East Anglia honour was indeed coming to reside not in military prowess but in a reputation for the integrity of behaviour befitting one's social status.64

Did this huge expansion of law-keeping and law-seeking by the property class subvert the public authority of the crown? Did the decline of the eyre, with its policing and exploitative functions, allow lords to dominate local legal and administrative structures through their affinities? Whatever case can be made for this in the thirteenth century, after 1350 the operation of lordship within political society seems far more complex. Late medieval historians differ in the emphasis they place on bastard feudal ties, which undoubtedly varied according to locality and circumstances; but certain considerations underlie any general assessment of their extent and significance.

First, the collective income of the peerage was overshadowed by that of the gentry. The income-tax returns of 1436 show that
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the peerage was at the apex of a broad pyramid of landed wealth, and those that survive from nineteen shires in 1412 suggest that the peerage had on average no more than a quarter of the land held by the whole armigerous class. Secondly, the peerage was not spread evenly if thinly across this multi-layered society. Though their lands usually extended across many shires, their political influence tended to be focused on their main residences. A few shires, like Cheshire and Nottinghamshire, had no resident nobility, and in others, like Kent, East Sussex, Derbyshire and Essex, their influence was rivalled by that of the leading gentry.

Again, the authority of super-magnates, like John of Gaunt and Warwick the Kingmaker, suffered from being overextended, while within any shire there could be areas without magnate estates, forming a vacuum to be filled by other forms of authority. Indeed only the very greatest magnate could hope to encompass the whole shire within his influence and thereby control its officers and administration. And even where the identity of affinity and shire officers can be established, it is difficult to know whether this worked to the advantage of the magnate or to that of the lesser baronial élite in his retinue. What is certain is that any magnate was engulfed in a sea of gentry families whose support he needed to make his authority effective. Thirdly, lordship had to be actively exercised, and was thus susceptible to personal accidents like minorities, long-lived dowagers, absences in war or simple personal inadequacy. Fourthly, as Brynmor Pugh pointed out and particular studies have confirmed, most magnates spent no more than 10 per cent of their income on retaining fees, and at £10 or 10 marks a head baronial retinue would have numbered less than two dozen and a comital retinue not more than twice that. Yet the class of potential retainers with incomes upward of £10 per annum numbered four thousand or more. In terms of their formal membership bastard feudal affinities only scraped the surface of the political society.

Despite these inherent limitations, magnate lordship was both attractive and influential. In a strongly hierarchical society the peerage were the acknowledged leaders by virtue both of their individual wealth and their titles of dignity. Lordship was sought by the ambitious for its benefits and by conformists for its protection. Service and good lordship was an open-ended relationship which embraced many beyond those formally retained. Moreover good lordship, when it was widely and effectively deployed, as by Earl Richard Beauchamp or Richard, duke of Gloucester, could offer a focus for the political society of an area and absorb the networks of the gentry. It provided a vital link between the local and the national polity. But what a great lord exercised through his affinity was not so much control or domination as to use the contemporary term the "rule" of his country. This was not unlike the king's rule of his nobility and realm, being a feat of governance by personality and political skills, within established conventions. It had to run with the grain of political society and uphold the stability and fair-dealing which enabled political society to function. Such exemplary rule by a magnate tended

---
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to be as rare as that by a king. Overall, bastard feudalism functioned in a sporadic and imperfect fashion, and perhaps to 12. the increasing dissatisfaction of the gentry. Certainly over the course of these centuries the increasing independence of the gentry is a theme which emerges from different studies and is evident in their growing political power and sense of identity.

In tracing the growth of the medieval political order we have to set aside our preconception of a centralized state in which government is the action of executive authority on individuals and power structures. By contrast, the English state of the late Middle Ages developed not just as an emanation of royal authority, but in response to the pressures from a widening political society. The crown's authority cannot be measured simply in terms of its ability to command and enforce, for it ruled through its capacity to invoke and mobilize the participation of the political elite. We have as yet said little directly about the monarchy itself. That is too large a subject for discussion here; but it would be wrong to assume that the growth of a complex political society diminished the role of the king or eroded his power. Political authority was not a finite cake, to be divided between king, magnates and 7. gentry. Far from entrenching on the power of the crown, the growth of the political nation enhanced it, adding new fiscal and military resources, extending its authority into the localities, and introducing new techniques into government. Correspondingly, as political society grew, so it needed the monarchy more, not less: to distribute patronage and power, to regulate and harmonize its tensions, and to provide a sense of direction and identity. This close integration of monarchy and society determined the politics of England in the late medieval period, perhaps the first age in which this was so, because the first in which political society was sufficiently large and varied, but also sufficiently close-knit, to form a commonwealth.

How this society dealt with its problems — of securing political agreement, financing war and keeping order — had lasting con-sequences for political attitudes and structures of government.

Characteristically its solutions, achieved through an adjustment of the interests of crown and subjects, were pragmatic, economical and remarkably enduring. That is true of virtually all the agencies of government developed in late medieval England: parliament, council, the mechanism for taxation and expenditure, the J.P.'s and assize justices, the jurisdiction of common law and equity, and arbitration. It was, indeed, a period of great creativity in government. Yet because government depended on a broad congruence of aim and method between monarch and subjects, and because subjects increasingly prescribed a role for monarchy as the guardian and symbol of the commonweal, any malfunction of the monarch, or any dissonance between crown and people, produced political crisis. As political society enlarged and government extended, such crises had ever widening repercussions, until in 1450 the conjuncture of Henry VI's disastrous failure to regulate political society, with its own collective abandonment of the tradition of war in France, produced a fundamental change in English government. The first led the polity into civil conflict, the second gave it a more insular, more legal and less chivalric character. Fortescue, writing at the height of the turmoil, from the perspective of exile, singled out the quality of collegiality of crown and subjects as the essence of the English political system, something that distinguished it from France, and something he hoped to ensure by restoring the endowment of the crown. He would not have been disappointed, for what survived the Wars of the Roses, and the harsh legalism of the early Tudor state, was what had been shaping over the two preceding centuries: a political society deeply versed in government, and a system of government in which crown and subjects shared responsibility. This made England governable until the Civil War.
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Yorkshire Justices of the Peace, 1389–1413*

1. In later medieval England no institution better illustrates "that collaboration of the well-to-do classes in power, so characteristic of the English political structure", than the commission of the peace. The wide-ranging military and police powers originally committed on an emergency basis to small groups of royal officials, acting as keepers of the peace, in the early thirteenth century had evolved by Edward III's reign into a permanent commission of the peace in each county, that united magnates, royal justices and local gentry in discharging a variety of judicial and administrative duties. The unusually extensive involvement of local elites in the exercise of government required by such commissions has long been recognized by historians as one of the defining characteristics of English state development. This paper offers a detailed study of the justices of the peace in a single county during the years in which the commission of the peace took final - and very durable - form, in order to clarify the nature of that involvement and to examine its implications for the exercise of royal power.

2. Between 1389 and 1413 the powers and composition of the commissions of the peace, already the subject of more than half a century of discussion and negotiation between the Crown and the parliamentary Commons, underwent a further series of changes. The general peace commission of July 1389 drastically reduced each county bench in size, but simultaneously restored to the remaining justices power to determine all felonies and common law trespasses. Further additions to the justices' responsibilities in cases of riot, forcible entry and breaches of the several contemporary statutes of livery followed in subsequent years, with the result that the justices of the peace enjoyed considerably increased powers of
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is usual to see these changes as a direct response to the repeated insistence of the parliamentary Commons that the task of maintaining law and order at the local level was best entrusted to the most substantial men of the shire, and to interpret them as one further episode whereby the degree of control exercised by successive kings over the institutions of local government was reduced and the powers of the county gentry correspondingly increased. Historians have accordingly read considerable significance into this apparent shift in the balance of local authority, seeing it as a strategic restating of the locus of class power, an explanation for the disorder of late medieval England, and one of the most damaging and permanent limitations on the powers of the English monarchy.

Before such an interpretation, and the consequences that flow from it, can be fully accepted, certain objections, each of which casts doubt upon the degree of dominance the substantial gentry exercised over the commissions of the peace, need to be resolved. The first is a procedural one, for it has recently been suggested that the constant presence of the judges and officials of the Westminster courts on the commissions of the peace, acting in their capacity as assize justices, provided the king's ministers with a powerful and generally effective means of controlling the actions of the gentry justices. The second objection is political, since there is some evidence that the kind of periodic revision of the commissions in favour of the servants and trusted officials of the Crown, practised by Henry VI's government in the 1450s and more extensively by Edward IV in the 1470s, was already being attempted during the final years of Richard II's reign. Henry IV's councillors certainly contemplated a very similar method of controlling the peace commissions when they advised him to nominate his retainers as justices in order to 'save the estate of the king and his people in their countries'. A third reservation relates to the personnel of the commissions: Who were

The position of the magnates on the commission of the peace and their
influence on the administration of criminal justice remained controversial
throughout this period. A determined campaign by the parliamentary
Commons to lay the blame for much disorder in the localities at the
door of the aristocracy culminated, between July 1389 and December
1390, in the complete exclusion of the nobility from the commissions
of the peace. Even when political circumstances forced the abandonment
of this policy, the Commons remained anxious to reiterate, in the livery
legislation of 1399 and 1406, their belief that it was the maintenance and
protection of evil-doers practised by the magnates which lay behind many
crimes.

4 contemporary breakdowns in public order. By contrast, both Richard
II and Henry IV welcomed the presence of magnates on the peace com-
missions, responding to any sign of political unrest, as in 1397 and 1403,
5 by a swift increase in the number of aristocratic justices. Their attraction,
in the Crown’s eyes, lay in the physical resources they could command, the
vested interest most magnates possessed in maintaining good order within
their acknowledged sphere of influence, and the frequently close
6 relationship between the king and individual noble families. Aristocratic
domination of the bench was, in addition, less likely to arouse jealousy or
fear than the pre-eminence of even the most substantial gentleman;
contemporary social expectation ascribed to the nobility a natural lead-
ship that local society was usually happy to accept. The same social expec-
tations constrained the king and his advisers in their selection of magnate
justices, setting limits to the freedom of their choice, though the Crown
8 retained an important element of discretion. A few noblemen — John,
Duke of Lancaster; Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland; Ralph Neville,
Earl of Westmorland — virtually commanded a place on the Yorkshire
benches by virtue of their political eminence and their substantial estates
in the county; a slightly larger group of baronial families might reasonably
expect, if their residence and principal estates lay within one of the Rid-
ings, consistent appointment as a justice of the peace there. In the North
Riding, these families were the Scropes of Bolton, Roos of Helmsley
and Fitzhugh of Ravensworth; in the East Riding, the Scropes of Masham
and Maudleys of Mulgrave; in the West Riding, the Neville and Talbot
lords of Hallamshire. Political considerations, nevertheless, retained some
force, allowing Richard II discretion to omit a wealthy but negligible
magnate like Edmund, Duke of York from the West Riding commission,
despite his extensive estates in South Yorkshire; and Henry IV to elevate
a middling baron like Peter (VIII), lord Mauley — favoured by his kinship
with the Nevilles — to a seat on the bench of all three Ridings.
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to exercise a consistent influence over the personnel of the commission without requiring his physical presence. Between June 1394 and June 1395, for instance, the work of the West Riding bench was principally discharged by William Gascoigne and John Woodruff, respectively the Duke’s chief steward and secondary justice in his palatinate of Lancaster. Sir John Savile of Eland, his constable at Pontefract, and Sir William Rileston of Riston, bailiff of his wapentake of Staincross in Craven.1

The only active justice without a specific Lancastrian connection was Sir John Deepden of Helaugh, whose liberties seem to have lain with the Nevilles.2 The usurpation of 1399 did predictably little to modify this dominance of Duchy of Lancaster officials on the West Riding bench, which was effectively controlled throughout Henry IV’s reign by Richard Gascoigne, chief steward of the Duchy in the North, and present as a justice at sixty-one of the sixty-four recorded peace sessions between October 1399 and December 1411.

Although the resources of the Duchy of Lancaster allowed the Crown to maintain close and effective supervision of the West Riding commission, reliance on magnates like the Nevilles and Scropes to uphold social discipline both within their own ‘countries’ and on the county benches held its own dangers. Indeed, it was the close connection between the local agents of royal justice and the aristocracy that attracted the particular criticism of the Commons. Their suspicions were sometimes justified. When George Darell of Sessay was indicted before Ralph Neville and his fellows, justices of the peace in the North Riding, for the murder of Neville’s servant, Sir Thomas Colvile of Coxwold,3 during the Scrope rising in May 1425, Darell failed to appear before the justices and, after repeated exactions, was eventually outlawed in the county court. Darell subsequently traversed the judgement on a writ of error on the grounds that, when exacted to answer the indictment, he had been unable to do so because he was kept prisoner in Neville’s own castle of Richmond.4

On this occasion, it seems very likely that Neville had temporarily subordinated his public capacity as a royal justice to his private concern to maintain and protect his own affinit. What is not so clear is whether such incidents were a regular occurrence. The evidence is rarely so direct, with the consequence that the attitude and ambitions of the county’s magnates towards the peace commission must to a large extent be extrapolated from the presence or absence of their servants and retainers among the justices. The methodological problems with this approach are con-
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John Aske returned to the East Riding bench after an absence of fifteen years. Aske was subsequently joined in May 1401, by Sir Robert Hilton and Sir John Scrope, who was linked by marriage and service to the Percies, and Colville by William Laslingy, one of the Percy family's regular attorneys and councillors. Together with the consistent appointment of Sir Richard Tempest to the West Riding commission, this gave the servants of the Percy family presence on the benches of all three Ridings that, with the single exception of Sir Robert Hilton in the East Riding, they had lacked before Henry IV's accession. Yet even in the case of the powerful Percies, the presence of magnate retainers on the Yorkshire commissions of the peace cannot be said to constitute a genuine threat to royal control of the justices, for most of the Percy servants appointed to the Riding benches were servants of Henry IV as well. Tempest, Colville and Hilton were all knights of the king's affinity; Aske was a royal esquire and Laslingy an apprentice-at-law employed by the Duchy. While this double allegiance is most obviously testimony to the considerable influence the Earl of Northumberland exercised on the distribution of crown patronage in the aftermath of the Lancastrian usurpation, it also indicates careful royal scrutiny of appointments to the commissions of the peace and a successful attempt to maintain some measure of discretion and control over the justices appointed.

Alexander Neville, Archbishop of York, who managed to create a dangerously dominant role for his affinity in the North and East Ridings in 1389, was the only magnate to successfully evade this scrutiny and, even then, his triumph was short-lived.

The pattern of noble involvement in the commissions suggested by the Yorkshire evidence is, therefore, reasonably clear. Though no more than a third of the magnates appointed to the Yorkshire commissions of the peace can be shown to have attended in person, those who did so included the most substantial regional magnates - the Nevilles, Scrobes and Henry Percy - while, among those who did not, several were active as justices of the peace in counties more central to their landed interests, as William, lord Roos was in Lancashire and the


2. CFR, 1400-7, p. 121; ibid., 1401-5, p. 12; CPR, 1399-1401, p. 1; PRO, E101/104/6; Adbrook Item Ebor.

3. CPR, 1400-7, p. 18; PRO, DL 28/175 m. 4 (Tempest); CPR, 1400-7, p. 42 (Colville); CPR, 1400-7, p. 348 (Hilton); CPR, 1389-1402, pp. 311; ibid., 1400-7, f. 98; CPR, 1399-1401, p. 129 (Aske); Somerville, Duchy of Lancaster, v. 475 (Laslingy).

4. CPR, 1400-7, pp. 22; CPR, 1400-7, p. 23; CPR, 1399-1401, p. 13; PRO, E101/104/6; Adbrook Item Ebor.

5. CPR, 1400-7, p. 18; PRO, DL 28/175 m. 4 (Tempest); CPR, 1400-7, p. 42 (Colville); CPR, 1400-7, p. 348 (Hilton); CPR, 1389-1402, pp. 311; ibid., 1400-7, f. 98; CPR, 1399-1401, p. 129 (Aske); Somerville, Duchy of Lancaster, v. 475 (Laslingy).

6. CPR, 1400-7, pp. 22; CPR, 1400-7, p. 23; CPR, 1399-1401, p. 13; PRO, E101/104/6; Adbrook Item Ebor.

7. CPR, 1400-7, pp. 22; CPR, 1400-7, p. 23; CPR, 1399-1401, p. 13; PRO, E101/104/6; Adbrook Item Ebor.

8. CPR, 1400-7, pp. 22; CPR, 1400-7, p. 23; CPR, 1399-1401, p. 13; PRO, E101/104/6; Adbrook Item Ebor.
possessed, in theory, considerable opportunity to influence the actions and decisions of the local justices. The attendance payments made to the justices suggest, though, that in practice they made little use of this opportunity. John Markham (JCB, 1396–1408) was paid for two sessions on the North Riding bench between 1397 and 1399. John Cokayn (chief baron of the Exchequer, 1400–6) for one session in the West Riding early in Henry IV's reign, and William Gascoigne (CJB, 1400–13), whose Yorkshire lands gave him more reason than any of the other assize judges to sit with the justices of the peace, was paid for only four sessions on the West Riding bench while Chief Justice. To rely on the evidence of such payments alone would, however, be misleading; they appear to relate only to those occasions when the justices sat on the Riding benches outside their assize sessions. William Gascoigne, in particular, is recorded as sitting as a justice of the peace on many further occasions while the assizes themselves were in progress. The influence of the assize justices on the conduct of the Riding benches and, in all likelihood, on their composition (since they were an obvious source of information when the Chancellor and his advisors sought to review the membership of the commissions) was therefore greater than the meagre record of their attendance payments would imply. The precise relationship between the regular quarter sessions and the sessions attended by the assize justices is not easy to recover, but it seems that while the justices of the peace did not deliberately arrange their sessions to coincide with the arrival of the assizes in the county, joint sessions of assize and of the peace were, in practice, held often enough to provide the assize justices with a good knowledge of the abilities and conscientiousness of the Yorkshire justices of the peace—a point of the twenty-six assize sessions for which sufficiently comprehensive information survives. This oversight was not the limit of the assize justices' influence on the Yorkshire benches, for the fact that all surviving recognizances to keep the peace entered into before the justices of the peace were, in fact, entered into before the assize justices acting in their secondary capacity as justices of the peace, suggests that the regular justices frequently looked to their professional colleagues in the more serious cases of disorder, referring them from the quarter sessions to await the next assize.

A further indication of the increasingly close connection between quarter sessions and the visits of the central court justices to the county
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For December 1405, until it was further modified in 1427 and, more substantially, in 1424. The durability of the compromise arrived at in 1434 indicates that it was generally acceptable to all the parties concerned, though the reintroduction in 1435 of the double quorum, which removed from the gentry justices the power to determine felonies, and the reservation of the task of inquiry into breaches of the livery statutes of 1399 and 1401 to the justices of assize, made by statute in 1426, suggest that Henry IV and his advisers may still have felt too much judicial authority had been surrendered to the gentry justices of the peace.

As a group, the gentry members of the quorum, usually no more than two or three justices in each Riding, were the most frequent attenders at quarter sessions, accounting for a little more than half the justice-days for which a record of payment survives; the precise level of attendance varies from 51 per cent of the total in the East Riding (158 out of 359 justice-days) to 66 per cent in the West Riding (198 out of 272 justice-days) and 60 per cent (80 out of 134 justice-days) in the North Riding. The quorum alone exercised the power to determine the more serious category of criminal offences, felony; and even when lesser matters were at stake, the legal knowledge and experience of the men of law on the county benches made it likely that those gentry justices appointed more for their social eminence than their administrative abilities would follow the lead of their lawyer-colleagues. It was consequently important for the efficient working of each county bench that suitable members of the quorum be found to direct its activities in the absence of the assize justices, and it was to this end that the Chancery devoted much thought to the selection of the twenty-four justices appointed to one stage or another of their terms, of the three Ridings.

In essence, the justices of the quorum were drawn from two distinct groups: lawyers of Yorkshire origin who practised successfully enough in the Westminster courts to earn themselves crown office of one kind or another; and men with some legal training whose expertise was exercised, sometimes at Westminster but more usually within Yorkshire itself, on behalf of predominantly local clients. The period saw something of a shift in the relative importance of these two groups within the Yorkshire commissions, with the Westminster practitioners gaining ground at the expense of their provincial colleagues. There is some evidence that, especially under Henry IV, this was the result of a deliberate Chancery policy, instituted in December 1405, which sought both a reduction in

1. NYCRZL, 1/77, PRO, JUST 3/176 mm. 7, 9d. 185 mm. 3, 3d. For further details of Burgh's career, see A.J. Pollard, 'The Burghs of Brough Hall', North Yorkshire County Record Office Journal, 4 (1978), 111-113.
3. For further details of the justices appointed to the quorum were John Burgh of Brough, Queen Anne's bailiff at Richmond, and John Friebeke of Manfield, another employee in the estate administration of the honour of Richmond, who subsequently rose to be steward of the neighbouring Beauchamp lordship of Barnard Castle. By 1397, however, this partnership had been broken up in favour of a new pairing between Richard Norton and John Conyers of Hornby, both apprentices-at-law practising in the Westminster courts. The advantage the Crown hoped to gain by this transformation in the personnel of the quorum was twofold: a stricter adherence to the limits of the peace commission's powers, which the king's judges consistently suspected the justices of exceeding, and a greater resistance to the influence of private interests.
4. The decisions, however, were not because men like Norton and Conyers were innocent of such interests: their standing within the
Burgh or Frithebank could ever have hoped for. But the Crown had at least the assurance, which it lacked in the case of lesser men whose careers revolved around the service of a single lord, that as the most lucrative of their many employers and possessors of the most damaging financial sanctions in the case of disloyalty, it had the most effective claim on their obedience. Norton and Conyers' dominance of the quorum held good for a decade but, following Norton's appointment as a justice of assize on the East Anglian circuit in 1406 and the subsequent omission of Conyers from the North Riding bench in February 1407, it proved impossible to find immediate replacements of a similar standing. A local quorum consequently re-emerged to fill the vacuum, in the persons of the durable John Burgh, now chief steward of lord Fitzhugh's lands in Yorkshire, and William Lambard of Ingleby, an estate steward with some legal training. Though John Burgh's place on the quorum was eventually filled, after his death in 1422, by Norton and James Strangways of West horrified, a newly-created sergeant-at-law, it was the local man among the justices, William Lambard, who remained the most frequent attendant to sessions to the very end of Henry IV's reign.

The situation was rather different in the West Riding, where the Westminster lawyers always predominated. Between 1389 and 1397 the partnership of William Gascoigne of Gawthorpe and John Woodruff of Woolley, both created sergeant-at-law at the same time in 1388, discharged the bulk of the commission's work and, on Woodruff's death in 1397, his place was filled by Richard Gascoigne of Hunslet. An apprentice-at-law who had been marshal of the Exchequer since 1384, and became chief steward of the northern estates of the Duke of Lancaster between 1400 and 1407, Richard Gascoigne discharged the duties of the quorum more

1. Norton was steward of the liberty of Ripon under Archbishop Scrope and acted on behalf of the executors of both Bolton and Masham; he was a member of the inner earl of Northumberland. He was a member of the committee of the nobles for the marriage of the earl's daughter, Elizabeth, to John Clifford, the earl's eldest son. He is also mentioned as the steward of the earl's manor of Bolton in 1388. PRO JUST 3/241 m. 1. 191 m. 31. B, P.K. (treaty) Research, York, Archives, Registers, A fo. 331. CPR, 1386-9, p. 216. Bod. MS Daddysto, fo. 14. B. Library Add. Charnley, m. 11. Egerton MS 8732, m. 21d. NYCC. ZJX 3/44. YorkshireKeeper. E 3/38 (Norton); BL Egerton MS 4342, M. 95. CPR, 1386-9, p. 409. NYCC: 1388-90, p. 160. PRO, Inquisitions Postmortem, p. 60. PRO, E, 3412/437, ibid. JUST 1/317 mm. 21, 31. ibid. JUST 3/198 mm. 1, 6d. ibid. DURH 9/35/14. YM, E, 38-38. NYCC, ZJX 3/44 (Convey).

2. Ibid. ZJX 3/44/46. 46.

3. Ibid. ZJX 3/44/46. 46.

4. John Scrope, a Chancery clerk with Northumberland connections; Robert Norton, apparently appointed as a deputy for Scrope; John Foljambe, a household esquire from a prominent Derbyshire family appointed in December 1405, when loyalty was at a premium; and William Lodging, king's attorney in Common Pleas since 1399, promoted to sergeant-at-law in 1412.

5. N. Ramsay, Retained Legal Counsel, c. 1357-1407, THS, 4th ser., xxxii (1961), 101, for Wrigth's many clients, to whom may be added the abbot of Ramsey and the keepers of Beverley; BL Add. Roll 3450, Humberstone CRO, BC II/6/4. 1. For Wrigth's activities as a JP PRO, P. 230/64/4. 1o. 7. 1221/56 f. 1. 2.


7. Arden was esquire for the county in 1393-94; he was a member of Archbishop Neville's affiance and steward of Mary of Lancaster's lands in Yorkshire, but was most influential around Beverley, where he was simultaneously steward for the burgesses and the archbishop. Hugnet was esquire in 1401-2; he was one of the gems de curet at the chambers of York, an attorney at the Exchequer for Queen Anne, and deputy steward of Holderness throughout the conduct of Glendower's rebellion.
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The mayor Gascoigne, session; others place their seat to Rosselyn appointed 1397, county. The King's Bench: issued from the abbey of Beverley, and the stewards of the burgesses. Henry IV's advisers experimented with the appointment of two other local men to the quorum, Richard Beverley and Walter Rudstone of Hayton, and quickly discarded them both. Though an active and influential local attorney, Beverley occupied too prominent a position within the burgesses' oligarchy of Beverley to be entirely trustworthy, while Rudstone's legal practice, largely confined to knightly families like the Ughtredes of Kexby, proved too modest to justify a regular place on the bench. Both men were consequently dropped from the quorum after a year, while a third Beverley lawyer, Richard Tuirn, received even shorter shrift, losing his place on the quorum the day he was appointed to it. In the end, it was the shortage of suitably qualified justices willing to take an active role on the East Riding quorum that ensured that William Hunge was, in the summer of 1401, restored to the partnership with Hugh Ardern that his experience and frequent attendance at quarter sessions had always suggested. As a result, a measure of stability was restored to the East Riding bench: after July 1401 no new peace commission was issued for the Riding for more than a half year, in contrast to the five commissions issued within the previous two years.

Tensions remained, however, especially between the burgesses of Beverley and the East Riding justices. The burgesses' consistent
that the deliberate policy, not accident, which dictated the composition of the quorum justices under Henry IV. As a policy, fine-tuning the existing institutions by a detailed scrutiny of their personnel lacked some of the appeal of Henry V's more spectacular initiatives. It was not necessarily a less fruitful approach to the problem of law enforcement.

By the reign of Richard II the qualifications desirable in the remaining group of justices of the peace to be considered, those gentry justices not appointed to the quorum, were well-established: they should be of good fame and good condition", resident in their counties, and neither barretors nor maintainers of quarrels. These were uncontroverted demands, on which both the royal administration and the parliamentary Commons were prepared to agree, though the Commons sought, unsuccessfully, to impose certain further restrictions upon the type of justice appointed at the start of Richard II's majority; chiefly, that magnate stewards were to be excluded from the commissions and that the justices were to be 'assigned and nominated' in Parliament rather than, as usual, chosen by the Chancellor and the Council. In reality, the gentry justices in Yorkshire were, like the quorum justices, drawn from two distinct social groups. The first group came from the social elite of county society and consisted of men for whom a seat on the bench was only one rung on the cursus honorum of county government; men such as Sir John Savile of Eland and Sir Robert Neville of Hornby in the West Riding, or Sir Robert Hilton of Swine and Sir Robert Constable of Flamstead in the East Riding. The second group, drawn from outside the ranks of the greater gentry, owed their place either to their administrative experience, usually acquired in one of the county's magnates, or to some legal knowledge. Edmund Fitzwilliam of Wadsworth, John Aske of Ousthord and Peter del Hay of Spaldington, for example, were respectively stewards of the Duke of York, Earl of Northumberland and Bishop of Durham, while the North Riding justice, Henry Pudsey, occasionally acted as an attorney in Common Pleas. What distinguished this latter group from the men of law on the quorum was, principally, their unquestionably gentle birth, though the important position on the Yorkshire commissions occupied by quorum lawyers drawn from established gentry families, such as Richard Gascoigne or...
in the North Riding, however: there Sir Thomas Boynton of Acklam, who sat on the bench in the early 1390s, and Sir Robert Conyers of Ormesby, active during the later years of Henry IV's reign, are the only two justices from the upper gentry of the Riding who can be shown to have sat, while eight further gentry justices never attended at all. It is in respect of this virtual absence of substantial gentry active on the bench that the North Riding commission, characterized by an unusual degree of magnate participation in its sessions and a dominant quorum on which the stewards and legal advisers of those magnates were prominent, is most clearly distinguished from the rest of Yorkshire.

1 The pattern of gentry attendance in the East and West Riding is, by contrast, fairly uniform and underlies the same changes over time. At the start of the period both Ridings saw a single prominent gentleman working in partnership with a couple of quorum justices, discharging most of the bench's work. In the West Riding this was Sir John Savile of Eland; in the East Riding, Sir Robert Constable of Flamborough. By c. 1395, however, both Savile and Constable had retired from active work as a justice and no single gentleman emerged in either Riding to take their place; instead, while the quorum justices began to take on more of the bench's business, the task of attendance at quarter sessions was shared among a wider group of gentry justices. In the East Riding this consisted principally of Sir Robert Hilton and Sir Peter Buckley, joined after 1399 by John Aske, John Routh and, most notably, Peter del Hay. A similar group of active justices took rather longer to form in the West Riding, where Sir William Rlleston and Sir John Deppen attended on a regular basis between Savile's retirement and the usurpation of 1399. The ascension of Henry IV brought something of a revival of interest among the gentry in the work of the bench, however, with nine gentry justices taking a part in its work during his reign, compared to only four in the previous decade. This undoubtedly owed something to Henry's desire to mobilize the considerable resources his large kingdom, in conjunction with the estate administration of the Duchy of Lancaster, put at his disposal in the principal institutions of local government, but concern for the effective discharge of the bench's duties among the West Riding gentry is not to be ascribed to royal initiative alone. The diligent Sir Nicholas Middleton possessed no such straightforward incentive for his frequent attendance at sessions, while the

1 Calendar of Inquisitions Post-Mortem, 1361-1400, nos. 95-17. Mowbray's influential position as a quorum justice in the East Riding was recognized by the dean and chapter of York, who paid him an annual fee between 1389 and 1396. ADY, W 1/11-17.
2 PRO, JUST 1/76, mm. 4-442, d. 12.
3 Ibid., X 1/50, Rex m. 458, Rex m., 15, 684, Rex m., 4584.
4 See Appendix, Table A, for details of attendance.
5 Given-Wilson, 'The Royal Household and the King's oligarchy', pp. 256-64, 143-144.
6 For Middleton's activity as a coroner, in addition to his duties as a justice of the peace: PRO, E 126, 1362-72, 1363-74, 1377-78, 1380-81, 1384-85, 1387-88, 1391-92, 1400-01, 1403-04, 1405-06, 1408-09.
7 CR, 177-192, 219-22.
8 CCR, 1399-1402, 219-22.
9 CCR, 1402-03, 219-22.
10 CCR, 1403-04, 219-22.
11 CCR, 1404-05, 219-22.
12 CCR, 1405-06, 219-22.
13 CCR, 1406-07, 219-22.
14 CCR, 1407-08, 219-22.
15 CCR, 1408-09, 219-22.
16 CCR, 1409-10, 219-22.
3 In a minority of West Ridings, the reality of a single knight discharging the work of the commission in partnership with a couple of local lawyers, or into a county bench dominated by the quorum justices and without a significant upper-gentry presence, as was the case in the North Riding.

4 In terms of those justices who actually attended sessions, the Commons' campaign to reform the peace commission therefore brought only marginal changes to the Yorkshire benches. The replacement of John Dronsfield of West Bretton, an appointee-lawyer who was the central figure in the work of the West Riding commission throughout the minority of Richard II, with the more substantial partnership of Savile and Gascoigne represented the most considerable movement in the direction of the Commons' ideal. The active gentry justices in the East Riding, William Holme and Sir Robert Hilton, may in addition have enjoyed a slightly freer hand after 1389 than before, though this was more the result of the political misfortunes that overcame their professional colleagues on the commission - principally John Lockton and Roger Fulthorpe - than the consequence of the institutional changes demanded by the Commons. In the North Riding, the outcome of the reforms was the exact opposite of the intention behind them: established county gentry like Sir John Marmion of Tanfield and Sir William Percy of Levisham were more active as justices before 1389 than in any subsequent years.

The Yorkshire evidence suggests that the Commons' campaign to ensure a greater gentry presence on the county benches enjoyed, at best, a limited success; only relatively slight changes in the composition of the active justices were effected by the reforms begun in May 1389.

2 More significant in shaping the character of the bench in this period was the considerable effort expended by the king and his advisers to ensure the appointment of gentry justices of proven diligence and loyalty.

3 Richard II had shown himself anxious to secure peace commissions in conformity with his wishes as early as 1386, but there is little sign of direct royal influence on the personnel of the Yorkshire commissions before the political crisis of 1397. Until then, the only knight of the king's affinity to serve as a justice of the peace, Sir John Goddard, had left the East Riding bench by the time the king retained him. Following...
3 who heard the initial indictment. Though common, such actions were not always beyond the influence of the local gentry. The making of a case in point and the culprit in that instance, John Rilston, son of the West Riding justice Sir William Rilston, received no special consideration from his father's former colleagues on the bench, undergoing the full process of indictment, execution in the county court and subsequent outlawry.

5 Such attitudes contributed towards a modest improvement in the standard of public order in the shire. Yorkshire still experienced sporadic outbreaks of disorder at the end of Henry IV's reign: there was opposition to Sir Robert Plumpton's authority as steward of Knaresborough, and the gentry family of Routle led resistance to the sheriff's officials in the East Riding. These were relatively isolated incidents, however, lacking the persistence of the widespread popular support that had rendered the Beckett family, the Yorks and the supposed disturbances, such as those in the town of York's lordship at Wakefield and Conisburgh, so threatening in the early years of Richard II's majority. The institutional innovations of the period were perhaps less important in creating this improvement than the commissions' new modes of execution of their existing powers, made possible by the greater integration of their personnel and the increased co-ordination of their work. The oversight of William Gascoigne and his associate colleagues bore in mind the city of York.

1 From an examination of each of the four groups of justices which constituted the Yorkshire commissions of the peace, the same conclusion seems justified: prosopographical analysis supports the procedural evidence in suggesting that the changes in the composition and powers of the commission in this period neither surrendered the initiative in local government to the county gentry nor weakened its resistance to the claims of ambitious magnates; rather, they considerably increased the ability of the royal administration to enforce its will in the localities. This ability was exercised in several ways: by the attendance of magnates closely associated with the king, such as Ralph Neville, at occasional sessions; by the increasingly close control the justices of assize maintained over all aspects of the bench's work; by the policy of seeking, wherever possible, to place
ent on royal favour for further advancement within their profession; and by the steady accretion of crown servants among the gentry justices, a development especially marked under Henry IV. The obstructions to these centrifugal pressures were slight and generally ineffective: though an individual magnate might occasionally turn his oversight of the bench to his own private advantage, none possessed the resources to oust the Crown when it came to securing the loyalty of the justices; the reforms in the personnel of the commissions demanded by the parliamentary Commons, intended to ensure the predominance of the established county gentry in the deliberations of the bench, were, in addition, short-lived and generally negligible in their consequences, confirming an existing balance of power rather than creating a new one.

1 How far do these conclusions hold good for the rest of the country? While there can be no final answer to the question without a similarly intensive investigation of the evidence available for other shires, there is at least sufficient information to allow some preliminary observations.

2 The active involvement of the region's magnates in the work of the Yorkshire benches at this period is significant by virtue, for example, with the pattern that has emerged from the study of a series of Midland and East Anglian counties in the mid-fifteenth century, in each of which it appears that, as far as the administration of justice was concerned, the local gentry, unhindered by the nobility, ran the shire.1 The crucial variable in this case seems as much chronological as geographical, for aristocratic participation in the ordinary business of the county benches remained commoner in Richard II's reign than it was to become, both among the great nobles, like the Beauchamps in Warwickshire, and by lesser peers such as John, lord Strange, in Shropshire.2 Equally, although few studies of the work of the later medieval peace commission have yet paid adequate attention to the supervision and co-ordination of the bench's activities provided by the justices of assize and gaol delivery, the central role these justices played on the East Anglian commissions under Henry VI suggests that the prominence assumed by the assize justices in the work of the Yorkshire bench may not have been exceptional.3 Although few justices attained as dominant a position within their native counties as William Gascoigne, the powerful influence exercised by the justices and sergeants of the Westminster courts on the

---


2. Rolls of the Warwickshire and Cotswold Sessions, 1727-1787, ed. E. G. Kimbell (Yates-Digby Society, vol. xxviii, 1939), pp. xxii, xxvi, xlviii; PRO, KB 27/4 Reg. 74, f. 45; PRO, KB 37/4 Reg. 7, f. 82; PRO, KB 40 Reg. 3, f. 35 (Beauchamp); ibid., E. 170/56, f. 1; Strange).

During Henry IV's reign, they were a solution to the particular problems created by the country's involvement in the Percy rebellions of 1402 and 1405, and one made possible largely by the extensive resources of the Duchy of Lancaster in the region. But while the rapid increase in the number of royal servants among the justices more closely resembles developments in other 'Duchy' counties than in the country at large, Henry IV's concern for the composition and control of the county benches is observable elsewhere, whether in the elevation of suitable knights of the king's affinity - such as Sir Payn Tiptoft in Cambridgeshire - to a predominant position among the justices of his native county, or in the more traditional policy of alliance with leading regional families, like the Courtenays in Devon, resurgent after a decade of disfavour, in order to harness the resources of their lordship to the interest of the Crown.

If the development of the Yorkshire commissions of the peace in these years was not, then, untypical of the changes taking place in the rest of the country, some more general observations seem to follow from the resolution of the questions with which this study began. The first concerns the respective attitudes of Richard II and Henry IV towards the kind of self-regarding local sentiment embodied in the parliamentary Commons' aspirations to control the county bench. It seems clear that Richard II's appointments to the peace commissions, in particular his preference for a strong magistrate present among the justices and his promotion of the influence of a small group of royal servants in November 1397, had little effect on the actual conduct of the sessions. By contrast, Henry IV was able to maintain an impressively close grip on the personnel, both nominal and active, of the Yorkshire commissions, through the agency of several trusted noblemen and his own extensive authority. If this seems unremarkable, granted the considerable local influence the £1000 of annuities charged on the Duchy of Lancaster estates in the county brought him, it should not obscure the skill with which Henry IV managed to marry the local aspirations of the gentry to his own wider interests.

The relationship between William Gascoigne and the new king soon developed beyond the purely official; he became one of Henry's most trusted advisers, summoned to his presence in July 1407 'pur chivaher en nostre compagnie pur suntre treschargement maitres toucheant lest de nos et de nostre royaume' and singled out by the Council in 1405 as one of those in whom the king put special confidence. His reward was an unprecedented elevation from his sergeant to Chief Justice of King's Bench in November 1409, but the resulting responsibilities went beyond the strictly judicial. In Yorkshire, his possession of the threefold commission of assize, gaol delivery and the peace, vigorously exercised on his usually biannual visits to the county and bolstered by further ad hoc commissions issued to him in times of unrest or rebellion, gave him overall responsibility for the execution of criminal justice.
duals and communities. William Hungate and Richard Gascoigne were asked by their fellow gentry to assist in the execution of royal commissions; Hugh Ardern received a special payment from the grateful community of Beverley 'for his counsel in the time of litigation and insurrection'. The county gentry were far less exclusive in their pursuit of local autonomy than some of the demands of the parliamentary Commons might suggest; they needed the expertise of the lawyers, just as they cultivated the influence of the magnates, though they were anxious to set a limit to both. When the commission of the peace functioned effectively, as it did in Yorkshire for much of this period, it did so by maintaining an equilibrium between the interests and expectations of each of those groups. What characterized these years was not a decisive shift in the balance of judicial power towards the local communities, for this had never been the exclusive object of their petitioning, but a modest increase in the oversight of local society maintained by the king's government, achieved by the creation of a balance between professional and amateur justices on which both the Crown and the parliamentary spokesmen of the gentry could agree. It was the embodiment of an enduring ideal of local government, already enshrined in Magna Carta and reiterated in the second Statute of Westminster, which associated the knights of the shire with the itinerant justices in hearing assizes and attains in each county.
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### Table 1. Source of Indictments before Yorkshire Justices of Gaol Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1389-99</th>
<th>1399-1413</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>287 (44%)</td>
<td>226 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justices of the Peace</td>
<td>135 (24%)</td>
<td>213 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private liberties</td>
<td>128 (25%)</td>
<td>19 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coroners</td>
<td>71 (11%)</td>
<td>39 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>25 (4%)</td>
<td>47 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 653 | 386 |

### Table 2. Attendance Payments for the Justices: East Riding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Godart</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Robert Constable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Holme</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hungary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Arden</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Robert Hilton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Peter Buckton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Tirwhit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Rosselyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Aske</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Rudstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter del Hay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Thomas Bouchelott</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Waldeby</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Routhe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ellerker</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Beverley</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Robert Rudstone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Guy Rowcliffe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Attendance Payments for the Justices: North Riding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Norton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John de Burgh</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Newsome</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John de Frithebank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Lambard</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Markham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Conyers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barton</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Strangeways</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Christopher Boynton)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Attendance Payments for the Justices: West Riding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Savile</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gascoigne</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Woodruff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Rillerton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Deepden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Ingeby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Gascoigne</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Richard Tempest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir William Dronfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Nicholas Middleton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Cokayn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Tirwhit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Gascoigne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Waterston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Robert Neville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Richard Redman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Fitzwilliam</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
1. [PRO], JUST 1/176, f. 184, 191.
2. E101/98/18, E372/244, Adhuc Item Ebor.
4. E101/98/18, f. 1; E372/244, Westm., The record of payments made to the justices differs slightly from the record of their presence at sessions, which is: Hungary, Arden, Hilton, Buckton; Tirwhit, 1.
5. E372/244, Adhuc Item Ebor.
6. E372/244, Adhuc Item Ebor.
7. E372/244, Adhuc Item Ebor.
8. E372/244, Adhuc Item Ebor.
9. E372/244, Adhuc Item Ebor.
10. E372/244, Adhuc Item Ebor.
In any examination of the treatment afforded prisoners of war (POWs), the Second World War stands out both in terms of scale—approximately thirty-five million military personnel spent time in enemy hands between 1939 and 1945—and in terms of the sheer range of behavior exhibited by captor states. Depending on the nationality of both captive and captor and the period of the war, treatment could range from strict adherence to the terms of the 1929 Geneva Convention to privation and brutality severe enough to claim approximately five million lives by the time the last prisoners were repatriated.

The historical literature concerning POW affairs in the Second World War is substantial. Both professional and lay historians, however, have tended to concentrate their attention on the experiences and behavior of the prisoners themselves. What analysis there has been of captor policy, moreover, has in

1 Obtaining an exact figure for the number of POWs is made virtually impossible by the inexactness or unavailability of the records kept by many of the belligerents. The figure of 35 million was put forward by K. W. Böhmle, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Kriegsgefangenen des Zweiten Weltkriegs*, 15 vols. (Munich, 1962–74), 1, pt. I–X.


4 many cases have been somewhat biased, and on occasion quite xenophobic. Brutal behavior toward Allied prisoners in Japanese POW camps, for example, as compared to fair treatment for Japanese POWs in Allied camps, has often been ascribed to the Japanese possessing only the veneer of Western civilization, beneath which lurked an oriental barbarian. This view ignores, among other things, the fact that during the Russo-Japanese War and the First World War, prisoners taken by the Japanese forces received exemplary treatment. On a similar though more subtle level, the high standards Axis prisoners enjoyed in the United States during the Second World War, as compared to the harsher conditions endured by U.S. personnel in Axis hands, have often implicitly been treated as a matter of greater American compassion; yet recent studies suggest that Japanese troops taken by the Marines in the Pacific were often killed out of hand rather than sent back to POW camps, while Germans captured in the last days of the war in Europe and after were so neglected by the U.S. Army that tens of thousands appear to have died of malnutrition and disease. To take a reverse and more extreme example, there has arisen in recent years a school of thought among certain German historians that suggests that the ferocity of the Wehrmacht on the eastern front in the latter part of the war—including, by implication, the killing of Soviet prisoners—arose from a high-minded desire to protect Western civilization from the ravages of the Slavic hordes. Such moral-cum-racial comparisons have tended to mislead as much as they enlighten.

1 Examining the POW policies adopted by the belligerents more closely, without immediate recourse to the deceptively simple dichotomy of civilized versus barbaric, should shed more light on the fundamental ideological and practical motives behind captor behavior on all sides. Moral judgments, after all, are based on assumptions, fundamental beliefs, which have varied between societies and over time. To fully comprehend POW treatment we need to understand not only the material context (the availability of food, medicine, and shelter, as well as the labor situation within a state) but also, and perhaps even more importantly, the ideological context (the prevailing moral code or politico-cultural belief system). The aim of this article is to examine, through a narrative analysis of captor policies and their results, the essential factors underlying POW treatment in the three sometimes quite distinct conflicts that together formed the Second World War: the war in the West, the war in the East, and the war against Japan.

The War in the West

When the struggle in Western Europe began in September 1939, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) requested assurances from the belligerents that they intended to abide by the terms of the 1929 Geneva Conventions. For these states to do so, however, would involve maintaining adequate standards regarding food, shelter, labor, and hygiene—all roughly equal to those granted rear-area troops—and guaranteeing the ICRC and the designated protecting power access to camps to make sure these provisions were being observed and to listen privately to prisoners' complaints. The provisions concerning labor—adequate pay, limited working hours, no unhealthy or dangerous jobs, and no war-related work—also severely limited

7 See A. Hillgruber, Zweiter Weltkrieg: Die Zerschlagung des Deutschen Reichs und das Ende der europäischen Judendentum (Berlin, 1986). For discussion of the implications of this view, see C. S. Maier, The Unmasterable Past: History, Holocaust, and German National Identity (Cambridge, Mass., 1988), R. J. Evans, In Hitler's Shadow: West German Historians and the Attempt to Escape from the Nazi Past (New York, 1989), chap. 3. Even more recently, an American military historian, R. H. S. Stoff, In Hitler's Foci East: World War II Reinterpreted (Norman, Okla., 1991), has implicitly suggested that from the first day of Operation Barbarossa it was the malevolent orders of Red Army commissars rather than the actions of the Wehrmacht that were responsible for the general barbarity that characterized combat on the eastern front.
extant to which costs could be recouped through the employment of POWs.

4 All those states that had signed the convention, however, confirmed that they would indeed abide by its provisions.  

The extent to which warring states subsequently did or did not live up to this declaration of intent depended on a number of factors. The humanitarian ethos—broadly conceived to mean that the captured enemy soldier was regarded as possessing the same essentially human nature as his captor—was almost always a prerequisite for good treatment. It constituted the basic raison d'être of the International Red Cross and was the philosophical underpinning of many other measures. As correctly observed in the Atlanta Declaration, the broader the belligerents by and large also possessed the material resources to at least approximate Geneva standards.

Yet what made adherence to the convention possible did not, in and of itself, guarantee that POWs would be treated accordingly. Prisoner-of-war affairs, for one thing, had to be handled competently, which was not always the case. On two occasions in 1942, for example, poor conditions on board ships carrying POWs led to their release. One a British and Italian freighter carrying Commonwealth prisoners from Libya caused a good deal of suffering and generated considerable diplomatic friction. Moreover, as the war lengthened and restraint was increasingly abandoned by both sides (as in the area bombing of cities by both the Luftwaffe and the Royal Air Force [RAF], e.g., or the execution of civilian hostages by Axis forces as a means of curbing resistance activities in occupied Europe), the desire to exact retribution on prisoners, or at least to make them less of an economic burden, sometimes proved irresistible. There was, however, an additional consideration that helped counterbalance such thoughts—the knowledge that since the enemy also held prisoners he might retaliate in kind.

Overall, in fact, the impulse toward openly disregarding the more onerous elements of the Geneva Convention was canceled out by the fear of what this might mean for those already in enemy hands. Indeed, the situation was sufficiently stable for long enough periods to allow for ten separate exchanges of seriously disabled and medical personnel between 1942 and 1944. In all, over six thousand Italian and fourteen thousand German prisoners were exchanged through neutral ports for 12,400 British, American, and other Allied POWs. This did not mean, however, that the emotional stresses of total war could not at times lead to situations in which this modus vivendi appeared to be in serious danger.

There was, to take perhaps the most critical example, the crisis that blew up in the autumn of 1942 over the tying of prisoners' hands by British and Canadian forces in the course of the Dieppe Raid of August 1942 and a smaller attack on the island of Sark in October. Whether or not this was contrary to the terms of the Geneva Convention was not entirely clear; but the discovery on Sark of dead Wehrmacht personnel with their hands tied behind them struck the German military authorities and Hitler himself as flagrantly unlawful. Retaliatory action was swift. On October 7, 1942, the German High Command (OKW) announced that the POWs taken at Dieppe would be


shackled the following day unless the British government provided assurances that prisoners’ hands would not be tied in future.\footnote{See PRO, CAB 65/28, 137(42), October 9, 1942, 139(42), October 12, 1942, CAB 66/30, telegram 207, Dominions Office to Ottawa, October 10, 1942, telegram 208, Ottawa to Dominions Office, October 9, 1942, WP(42)458, October 10, 1942, CAB 122/232, Halifax to Foreign Office, October 2, 1942, C. P. Stacey, *Arms, Men and Governments: The War Policies of Canada* (Ottawa, 1970), pp. 152–53, 287n.; Public Archives of Canada, *King of Canada Diary*, October 10, 1942.}

Whatever interpretation was made of the ambiguous clauses of the Geneva Convention concerning the securing of prisoners on the battlefield, reprisals against POWs were specifically banned. Given that the dead found on Sark had been shot while trying to flee after capture, Winston Churchill was able to convince his War Cabinet colleagues on October 8 that it was Germany that was misbehaving and that a counterthreat should be issued: if the German authorities placed prisoners in chains, Britian would shackle an equal number of German POWs.\footnote{See PRO, CAB 66/30, WP(42)45, telegram 408, October 10, 1942, pars. 1–5, Nuremberg Military Tribunal, *Trials of War Criminals before the Nuremberg Military Tribunal under Control Council Law No. 10, October 1946–April 1949* (hereafter TWC), 15 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1946–49); High Command Case, Warlimont, testimony, 11:127.} The following day OKW announced that 1,376 British and Canadian POWs were now wearing manacles and stated that if any action were taken against German prisoners, three times that number would be shackled. The British counterreprisal went ahead anyway, and by October 10, 1942, over 5,500 Commonwealth and German POWs were in chains.\footnote{See PRO, CAB 65/28, 136(42), October 8, 1942.}

The stage now seemed set for another round of reprisals. Each side believed the other responsible for contravening the convention and itself the victim. Each side also expected the other to knuckle under if sufficient pressure was applied, in effect rejecting offers of mediation by the ICRC and Swiss government (the protecting power in both cases) while approaching their allies for support in raising the stakes.\footnote{See PRO, CAB 65/28, 137(42), October 12, 1942, CAB 66/30, telegram 475, October 10, 1942, pars. 9–10, and CAB 65/28, 137(42), October 9, 1942.}

"Our policy," wrote German State Secretary Ernst von Weizsäcker on October 11, echoing the views of the British government as well as his own, "is a gamble on the weakness of nerves of the other side."\footnote{See PRO, CAB 65/28, 137(42), October 9, 1942, 139(42), October 12, 1942, CAB 66/30, telegram 207, Dominions Office to Ottawa, October 10, 1942, telegram 208, Ottawa to Dominions Office, October 9, 1942, WP(42)458, October 10, 1942, CAB 122/232, Halifax to Foreign Office, October 2, 1942, C. P. Stacey, *Arms, Men and Governments: The War Policies of Canada* (Ottawa, 1970), pp. 152–53, 287n.; Public Archives of Canada, *King of Canada Diary*, October 10, 1942.}

Over the following weeks, however, as the situation was assessed rationally, official opinion began to shift away from further escalation. The unpalatable truth was that if the retaliatory cycle continued, if neither side backed down, then prisoners in enemy hands might soon be in serious jeopardy.

On the Allied side, the United States publicly disassociated itself from British reprisals, while the Dominion governments—particularly Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada—privately made it clear that they were not willing to risk further the welfare of Commonwealth prisoners.\footnote{See ibid., enclosure 319A, FO to Berne, November 19, 1942, WO 366/26, fol. 67–69; IWM, F. J. Stewart Diary, January 15, 1945.} On the Axis side, neither the Italian nor the Japanese government proved willing to support further German action, the fear being that such action might adversely affect the treatment of the very large number of Italian POWs in Allied hands and the tens of thousands of Japanese civilians in North American internment camps.\footnote{See PRO, CAB 32/10719, enclosure 230A-453A.} In Berlin, meanwhile, Helmut von Moltke of the international law section of the Foreign Intelligence Division (Ausland-Abwehr), and other officials concerned about the dangers posed to German prisoners, eventually managed to convince Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop that as long as the British did not make another move, Germany ought not to run risks.\footnote{See TGMW (HMSO), Jodl testimony, 15:367; G. van Roon, "Graf Moltke als Völkerechter im OKW," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 18 (1970): 267; B. R. von Oppen, ed., *Letters to Freya*, 1939–1945 (New York, 1990), pp. 253, 267, n. 3.}

In the latter part of October 1942, both sides began to look more favorably on Swiss and ICRC proposals to mediate the dispute, and after consultations with the Swiss the British government announced that all German prisoners would be unshackled by Christmas. The German High Command never publicly abandoned its reprisal, but by early 1943 the shackling of prisoners was becoming symbolic only, and even this was quietly abandoned later in the year.\footnote{See PRO, CAB 32/10719, enclosure 230A-453A.}
February 1945, suggesting to Hitler in the wake of the firestorm bombing of Dresden, in which over one hundred thousand people had died, that an equal number of Allied POWs should be shot to deter future raids.\[26\]

In all such cases, however, the mutual hostage status quo was usually maintained or quickly restored through the actions of OKW and the restraint displayed by the Allies. In many instances, if they believed that what was being ordered by the führer placed German POWs in enemy hands in potential danger, OKW staff officials could engage in what Colonel-General Alfred Jodl (OKW chief of operations staff) later described as “delaying tactics, a kind of passive resistance” involving interminable wrangling over the precise meaning and wording of Hitler’s verbal commands until the whole matter was forgotten.\[27\]

While unable to do much about the Soviet affair—where authority was taken out of Wehrmacht hands by Himmler—or about Bormann’s orders to party officials and the Volkscher Beobachter piece, OKW managed to tie up the order to withhold Wehrmacht protection from downed airmen and thus helped prevent wholesale murder (as the swelling Stalag Luft population testified).\[28\]

Moreover, if the führer had not made up his mind, then it was sometimes possible to deploy effective counterarguments. When Hitler, for example, ordered Grand Admiral Karl Dönitz in February 1945 to draw up a paper listing the advantages of abandoning the Geneva Convention, the opportunity arose for Jodl, Ribbentrop, and others to argue that to renounce the convention would only lower public morale while shooting captured terror fliers would almost certainly adversely affect the treatment of Luftwaffe personnel in enemy hands.\[29\]

Even more important was the response of the Allies when such breaches of the convention were discovered. Rumors of the fate of the Sagan prisoners, for example, had quickly leaked out via the protecting power. Instead of retaliating in some less draconian manner, which nevertheless might have prompted counterreprisals, the Allied governments decided to issue a simul-
put on trial after the war. By early 1945, with the war clearly lost, this and other such declarations were enough to deter even Ernst Kaltenbrunner (Himmler’s deputy and the man responsible for organizing the Sagan executions) from carrying out an order issued by Hitler in March 1945 specifying that all downed enemy airmen henceforth be shot on capture.33

The mutual hostage factor, then, supplemented in the last months of the war on the German side by fear of personal indictment, was a powerful factor in preventing the collapse of the Geneva Convention in the West. “Practical success,” Max Huber (president of the ICRC) later commented, “depends not only on legal reciprocity, but also on one national interest balancing with the other.”34 Fear of retaliation, indeed, could in the West even affect those not covered by the laws of war. Free French forces captured at Bir-Hakeim in 1942, for example, though technically outlaws according to the terms of the armistice, the Pétain government, which had signed with Germany in 1940, were nevertheless accorded the status of POWs because of concerns about what the Allies might do by way of retaliation if they were mistreated.35 Likewise, when control of POW administration was handed over to Himmler in September 1944 on Hitler’s orders, the treatment of British and American prisoners under SS Obergruppenführer Gottlob Berger did not significantly change.36 Even more indicative of the deterrent strength of fears for prisoners in enemy hands was the manner in which captured Jews in British and American uniform were handled. Despite their status as racial enemies, these prisoners—in stark contrast to the victims of the Holocaust—were segregated and forced to wear the star of David but otherwise were usually treated no differently than their Gentile compatriots.37

The significance of the mutual hostage factor in shaping official attitudes toward upholding the Geneva Convention in the West is also highlighted by the extent to which it came to be disregarded or avoided when one side or the other held a monopoly on POWs. With the danger of retaliation removed, the opportunity to interpret or break the rules in the national interest often proved too strong to resist.38

During the first half of the war the possibilities were greatest for Germany. After the immensely successful campaigns of the spring and early summer of 1940 and the conclusion of armistice agreements with Norwegian, Dutch, Belgian, and French surrender delegations, the Wehrmacht found itself taking into captivity virtually the entire remaining armed forces of all four countries—most significantly the nearly two million Frenchmen in uniform—on top of the half-million or so Poles already behind barbed wire.

The sudden influx of such a large number of prisoners posed enormous logistical problems for the German authorities, and to relieve the strain, Germany over the summer and autumn released on parole all the Dutch, the

threatening to shoot eighty Germans captured at Amiens. This threat may or may not have deterred the Germans from future public executions after it was carried out. Promises of humane treatment for the Polish Home Army prisoners when the Warsaw Uprising in the autumn of 1944 were not fulfilled. See ICRC, pp. 319 ff.; M. Walzer, Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations (New York, 1977), pp. 208–9.


1 Hopes that this move would soon be followed by the freeing of the
remainder of the POWs proved illusory. Batchs of French prisoners
numbering in all around 300,000 were released over time, but mostly those too old
or ill to be of much use. Rebuys were always in return for Vichy cooperation
in one sphere or another and in any case left us with a number of facto
hospital from their German hands. By the summer of 1942, the only means
the Vichy government could devise of getting prisoners back to France that proved
acceptable to the German authorities was the exchange of one unskilled POW
for the dispatch of three civilian skilled workers to Germany. King Leopold
of Belgium made efforts to persuade the Germans to release the remaining
165,000 Belgian POWs but only managed to compromise himself in the eyes of
many by traveling to Berchtesgaden to plead his case in a personal audience
with the Führer.2

In letter, though not in spirit, Hitler’s decision to hold on to the bulk of the
2 enemy personnel captured in 1940 was not a breach of international law. One
of the terms of the armistice with France had been the repatriation of French
POWs on the conclusion of a formal peace treaty, a stipulation in accord with
article 75 of the Geneva Convention. Since no formal peace treaty was ever
signed—keeping it tantalizingly close but just out of reach proving a less
effective means of prompting the Vichy government to think up new ways of
ratifying itself with the Reich—Germany was technically within its rights.

The policy remained, however, a not-so-subtle form of blackmail.3

For the POWs from the occupied states captivity was made more onerous
by the fact that, while their captors were still in theory regarding them as

38 E. L. Horne, Foreign Labor in Nazi Germany (Princeton, N.J., 1967), pp. 46-
47; Ministry of Information (Poland), The German New Order in Poland (London,
1942), p. 117; J. Favez, Une Mission Impossible: les déportations des camps de
concentration nazis (Lausanne, 1988), p. 214; Y. Durand (n. 2 above), p. 21; R. Morau,
“Reparierten,” in France during the German Occupation, 1940-1944: A Collection
of 292 Statements on the Government of Marshal Pétain and Pierre Laval
(Stanford, Calif., 1958), 1:213; L. de Jong, Het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden in de
Tweede Wereldoorlog: Deel 4, Mei ’40-Maart ’41 (Amsterdam, 1972), pp. 259–64.
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action might be taken against their own servicemen in enemy hands), were increasingly employed in mining and other industries—including armament factories—and pressured to work harder under what were often bad conditions. By early 1943, Sauckel was able to report that 1,170,000 non-Soviet POWs were integrated into the German war economy.46

Even at this stage, though, there were limits to the exploitation of European slave labor. Particular provisions of the Geneva Convention were regularly being violated, but to achieve the best possible cost-benefit balance-virtual slave labor—the code in its entirety would have to go. That, however, was for most senior officials not a viable option in 1943–44, given the risks to German prisoners in Allied hands that a general renunciation of the Geneva Convention would engender. The solution was to transform POWs into civilian workers.

1. This was not entirely without precedent. After the defeat of Poland in 1939, those Polish troops "released" from POW status had found themselves transformed into a virtual conscript labor force, a practice also followed with most Yugoslav military personnel two years later. Such action was defended on the grounds that, since both countries had been broken up or absorbed after occupation and since official POW status depended on affiliation to a recognized state, former Polish and Yugoslav military personnel were not legally prisoners of war.47 There were, however, limitations to this approach, the chief one being that the bulk of Germany's prisoners from the West were French, and France still existed as a state. Ironically, it was Pierre Laval, premier of the virtually defunct Vichy government, who came up with a solution to this problem in January 1943.

Desperate for political reasons to avoid sending 250,000 more French civilian workers to the Reich (as Sauckel was demanding as part of his labor-mobilization program), Laval proposed that instead an equivalent number of French POWs would be transformed into "free" contract laborers. In theory these men would be volunteers, but in practice coercion needed to be employed once it became clear that the prisoners themselves gained little in the way of added freedom and lost a great deal in terms of rights accorded legally recognized POWs. As civilian "guest" workers they were no longer protected by the Geneva Convention, and they exchanged the relative safety of Wehrmacht custody for a life in which the Gestapo played a major role.

For the POW this was a disaster,48 but "transformation" (Umsetzung) was seen from the German perspective that it was extended, plans even being laid in April 1943 to bring back the 300,000 Dutch prisoners of war paroled in 1940 as civilian workers. This particular effort was not very successful-only eight thousand men voluntarily reported for reinstatement49—but as greater coercion began to be employed the numbers of transformed prisoners of war grew. In the wake of the armistice concluded between the government of Marshal Badoglio and the Allies in September 1943, German units in Italy had moved swiftly to disarm, round up, and transport to Germany all the Italian soldiers they could lay their hands on.

Numbering over 550,000, these prisoners were never recognized as POWs but instead were dubbed "Italian Military Internnees" (IMIs), even though Italy was soon at war again on the Allied side. Deprived of the legal status of POWs, the Italians suffered greatly, as the German authorities denied the International Red Cross and the Vatican permission to visit internment camps and provide aid. A gloss of legitimacy was given to all this when Mussolini officially placed the Italian prisoners at the disposal of the Reich in early 1944; but living and working conditions for the IMIs remained extraordinarily bad.50

There was some opposition to these moves within OKW and the Abwehr legal section. "The so-called technique of conversion," Sauckel later stressed, "caused me difficulties."51 The fact remained, however, that utilitarian


51 TGMWC (HMSO), Sauckel testimony, 15:122; see van Roon (n. 21 above), pp. 33–35.
In the latter part of the war the Allies also showed a certain willingness to tinker with the status of prisoners in order to further their own aims. When Mussolini had been overthrown in July 1943, one of the means used to induce the new Italian government to surrender was the promise—on condition Allied prisoners were returned—that the over 300,000 Italian POWs in Allied hands would be quickly repatriated. Italian POWs, however, had become a highly valued source of labor everywhere from the United States to Australia, and shipping space was scarce. Thus, when it emerged that the Italian government had been unable to prevent the Germans from transporting almost all Allied prisoners in Italy to the Reich, the British government (with the reluctant approval of the United States) announced in the autumn of 1943 that the Italian POWs would remain where they were. Discipline in the camps was relaxed, but the Italian POWs continued to be de facto prisoners even though their government was as of October 1943 a belligerent in the war against Germany.

Although rather unfair and self-serving, this action did not affect the well-being of Italian POWs. More serious—and contrary to the spirit if not the letter of the Geneva Convention—was the treatment accorded German prisoners after the war had ended. With Allied POWs safely on their way home and the danger of retaliation gone, Allied governments felt free to alter the conditions of captivity hitherto enjoyed by German POWs when and where it was deemed necessary.

For the over 500,000 already in camps in the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia, and elsewhere when the war ended in May 1945, the changes were relatively minor. Rather more controversial was the position of the six million or so German servicemen who fell into Allied hands in the last weeks of the war and immediately after the final surrender. Unwilling (and to an extent unable) to meet the high standards of the Geneva code in coping with this huge mass of humanity, the Allies took the opportunity afforded by the disappearance of the Third Reich to argue that the convention no longer operated—that POW status did not apply to the vast majority who had passed into captivity on and after May 5. Dubbed instead “Surrendered Enemy Personnel” (SEP) by the British and “Disarmed Enemy Forces” (DEF) by the Americans, these prisoners often endured extremely harsh conditions. A number of American camps in western Germany, especially at first, were essentially huge wired-in enclosures lacking sufficient shelter and other amenities. And while there is no real evidence to suggest that a deliberate “death camp” policy was being pursued by SHAEF (Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force), the absence of possible retaliation meant that less effort was put into finding ways of procuring scarce food and shelter than would otherwise have been the case, and that consequently tens of thousands of prisoners died from hunger and disease who might have been saved.

That callous self-interest and a desire for retribution played a role in the fate of these men is illustrated by the way in which the safeguards in the Geneva Convention governing POW labor were often ignored. Prisoners who were too sick or otherwise ill-equipped to work were pressed into service in reconstruction, and with full public support German captives were used in France and the Low Countries to help clear the huge number of mines laid by the Wehrmacht along the coastline from 1942 onward. This was highly dangerous work, and by September 1945 it was estimated by the French authorities that two thousand prisoners were being maimed and killed each month in accidents. Working conditions, like living conditions, did improve over time in France, Germany, and the Low Countries. But the International Red Cross was never allowed to involve itself properly in the welfare of SEP and DEF prisoners, and even the most conservative estimates put the death toll in French camps alone at over 16,500 in 1945.

Utilitarian considerations, then, often took precedence over the Geneva Convention in the West when the threat of retaliation or retribution was no longer present. Even then, however, the enemy POW was, by and large, still considered to be part of a common humanity. In German hands, it was true.

53. PRO, WO 32/1123, enclosure 10A, Brief for D. W., p. 5; Lewis and Mewha (n. 2 above), chap. 8; L. E. Keefer, Italian Prisoners of War in America, 1942–1946: Captives or Allies? (New York, 1992), chaps. 8–9.
Bolshevik lay in wait to seize any opportunity to undermine its greatest foe, the Third Reich. Insofar as there was any consistency to Hitler's worldview in his writings and articulated thoughts, it was the need to crush this menace utterly and give Germany Lebensraum in the East.

This ideological dimension to the führer's thinking did not auger well for the future treatment of prisoners of war when planning began for the invasion of Russia in 1941. "Hitler," Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel (OKW chief of staff) later explained, "did not consider this a formal battle between two states, to be waged in accordance with the rules of International Law, but as a conflict between two philosophies." Months before the invasion actually began, Hitler was making it clear to his generals that the new campaign would be quite different in kind from that of the previous summer in the West.

Bolshevism was a disease, a "poison," which had to be eradicated along with its carriers. Commissars and other Soviet officials were, ipso facto, "criminals" and had to be treated as such. There was, the führer maintained in an address to senior generals on March 30, 1941, no place for restraint or moral scruple in a struggle of this kind.

In accordance with this ideology of absolute war, special orders were prepared. On May 19, guidelines for the conduct of troops in Russia were issued that reiterated the message that the most ruthless action was to be taken against Jewish-Bolshevik cadres and all resistance smashed by whatever means was necessary. At the same time, secret special instructions dealing with the treatment of political commissars were being drawn up, ready for circulation on June 6. Since commissars would be sure to maltreat German prisoners and encourage "barbarous" methods of resistance, they were to be "eliminated" (i.e., shot when captured).

The question was, Would the generals go along with all this? In the West, as we have seen, the German military establishment had been at least partially successful in resisting moves likely to lead to the abandonment of the Geneva Convention and retaliatory action against German prisoners in Allied hands. The Russians, to be sure, were not signatories to the convention, but this only meant that they would not hesitate to respond in kind if those captured were deliberately maltreated. This ought to have made senior army commanders

---
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wary of turning the theory of race war into a reality; and, indeed, many generals claimed after 1945 that in practice they had ignored the Commissar Order, refused to condone the atrocities being carried out by the SS Einsatzgruppen in the rear, and had simply lacked the logistical support to cope adequately with the huge number of prisoners who fell into German hands.64

Contemporary evidence, however, suggests that many senior officers fully shared the views of their führer concerning the Bolshevist menace and took no exception to what was being proposed.65 Field-Marshal Walter von Brauchitsch himself had told senior generals three days before the address by the führer that the war would be "a struggle between two different races" and that consequently "all necessary harshness" should be brought to bear on the enemy. And even an anti-Nazi general such as Erich Hoepner (commanding Panzer Group 4) could write that, as a "battle of the Germanic against the Slav peoples" and "Jewish Bolshevism," the upcoming campaign should be "conducted with unprecedented severity," by which he meant "an iron will to exterminate the enemy mercilessly and totally."66 The junior officers and men of the Wehrmacht, recent scholarship suggests, were equally imbued with an ideological perception of the Russians.67

Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the huge numbers of Russian soldiers captured in the great encirclement battles of the summer and autumn of 1941 suffered greatly. The fighting itself quickly took on a very ugly character, the massacre and mutilation of enemy wounded and small groups trying to surrender becoming commonplace rather than—as in the West—exceptional.68 The hundreds of thousands of Soviet troops cut off by the German advance and eventually forced to surrender en masse were too numerous to be shot out of hand, but their future remained grim. By the time they finally laid down their arms, these men were usually in a pitiful state.

Medicine and food having run out long before. The in extremis condition of the prisoners and their sheer number did create unexpectedly severe logistical problems for their captors, and a significant number of prisoners probably could not have been saved with the best will in the world.69 But evidence suggests that very little attempt was made to arrange adequate care.

According to Keitel, plans had been drawn up within OKW for the transport of captured Soviet troops to existing camps in the Reich—plans that Hitler vetoed on the grounds that he did not want German racial purity sullied by contact with Untermenschen.70 This meant that Russian POWs taken in the summer and autumn of 1941 were confined for weeks and months in what were essentially only holding pens in the eastern territories, wired-in enclosures that usually lacked shelter and even the most rudimentary sanitary facilities (or even any kind of water supply at all). Prisoners were jammed into open railway trucks or force-marched from the front to these cages, those too ill or exhausted to go on being shot by the German escort. Medical aid for the wounded was virtually nonexistent, the food inadequate to sustain human life for any length of time, and the behavior of the Wehrmacht guards brutal in the extreme.71
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In this with the general lack of respect and humanity being encouraged among front-line troops, the regulations governing the treatment of prisoners in the East were uncompromisingly harsh. In light of the fact that the Soviet soldier was indoctrinated with Bolshevist hatred for National Socialism, an order governing the treatment of Russian POWs dated September 8 explained that "he loses all claims to treatment as an honorable soldier and according to the Geneva Convention." The slightest hint of insubordination was to be "immediately stamped out" through use of bayonets, rifle butts, and bullets (it was not necessary, the order emphasized, for guards to be squeamish about firing without warning on prisoners). As for Jews, commissars, or other suspect elements within the prisoner population, arrangements were made for the SS Einsatzkommando to provide "special treatment." By September 1941, mostly as a result of bad sanitary conditions and lack of food, typhus epidemics were sweeping Russian camps. The mortality rate in some was as high as 1 percent a day. There were those, admittedly, who were aghast at the way Soviet prisoners were being handled. The international law section of the Foreign Office argued in favor of accepting mutual observance of the Hague Convention, while humanitarians within Ausland-Arbeit such as Molotov did their best to show OKW senior staff that the policy was in fact counterproductive. On September 15, 1941, in response to the recent issue of orders governing the treatment of Soviet POWs, Admiral Wilhelm Canaris, with the help of his staff, drew up a memorandum for OKW that outlined the problems that would be likely to arise as a result. Such brutality, for one thing, would tend to stir up great resentment among prisoners and thereby require more guards to be employed than might otherwise be the case. In addition, blatant disregard of the Geneva Convention would give the USSR a first-class excuse for backing away from its own declared intention to treat prisoners in accordance with international law and would certainly stiffen enemy resistance and end all chance of using prisoners constructively.

These were cogent arguments, and similar ones had often had a positive effect on POW treatment in the West. In relation to POWs in the East, however, they made little or no headway, especially with Hitler. The Führer, according to Keitel, "refused point blank" to contemplate any change, angrily stating that decent treatment for Russian prisoners would not in any way deter the Bolsheviks from maltreating German prisoners (as they were bound to do). Moreover, as he informed von Weizsäcker, to admit in any way that the Russians were not, a priori, barbaric in their handling of prisoners might give German soldiers "the wrong idea" about surrendering and undermine their willingness to fight to the death rather than fall into enemy hands. There was, however, one line of argument that eventually led to a modification in policy toward the end of the year: the manner in which a vast potential workforce was being frittered away. Overcoming his fears of racial pollution, Hitler ordered that "even the labor capacity of Russian prisoners of war must be placed at the disposal of the German war economy on a large scale," thereby raising the novel prospect of "adequate nutrition." By the time this order took effect and Soviet POWs began to be transported to the Reich, conditions in the camps had reached the point at which cannibalism was being reported. When the first prisoners reached Germany, the extent of the damage done in the East became starkly clear. In a note to the Munitions Ministry in February 1942, Dr. Werner Mansfeld of the Labor Ministry pointed out that, of the 3.9 million Russians captured since the war began, only 1.1 million were still alive, and only 400,000 were so far able to work. Industrial concerns that were assigned batches of newly arrived Russian POWs found them so ill and weak as to be almost useless, and they were still dying in large numbers. The chances of survival for the growing number of Soviet prisoners put to work in the German war economy did improve slightly, but only in a comparison to what had gone before. Living and working conditions were appallingly bad (at least 30 percent of the prisoners appear to have been too...
weak or ill for any sort of work at any given time in 1943–44,\textsuperscript{83} and discipline was enforced with an iron fist by captors who continued to regard Russians as subhuman slave labor.\textsuperscript{84} Tens of thousands of Russian prisoners, moreover, were put at the disposal of the SS, which meant slow death or execution in the concentration camps.\textsuperscript{85} Even those prisoners who “volunteered” to serve as auxiliary Wehrmacht personnel on the Eastern Front—Hiwis—were treated badly, to the point of occasionally being shot at by impatient German soldiers.\textsuperscript{86} By the spring of 1945 up to 3.3 million Soviet POWs had died: 57.5 percent of all those taken, as against a figure of 5.1 percent for British prisoners in German hands.\textsuperscript{87}

I. Ideological and utilitarian considerations also heavily influenced how German prisoners were treated by the Russians. In the summer of 1941 the Soviet government had publicly declared its intention to abide by the 1907 Hague Convention, and in July POW regulations to this effect had been drafted for army commissars.\textsuperscript{88} Moreover, once the atrocities against Russian prisoners in German hands became known. Foreign Commissar V.M. Molotov announced that his government had “no intention, even in the given circumstances, of applying retaliatory repressive measures against prisoners of war” and would continue to observe the terms of the Hague Convention.\textsuperscript{89}

This declared commitment to humanitarian principles, however, was largely for foreign propaganda purposes.

Both at the front and behind the lines, Red Army commissars and party functionaries sought to encourage fighting spirit among Soviet troops by portraying the enemy as inhuman, bestial, and wanting to destroy both communism and the Russian people (a task made easier by the behavior of the Germans themselves). “The officers and soldiers in the green coats,” one propaganda leaflet declared, “are not human beings but wild animals”—the kind of “mad dogs” for whom a single bullet in the head would suffice.\textsuperscript{90} In order to encourage the Soviet people to exert themselves to the full in repelling the German invader and to willingly make the necessary sacrifices.

The enemy had to be seen as uncompromisingly hostile and dangerous. This war was total, a war between peoples and their values: the peace- and freedom-loving people of the USSR under the great leader Stalin versus the Hitlerites and the fascist evil embodied in the German people. In many senses, Soviet army propaganda was a mirror image of what the Germans were saying about the Russians: “The Germans are not human beings.”\textsuperscript{91}

All this had an inevitable effect on the treatment of German prisoners.\textsuperscript{92}

Many were simply killed out of hand at the front—a practice that became so widespread that some Red Army formation commanders (unconsciously echoing the Canaris Memorandum) began to argue that fear of surrender would induce the enemy to fight harder. Conditions for the prisoners who were shipped eastward in 1941–42 were just as atrocious as those accorded Russian POWs, the death rate in this period possibly being as high as 90 percent.\textsuperscript{93} By 1942–43, however, the Soviet Union was suffering from a severe labor shortage that POWs, now beginning to be captured in large numbers, could help alleviate. Consequently, efforts were made to prevent “unauthorized” shooting at the front, and German and other Axis prisoners were shipped eastward to work in mines, felling timber, and at a variety of other unskilled jobs. As in Germany, however, this did not mean that POWs were treated even remotely in accordance with the Geneva Convention. Thousands froze to death and starved on the march or in unheated cattle trucks, and once in camps they were treated as slave labor. Heat, shelter, and clothing were all inadequate, diseases such as typhus were rampant, and food was so scarce that on occasion cannibalism occurred. In all, at least one million German prisoners died out of the 3,150,000 taken by the Red Army. The International Red Cross and the Vatican, needless to say, were refused access to these camps, just as they were prevented from visiting the camps for Russian prisoners in Germany.\textsuperscript{94}

II. Ideological considerations, modified to a greater or lesser extent by the need for slave labor, thus determined the fate of POWs in the East. They also overrode what in the West was serving as a useful deterrent to inhumane treatment—the knowledge that the enemy held prisoners too. When a batch of mail from German POWs in Russia arrived in 1943, Hitler ordered that news of it be kept secret out of concern that this would encourage a less ruthless repelling the enemy.
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image of the enemy. Stalin, for his part, took the view that any Russian soldier who surrendered was a traitor, and those who survived German captivity to 1945 were promptly sent to the Gulag. This utterly uncompromising stance applied even to the general secretary's own immediate family. Efforts by the German authorities to use one of his sons (who was captured in late 1941) as a hostage completely failed. In a war in which each side portrayed the other as something other than human and motivated by totally alien ideas, humanitarian considerations simply vanished.

The War in Asia and the Pacific

The treatment of POWs in the war against Japan was a study in contrasts. The small number of Japanese POWs held in Allied camps in North America and the antipodes were treated in complete accord with the Geneva Convention, while the hundreds of thousands of Allied prisoners in Japanese camps scattered throughout the Japanese Empire lived, worked, and often died under highly unsatisfactory conditions. In both cases, however, as in the European theaters, POW treatment was the result of a combination of ideological and utilitarian factors. What was unique about the war against Japan was that these considerations were quite different on each side.

The extreme brutality with which enemy captives were treated by the Japanese has often been explained through reference to a Japanese military ethic based on a strict Bushido tradition that demanded absolute sacrifice and 2 deemed surrender an unbearable dishonor. The willingness of large numbers of Commonwealth and American troops to give themselves up during the campaigns of 1941–42 when all seemed hopeless hence induced not sympathy but contempt in the minds of their captors—those who surrendered were dishonored and thus deserved to be treated badly.

There is a good deal of truth to the view that a belief system alien to the Western tradition was responsible for the ill-treatment of Allied POWs, but it needs to be emphasized that this was by no means an inevitable development. Japan, after all, had ratified the 1907 Hague Convention, and during the Russo-Japanese War it had been a point of pride that captured Russians received exemplary treatment at the hands of their Japanese captors. Falling into enemy hands, furthermore, while not encouraged, was not then considered an irreparable dishonor. The humane elements of the Bushido tradition and an enthusiasm to appear as “civilized” as any Western great power also governed the treatment of Germans captured in the First World War.

By the latter 1930s, however, a much more uncompromising attitude to combat and capture was prevalent within the armed forces and Japanese society as a whole. The stresses of the interwar years had led to the rise of a new, xenophobic form of nationalism in Japan, while from 1937 onward the seemingly endless war in China served to weaken army discipline and produce frustration and hatred that boiled over into atrocities such as the Rape of Nanking (where, among other things, all captured Chinese soldiers were executed). In these circumstances the Western origin and nature of the principles and laws governing the treatment of POWs became grounds for suspicion and, in practice, repudiation rather than emulation. Seeking to reflect the new spirit of Japanese uniqueness and nationalism while tightening discipline through brutality, the military authorities made their expectations more stringent. As early as 1908, military regulations had emphasized the need for officers to avoid capture. By 1940, when a new Field Service Code was drafted, soldiers themselves were being told that to be captured would bring dishonor on the family: “Never live to experience shame as a
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1. The response of the Japanese government in 1942 to foreign inquiries about its treatment of prisoners of war (POWs) was influenced by the perceived need to demonstrate compliance with international law and the Geneva Convention. The government was keen to present a positive image of Japan's treatment of POWs, thereby maintaining its diplomatic relations with other nations. This attitude, however, was sometimes at odds with the actual treatment received by POWs.

2. Under "strict discipline," POWs were expected to work as hard as possible. This policy was often not observed, and the working conditions and living conditions of POWs were frequently harsh. Despite this, Japan was reluctant to violate the Geneva Convention, which it had ratified, particularly as it might damage its international reputation.

3. POWs were forced to work in conditions that were sometimes inhumane. They were subjected to beatings and other forms of punishment, and their living conditions were often unsanitary and overcrowded. However, the Japanese government was aware of the negative publicity that could arise from prisoner mistreatment, and it was thus important to maintain a public image of compliance with international law.

4. The Japanese government's policies towards POWs were influenced by a desire to maintain its reputation as a responsible nation. However, the reality of the situation was often different, and the treatment of POWs was frequently less than humane. The government's focus on public image and international relations meant that it was sometimes willing to overlook the harsh treatment of POWs. This dual focus on public image and practical concerns is a common theme throughout the history of POW treatment.

5. The Japanese government's stance on POW treatment was also influenced by its own military strategy and the need to maintain a strong image. The government was aware of the importance of maintaining a positive public image, as it could affect the morale of its own soldiers and the support of the population. This was particularly true during a time of war, when the government was under immense pressure to maintain a strong public image.

6. The Geneva Convention provided guidelines for the treatment of POWs, and the Japanese government was expected to comply with its provisions. However, the Convention was not always observed, and POWs were subjected to harsh conditions. The Japanese government's focus on public image and international relations meant that it was sometimes willing to overlook the harsh treatment of POWs. This dual focus on public image and practical concerns is a common theme throughout the history of POW treatment.
American prisoners lost their lives as a result of disease, malnutrition, overwork, or deliberate murder. By 1942–43, news of the conditions in Japanese camps had begun to filter back to London and Washington and means of securing better treatment were discussed. One obvious route was to make sure that the Japanese authorities learned that Japanese POWs in Allied hands were being treated in accordance with the Geneva Convention. Hence, despite the fact that in both the Commonwealth and the United States the Japanese were regarded as analogous to monkeys and that at the front helpless Japanese soldiers were often killed out of hand, Allied governments did everything possible to run POW camps for the very small number of Japanese captured and sent back in the early years of the war according to the convention and employed every possible channel to communicate this to Tokyo.

The mutual hostage factor, however, while partially operative in the case of the internees, did not operate with any real effect for POWs. Quite apart from the fact that there was a great imbalance in the number of prisoners held by each side (by the end of 1942 Japanese POWs in Allied hands still numbered well under a thousand as compared to over 200,000 Commonwealth and American prisoners in Japanese hands), it soon became clear that in the eyes of the Japanese military authorities those few who had failed in their duty to die for the emperor had become nonpersons. Even when prisoners staged revolts within two camps in New Zealand and Australia in February 1943 and August 1944, partially to expiate their sense of guilt at having allowed themselves to become captives, all news of the events was suppressed in Japan. “As you know,” Foreign Minister Shigemitsu Mamin cabled to the Japanese minister in Berne, “our Army maintains the position that Japanese prisoners of war do not exist.”

This left only the option of publicizing the conditions in Japanese camps in the hope that international disapproval and loss of prestige would force the Japanese government to prove that things were not so bad by letting in neutral observers and the International Red Cross. Thus in January 1944 concerted public statements were made in London, Washington, and the Dominion capitals, laying out in detail what was known. As was to be expected, this set off a furious campaign of denial by the Japanese authorities and accusations of mistreatment of internee Japanese civilians in the United States. And while much of the Japanese attempt to convince the world that Allied prisoners enjoyed decent standards was sheer propaganda, a slightly more accommodating stance regarding the shipment of Red Cross relief supplies and visits to camps became discernible.

General conditions for Allied POWs, though, remained poor as Japan’s economic situation grew worse and supplies diminished. Moreover, while possible accountability was dismissed when Japan seemed likely to win (“a victorious Japan,” as one camp officer put it, “will not have to explain”), looming defeat raised the specter of fanatical officers ordering the slaughter of...
prisoners rather than allowing them to be liberated by advancing Allied forces.

3 The officially sanctioned murder of American airmen shot down over Japan in 1945 in an attempt to deter B-29 raids and exact revenge did not bode well for the ultimate fate of POWs in Japanese hands. Tokyo's sudden decision to surrender unconditionally after the dropping of the atomic bombs, however, and the swiftness with which POW camps were liberated by occupation forces meant that the opportunities for mass executions were mercifully few.121

4 As in the West, however, the end of fear concerning retaliation against Allied POWs meant that while the treatment of those Japanese prisoners taken earlier in the war remained the same, conditions among the huge number of surrendered personnel taken after August 1945 were often well below Geneva Convention standards. Food shortages, disease, and a certain amount of vindictive callousness among Allied troops meant that thousands of already weak men would die in the following months. Of the 594,000 Japanese troops captured by the Soviet Union in Manchuria in the last week of the war, 300,000 remained unaccounted for in the 1970s.122

CONCLUSION

1 Where a sufficient degree of respect for the foe as part of a common humanity existed—that is, where ideological considerations tended toward benevolence—or even more important, where concern existed for the well-being of friendly prisoners in enemy hands, as was mostly the case in the West and on the Allied side in the Far East, the 1929 Geneva Convention could in practice remain the standard by which treatment was measured. The paramount role played by the desire to safeguard one's own prisoners held by the enemy, as opposed to altruistic regard for the status of POWs in international law, was illustrated by the degree to which even the most scrupulous detaining powers circumvented the spirit of the convention when the threat of retaliation against prisoners in enemy hands was removed (and was further illustrated in the war in the Pacific by the immense gulf between treatment of Japanese prisoners at the front—where there were no neutral observers—and in camps to which the ICRC and protecting power had access).123
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1 The working class's experience of the tax system is an important aspect of its relationship with the state. This article examines the nature of this connexion during the First World War and its aftermath when fiscal policy was subject to intense political pressure. Two themes are paramount, those of resistance and appropriation. From the point of view of governments the less tax collection encouraged class-based opposition the better. Because the level of tax payments depended on varied circumstances within social groups — caused by family size or patterns of consumption, for example — the lines of differentiation were more finely drawn than the contours of social class. Many tax payments affected the individual as a citizen within the political system rather than as a producer within the economy. The articulation of resentment about tax burdens with conflicts in the economy was not therefore automatic.

2 However, when governments were closely involved in the running of the economy, as in the First World War, it was helpful to use the tax system as an instrument of social justice, so that efforts to generate a common purpose might not be impaired by resentment of the disproportionate gains of others. In these circumstances taxpayers might well be encouraged to see the tax system as a way of appropriating or limiting the wealth of other classes, in a way which did bring it into closer relationship with the economy.

3 The tax system in this period therefore straddled the economic and the political, and required the Labour movement to make decisions about strategies and attitudes. There were the questions of how far opposition to taxes could justifiably be taken, what priority it should have in the light of other issues, and whether it was a subject for political representation since it affected the working class as citizens or of trade union organization because of implications for the standard of living. But there was also the matter of how the tax system should be regarded, whether optimistically as a means of redistributing wealth or pessimistically as being essentially powerless to soften the injustices of the market. The first part of this article deals with tax resistance and its relationship to trade union strategies, the second with the development of ideas to exploit the tax system in the labour interest. This early experience of the progressive tax system under political and fiscal pressure was not wholly encouraging. Opposition to taxation by the working class met with...
some success principally because it was sustained by the power and influence of trade unions, while workers became increasingly pessimistic about the value of the tax system as an instrument of justice. The potential for the tax system to ease grievances about inequality and so free the economy from the complications of class tension was therefore limited; instead it seemed to reflect rather than correct the conflicts within the market place.

During the war, as a result of the lowering of the exemption level in 1915 and wage increases, the working class became subject to income tax in large numbers for the first time. Opposition to income tax gave workers some immunity from fresh burdens in the aftermath of the war when the demands for revenue were still considerable. In 1920 when the question of raising income tax was considered, the board of inland revenue advised against it because this 'would increase the burden of tax to a small but appreciable extent upon an enormous number of manual and other small wage-earners, and it may be felt that that result should be avoided'.

1 When the royal commission on income tax approached the question of the point at which incomes should be taxed, H. J. McKinder remarked that 'it leads to great animus and feeling between the classes'.

It was hoped that in paying income tax the working class would achieve a higher level of political responsibility and interest, and this opinion was held both outside and inside the labour movement. Herbert Smith, then vice-president of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, argued that if we had more direct taxation we would have more active workers than what we have and they would know the position better. But while many workers did pay up, there was considerable resistance among the more strategic sections of the Labour movement during and after the war so that sectional agitation stood for the position of the class as a whole. As J. C. Stamp observed in 1919, when remarking that direct taxation of the working class was 'full of political difficulties' one only has to consider the problems raised at this point by the attitude of the miners and others to decide whether or not it is a politically practicable proposal that persons with incomes between £70 and £200 shall bear an average burden of £20 per head.

Because of the way the burden of tax varied within social classes, it will be worth considering, alongside the more political aspects, the sociological question of how far the opposition had to follow the lines of differentiation created by the tax system, and how far it was able to draw upon the broader-based energies generated by industrial conflict.

1 The imposition of income tax on the working class was regarded as the most important step of McKenna's first budget of September 1915. It involved reduction of the exemption limit from £140 to £130 income in the income allowance standing at £120. The main political pressure had come from business groups anxious that the working class should make its contribution; according to the chamber of trade 'reduction of the income tax exemption limit is the most equitable way of opening up fresh sources of revenue'. While there was some concern about whether the working class would take kindly to the tax, the initial anxieties were more administratively than political, and concerned the demands upon staff and the complication of the collection process. The only way to proceed in these early stages, it was felt, was to have a simple tax on wages with no provision for repayment because of irregular earnings or for child allowances, and at this point the scheme was dropped. When the need to raise more revenue and bring the worker into the income tax was recognized, the chief consideration was to locate the section of the working class which could be taxed relatively easily and without excessive cost to the inland revenue. The view that an annual income of £120 - £200 per week was the dividing line was confirmed by trade union leaders.

2 According to Harry Gosling (N.T.W.F.) the worker on £130 was 'the better off man, who is getting higher wages, who is a household, and that sort of thing. There is no trouble with him now'. To go further down to £100 would have brought into the tax bracket those who changed jobs and residence frequently and who might be employed intermittently, while ignorance would be more prevalent, with awkwardness and hostility in tax matters directly proportional thereto. Eventually the nearest match to the worker's ability to pay (weekly) and the administrative convenience of the revenue (annual assessment) was payment every quarter, and the tax proved reasonably cheap to collect (about 7% of the total revenue of the tax).

Although manual workers were not the only group caught in the new tax band, they were the majority, being in 1918-19 nearly 70% of all such taxpayers. In 1919 the Treasury gained roughly £8 million from the direct taxation of wage earners, about 4% of the total revenue from income tax. The loss from raising the tax limit to leave out the working class might appear to have been small, but the true cost was much higher than £6 million, nearer £25 million, because of the effect of carrying newly granted allowances higher.

1 Board of inland revenue. Note on possible methods of replacing part of the Revenue now drawn from the excess profits duty', 17 Dec. 1919, Cabinet committee on taxation, London, Public Record Office (P.R.O.), Cabinet Papers, CAB 27/105, para. 52.
2 Royal commission on income tax, minutes of evidence (Parl. Papers, 1919, LXXII, pt 1), Q. 6701.
3 Smith was at this time vice-president of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain (M.F.G.B.). Special conference proceedings of M.F.G.B., 22 Oct. 1919, p. 23.
4 J. C. Stamp, 'The special taxation of business profits in relation to the present position of the Treasury', in Stamp, Taxation during the war (London, 1922), p. 49.
5 Hull branch of the chamber of trade to chancellor of the exchequer, in 'Evolution of income tax', P.R.O., Treasury Papers, T 172/973.
6 Board of inland revenue. Note on possible methods of replacing part of the Revenue now drawn from the excess profits duty', 17 Dec. 1919, Cabinet committee on taxation, London, Public Record Office (P.R.O.), Cabinet Papers, CAB 27/101, para. 52.
7 Smith was at this time vice-president of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain (M.F.G.B.). Special conference proceedings of M.F.G.B., 22 Oct. 1919, p. 23.
8 Royal commission on income tax, minutes of evidence (Parl. Papers, 1919, LXXII, pt 1), Q. 6701.
9 Smith was at this time vice-president of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain (M.F.G.B.). Special conference proceedings of M.F.G.B., 22 Oct. 1919, p. 23.
11 Hull branch of the chamber of trade to chancellor of the exchequer, in 'Evolution of income tax', P.R.O., Treasury Papers, T 172/973.
12 Board of inland revenue. Note on possible methods of replacing part of the Revenue now drawn from the excess profits duty', 17 Dec. 1919, Cabinet committee on taxation, London, Public Record Office (P.R.O.), Cabinet Papers, CAB 27/105, para. 52.
The operation of the income tax on wage earners was complicated by the effect of allowances, rather than by any significant changes in the rate of tax (which went up from 11.9d. to 2s. 3d. in the £ from 1916-17). A child allowance of £2.5 was extended to workers for the tax year 1918-19, and both were increased in 1919-20, the wife allowance going up to £50, that for a first child to £40, succeeding children still attracting £25. From 1917-18 it was also possible for a taxpayer to claim for a child maintained by him but not his own, and it was suggested that this provision would undoubtedly give relief to a large number of wage earners. Allowances could also be claimed for clothes and essential equipment. Many earning above £130 did not pay tax at all because of the allowances they received. For those earning between £130 and £160, 25% of wage earners actually paid tax in 1916-17, and 32% in 1918-19. Further up the income scale a higher proportion of workers paid income tax. In 1919, for example, it was estimated that about 58% of the miners in the South Wales coalfield earning £130 p.a. actually had to pay tax. The effect of allowances in reducing the tax liability of those in working class income levels is shown for 1919-20 in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income range, £</th>
<th>% of incomes taxed</th>
<th>Allowances as % of taxable income</th>
<th>Average tax paid, £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150-160</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160-200</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-250</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-300</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>13.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Report of board of inland revenue, Cmd 1083 (P.P. 1920, xviii), table 64.

It is important to examine the effect of changing allowances on a dynamic pay structure. Without allowances an exemption limit which remained unchanged would clearly have increased the tax liability of the worker as his pay improved. But if allowances themselves increased substantially (as they did for a wife and first child in 1919) then the impact of pay increases on tax liability would have been diminished and 'fiscal drag' offset. In 1918-19, 4.1% of income paid in tax was 4.1% (of £223) for a single man, 5.4% for a married man with one child, 1.5% for a single man, and 1.8% for a married man with one child. In 1919-20, 5.4% (of £270) for a single man, 1.8% for a married man with one child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>% of income paid in tax</th>
<th>1918-19</th>
<th>1919-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineers: Single</td>
<td>4.1% (of £223)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married man with one child</td>
<td>1.5% (of £290)</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miners (South Wales)</td>
<td>4.3% (of £227)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single man</td>
<td>5.7% (of £290)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married man with one child</td>
<td>1.8% (of £290)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The effect of allowances is also outlined in B. Waite, A class society at war, England 1914-19 (London, 1938), pp. 151, where piecework earnings are assumed to be 22% above those of time rate workers.
had no children, or only one. 16 So the insulation of the working class from income tax by the operation of tax allowances was far from complete simply because the family with three children who enjoyed such exemption was far from universal. The effect of income tax was increased when it fell on lump-sum back pay, as was the case with the miners' Sankey award in 1919.

It has been necessary to establish the effects of the allowances because they were one part of two contradictory tendencies within the sociology of working-class taxation. On the one hand, there was the obvious tendency of the tax to operate across occupational boundaries (at the higher income levels). As the ministry of labour's report to the cabinet on 10 October 1917 noted: 'The question is a serious one, not only on account of the widespread nature of the agitation, but it is also one in which the discontented in all industries have a common interest.' 17 Had there been, as originally intended, a flat tax on wages, this opposition might have spread further. But, on the other hand, with the introduction of family allowances, differences in family structure within the working class and across occupational divisions might have been expected to assert themselves. The development of the income-tax agitation saw the tension between these two aspects: on the one hand, the yoking of the issue to trade union activity which treated the workers as a common group; on the other hand, the efforts of the tax authorities to use allowances to fragment the opposition as a much cheaper way of handling it than increasing the level of exemption for all low-income taxpayers.

The incorporation of the income tax protest into trade union affairs was not an automatic development, since the drift of many discussions in 1915 was to try to detach the operation of the tax from conventional industrial relations. The inland revenue wanted to assess the tax but get the employers to collect it. 18 This was firmly resisted by both sides, neither the employers nor the trade-union leaders wishing to add any fresh element of dispute. 19 Apart from the employer making a return of all those earning over £130 per year, the worker was involved with the tax authorities purely as a citizen and not as a trade unionist. Actual practice tended to follow legal formality and schemes to use employers in the deduction of tax invariably ended in failure. 20

Some wanted the trade unions to remain completely detached from income tax matters and not to assist members in any way in their dealings with tax officers. 21 But this was not widespread, and most trade unions acted as channels for grievances and as negotiators about the allowances which certain workers might claim. In South Wales the involvement went further than elsewhere with lodges appointing a member, a sub-collector, to act with the local tax collector. According to one of their leaders, George Barker, 'our men

17 G.T. 2556, in P.R.O., CAB 24/28.
18 Committee on tax liability at £130 by quarterly assessment, in P.R.O., IR 63/57.
19 P.R.O., T 172/222.
20 R.T. 63/57, in University of Wales Coalfield Archive, University College Library, Swansea.
21 For Barnes see P.R.O., IR 75/82.
22 For the position outside South Wales see the ministry of labour reports to cabinet, 26 Nov. 1915 (CP 258), 21 Jan. 1920 (CP 386), in P.R.O., CAB 24/96 and 96, respectively. For South Wales see Lewis Merthyr Lodge minutes, 14 Nov. 1919 and S.W.M.F. special conference proceedings, 8 Nov. 1919, held in the South Wales Coalfield Archive, University College, Swansea.
withdrawal and the collection of income tax at a standstill. According to one of the tax inspectors in Wales 'The syndicalists are fairly strong and very influential in Abertillery which is the most turbulent miners' district in the Kingdom', and although at this stage the number refusing to pay was only 8,000 out of roughly 71,000 who were liable to tax in the coalfield, the government was concerned: 'The dangers of turning taxation into a mere subscription list dependent on the mood of the taxpayer need not be

opposition in the coalfield was enough to carry a resolution against the payment of any tax (direct or indirect) at a special conference of the S.W.M.F. in October 1917, and early in 1918 the South Wales group tried to give the question further prominence by asking that the Triple Alliance tackle income tax, along with food prices, 'by whatever means necessary',

It was at this point that the greater pressure from South Wales began to meet resistance from other districts in the M.F.G.B. Reference of the tax question to the Triple Alliance was accepted, but only to keep the peace in South Wales, anxieties being voiced about pushing too hard, and using the Alliance for purely political questions. For most of 1918 agitation was muffled. The acute anxiety about the German offensive had a dampening effect on all labour agitation and the Triple Alliance postponed their meeting with Lloyd George about income tax, and only the Welsh protested about this.

A Scottish miner agreed about the injustice of paying income tax but not 'when the very existence of the country is at stake, whilst we are fighting for our very existence as a nation.'

In 1919 income tax again attracted hostility beyond South Wales, but when the S.W.M.F. wanted to press the matter after the royal commission had been appointed the divisions reappeared. For a Lancashire delegate 'it affects only the single men, and it is not as big as South Wales makes it', and Smillie, the President of the Federation agreed 'it is not of the importance it has got in South Wales at the present time'. He feared imprisonment for non-payment provoking strikes (as it had done at the Llwynypia colliery in June 1919), which would threaten the bigger prizes: 'We may be face to face with an issue a thousand times more vital than the income tax, and it behoves us to keep our ranks secure.' Although rebuffed by the M.F.G.B., refusals to pay continued in South Wales and by December 'the collection among the miners is almost negligible although the notices have been out for weeks'.

Notes by Stenton, superintendent inspector for Cardiff, 7 Sept. 1917, P.R.O., T.12/49.26
N. Warren, Financial Secretary, 'Limit of exemption from income tax', 7 Sept. 1917, in P.R.O., T.12/49.
S.W.M.F. special conference proceedings, 8 Oct. 1917; M.F.G.B. special conference proceedings, 28 Feb. 1918, pp. 53-7.
M.F.G.B. special conference proceedings, 28 Feb. 1918, pp. 53-7, speeches of Lancashire, Nottinghamshire and Scottish delegates.
M.F.G.B. executive committee minutes, 8 May 1918, p. 8, and 16 May 1918, p. 17; S.W.M.F. conference proceedings, 1 June 1918.
Rhondda Circular No. 1 Superior, 5 Nov. 1913; Stenton, 3 Dec. 1913, P.R.O.

Although it was intended to create an impossible amount of work for the magistrates by withholding tax due (and deduction of arrears from wages was assumed to be too big a risk for the government to resort to it) the Welsh miners were also balloted on whether to strike over the issue. The margin in favour was too narrow (470 majority of 146,144 votes) to go ahead with a strike, and the M.F.G.B. declined to ballot the whole of the Federation.

Gradually, by early 1920, the South Wales miners began to pay the tax again, as the success of sectional action receded. 33

Outside South Wales the limited impact of income tax had been recognised and the issue seen as secondary to other concerns. Part of the reason for this may be the state of union politics in general rather than anything to do with taxation in particular. South Wales was a particularly discontented region during the war, and the S.W.M.F. saw a number of left-wingers achieve office.

Most of those engaged with the income tax issue were on the left: Noah Ablett, George Barker, A. J. Cook, Frank Hodges and James Winstone. The odd man out was Vernon Hartshorn who during the war became increasingly moderate, and by the summer of 1919 he seems to have become less convinced of the merits of pushing the matter to a strike. 34 The campaign to go beyond the demand for restoration of the old exemption limit to the abolition of all taxes of wages (including indirect taxes) in 1917 was organized in the lodges and A. J. Cook, chairman of the Lewis Merthyr joint committee, took a leading part in these discussions, aided by Ablett. Reference to the tax question to local Labour parties was deliberately forestalled. Ablett led the S.W.M.F. argument at the M.F.G.B. conference in October 1919 (for refusing to pay tax) and George Barker was leader of the Abertillery miners who had withheld tax in 1917. Moderates in the S.W.M.F. like Thomas Richards and William Brace, were more keen to force the tax question so far. 35 The failure of A. J. Cook to be elected vice-president in the summer of 1919 was predicted to be a reason for renewed agitation; according to the local inspector of taxes 'defeat will cause the extremists to resort to the Income Tax again and it will be a potent weapon to use against Brace'.

To be a 'potent weapon' the attention had to be kept on the exemption limit - which applied to all taxpayers - and away from the effects of allowances for wives and children on lessening burdens for family men. At the same time as lodges were helping miners by claiming allowances for clothes

33 S.W.M.F. executive council minutes, 11 Dec. 1919 for voting figures; Rhondda No. 1 district monthly report for decisive vote against any further action, 20 Dec. 1919, and arranging for repayment within the tax authorities.
34 S.W.M.F. conference, 4 Aug. 1919.
36 Brace and Richards withdrew the S.W.M.F. resolution to refuse to pay tax, in place of one of the M.F.G.B. executive council to await the report of the royal commission on income tax. M.F.G.B. special conference, 22 Oct. 1919, pp. 4-6, 21-8.
37 Stenton to R. V. N. Hopkins, 16 June 1919, in P.R.O., IR 75/185. Cook was heavily defeated for the office of vice-president in June 1919, when younger candidates of the left did battle against Barker and Hodges.
The tax authorities were particularly keen to use the allowance for a woman to differentiate between the single and married men and so exploit what was thought to be a powerful division in working class society. According to a sub-collector 'if an allowance were given for a wife it would rend the Federation from top to bottom as there is bitter hatred against the single men'. This was not entirely fanciful: in evidence to the royal commission on the income tax, Shirke of the T.U.C. favoured a tax specifically on married women, and during the parliamentary debates on income tax in 1915 Barnes had suggested that it be confined to married women as far as the working class were concerned. The tax authorities tried to use the sub-collectors in South Wales to weaken resistance to the tax in 1917 by spreading information about the wife's allowance:

I [Stenson, the Cardiff tax inspector] spent Wednesday evening with Mr Tom Parry, one of our own sub-collectors and a thoughtful and well-read miner - 36 years of age. He has a sound insight into the leaders and the miners... he is not sure of the men who know the ins and outs of the tax question and how little it affects them personally in the main. Mr Parry... thinks that the question will receive a heavy blow, as the effect of the Chancellor's statement that he would consider a wife's allowance and the line it draws between the bachelor and the married man has not yet been appreciated.38


39 Stenson to deputy chairman, 20 Sept. 1917, P.R.O., T.72/982.

40 Stenson to deputy chairman, 21 Aug. 1917, P.R.O., T.72/982.
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43 R.C. on income tax, minutes of evidence (P.P. 1919, xiii, pt 1), Q. 2576.

44 Report of R.C. on income tax (P.P. 1920, xvi), para. 255, emphasis added.

45 For an indication of this see the list of letters and resolutions sent to the chancellor of the exchequer in Aug. 1917, in which those from the A.S.E. are prominent, in P.R.O., T.72/982.

2 agitation. The miners were happy to claim it, but even when the allowances had been increased for 1919-20, opposition to the tax does not seem to have been confined to single men. The support for a strike over income tax (itself a major step), although it did not include all taxpayers, nonetheless extended to between a third and a half of the coalfield and must have gone beyond the bachelors. There was some justification, therefore, for the representatives of the S.W.M.F. claiming in evidence before the royal commission on the income tax that 'the married men, and the single men, as far as we are concerned, always go together'.

1 The campaign for a universal £250 exemption level was in the end unsuccessful, the royal commission on income tax recommending that figure only for married couples and not the bachelors. But the way in which this was to be done suggests that the trade unions had achieved some success in presenting the tax issue as one which affected all workers (by focusing on the exemption level which applied to all income) rather than one, which because of the operation of allowances, differentiated on basis of family size or marital status. The commission decided to follow the trade union perspective by merging the allowance for a wife with the exemption level because it was 'most desirable to specify separately the exemption which is to be allowed to a bachelor and the exemption which is to be allowed to a married couple'.

4 According to the commission it was all a matter of appearances:

The effect produced by this method will be exactly similar to the effect of allowing an abatement of the same amount on the exemption limit, plus allowances for family obligations, as the present system, but we consider it would be well to emphasize the fact, not always brought home to the taxpayer, that a married couple with an income within the appointed limit are definitely exempt from the tax, although their income lies above that of the bachelor.

6 In some areas, notably at Barrow, there was refusal to pay. What was missing
When the pre-war period was characterized by high taxation, the government introduced a system of withholding tax to ensure compliance with the pre-war levels of taxation. In 1919, however, the £2,686 agreement was renegotiated for less than the pre-war level, and this new agreement was signed by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Herbert Asquith. The agreement was characterized by a number of provisions that were designed to ensure compliance with the pre-war levels of taxation. However, these provisions were largely ignored by the unions, and the government had to resort to legal action to enforce compliance. The government's efforts to enforce the agreement were met with resistance from the unions, and the issue was ultimately settled by a court ruling. The case of the pre-war agreement and the subsequent renegotiation raises important questions about the relationship between the government and the unions, and the role of legal action in enforcing agreements.
2. Indirect taxation hit the working class far harder than income tax. In 1919 Herbert Samuel showed that a married man with three children earning £200 paid over 10% of his income in indirect tax and would not have been liable to income tax. In 1919, assuming a halving of money income because of wartime inflation, the burden was roughly 6%. Income tax, demanded and extracted by a government official, was therefore far more visible than the much heavier indirect tax impersonally carried, as it were, on a packet of cigarettes. For some, this was the attraction of indirect taxation, according to the steelmaker, Sir Hugh Bell, a tax on commodities is levied without the contributors being aware of its existence and so is levied without much grumbling...it is possible in this way to get something towards the maintenance of the state out of the poor and indeed the poorest classes. Does this mean that the real taxation of the working class was successfully carried on through indirect taxation, arousing little hostility amongst the industrial workers, while the much more insignificant income tax took all the flak?

The conventional wisdom at the end of the war assumed that indirect taxes could not be avoided by the working class. Herbert Samuel announced in the course of his paper on taxation, 'I have followed all previous investigators in assuming that the taxes on commodities are paid by the consumer'. Alfred Marshall, in his essay on taxation in After war problems (1917) argued that every such tax (on ordinary commodities) tends to be shifted forward onto the user. W. E. Layton, editor of The Economist suggested that the only way to avoid an indirect tax was to consume something else, and it was the impossibility of doing this with certain items that generated the revenue. This was the basis of Labour's dislike of indirect taxes: they fell on consumers irrespective of income and, because of the essential nature of the goods, could not be shifted. It looks, then, as though part of the practical value in the labour

---

56. Committee on national debt and taxation, minutes of evidence (non-parl., 1922), ii 398.
57. Samuel, 'Taxation of the people', p. 149.
59. Committee on national debt and taxation, minutes of evidence (non-parl., 1922), i 9097.
In the aftermath of the war the pay of the railwaymen exhibited the former tendency and the builders' wages the latter. The regard for the cost of living more generally and the notion of a living wage probably exerted a more powerful effect upon pay than the scales themselves.

1 In the switchback conditions of 1918–22 gains and losses were unevenly distributed across occupations: 'the real wages in the wool industry were stable, whereas in printing they rose by almost a quarter and in iron and steel they fell by more than one-fifth.' For occupations where real wages were falling indirect taxes were being borne; some alleviation was evident where real wage gains were protected. After the war employers naturally wanted to bring wage determination away from broadly applied cost-of-living factors and back to constraints imposed by conditions in their particular industries.

2 The pay award made to the engineering industry by the industrial court in March 1920, for example, threw its weight onto the side of what an individual industry might be able to afford, rather than onto a close connection with the cost of living. But this view was not widely shared, John Hilton arguing that 'it will be agreed by all except a few irresponsible and wreckers that the recognition of the cost of living as one element in wage determination is a distinct gain of permanent value.' Even though there had been sharp reductions in wages during 1920–2, this deflation was regarded as abnormal: if on a longer view regard be had to the future beyond the existing state of trade, and to the power of organised labour in more normal conditions, it would be bold to assert that heavy additional indirect taxation could be kept on the wage earning classes in more than a modest degree.

3 The same point had been made in a discussion about turnover taxes as a possible source of revenue: the tax would normally fall upon the consumer, that is, in the main part upon the working classes. In the case of the poorest section of the community (e.g. the Old Age Pensioners) the burden would remain there, and would definitely lower the standard of living. Among the more powerful working classes the tax would consolidate the claim to retain the existing high money wages or even set in motion a claim for increased wages, and would thus be likely to embarrass trade, embitter the relations of Capital and Labour and check the movement towards lower price levels.

4 Even if there was to be a diminution of real pay 'their [the workers'] tendency

---

65 Clegg, Trade unions, p. 336.
66 'Industry and the weight of taxation', P.R.O., T.172/130, para. 53.
67 'Note on possible methods of replacing part of the revenue now drawn from the excess profits duty', P.R.O., CAB 27/101, p. 160.
68 'Industry and the weight of taxation', P.R.O., T.172/130, para. 62.
70 'The British Excess Profits Duty, if not the first of these special profits taxes, is certainly in many respects the greatest and best of them all... Its future place in the British financial structure constitutes one of the most acute problems confronting the British government today.'
was no ‘normal’ profit against which high profits might be assessed. This
historical reference point worked increasingly against the firms employing new
capital as against older firms which were more likely to have a higher pre-war
standard below which excess profits duty was not charged. Moreover,
whenever profits dipped below the pre-war standard (even before actual losses
were made) rebates were allowed from duty paid in other years, and this
reduced the yield of the duty to the Treasury in the post-war years.

But while it was not practicable to consider excess profits duty as a
permanent peacetime tax, there was considerable interest in having some kind
of tax on profits. The board of inland revenue had a graduated profits tax
under discussion in November 1918, and in the Commons in May 1919 the
Liberal J. S. Holmes argued that ‘if taxation were so enacted that surplus
profit would come to the state and to the common good, then I suggest that
much of the prevailing discontent would disappear’. J. C. Stamp, who had
been largely responsible for the success of excess profits duty during the war,
set out in a business profits tax in the *Economist* for December
1919. The notion of a ‘surplus’, over and above the income necessary to bring
the factors of production into operation, as a target for taxation was
associated with J. A. Hobson, at this time a member of the Labour party’s advisory
committee on trade and finance. Stamp, in his essay on the graduated profits
tax, pointed out how closely his proposed tax came to finding Hobson’s surplus
and later, in 1924 before the Colwyn committee, Hobson agreed with him:

*Q.1649 Stamp: Can you suggest any other scheme than that which I put forward of
making your surplus a practical way of taxation?*

Hobson: No, I do not think I can. I think that was a good way to approach it.

The war might have been expected to give further encouragement to
2. Labour to press for peacetime taxation of profits. There was plenty of evidence
of profits at levels far beyond an adequate return for risk, to which Labour
newspapers frequently drew attention. ‘Profiteering’ was a widely used slogan
which, if rather imprecise as an economic concept, as a moral commentary
brought all profits into question, as the ministry of labour reported to the

cabinet: ‘The popular adoption of the word “profiteering” and the
application of it to particular abuses of profit-making has, however,
contributed to bring profit into wider disrepute’. The idea of a graduated
profits tax was not only thought to be in line with the outlook of Labour’s
theorists but also of broader appeal to the working class:

Labour has not doubt more ambitious schemes for dealing with the profits of industry,
but it is difficult to imagine that the representatives of this class would not welcome
the proposal, except perhaps a few extremists who will be satisfied with nothing short of
state ownership. It may well be that Labour more than any other class will feel that

1. This was precisely why industry had cause for anxiety. Its representatives
did not wish to see excess profits duty translated into a more permanent tax
to which Labour might become committed. Any new taxation of industry
would be likely to become permanent because it would be very difficult
thereafter with labour troubles and so on for industry to be able to get an
alteration, in any particular basis of something which had been a reconsidered
of taxation of industry. But the Labour party and the trade unions showed no
interest in proceeding along these lines. It is true that the Labour M.P.
William Graham, speaking in 1912 on the corporation tax introduced in that
year’s budget, suggested that ‘it may be necessary in future for governments
with a large social outlook to extend this tax’ but such pronouncements were
rare. Snowden was primarily interested in income tax and death duties.

Hobson’s notion of a taxable surplus had been applied to business profits by
Stamp, not by Hobson himself. The war had certainly made the economy
more visible and the status of profit more vulnerable, and the rate at which
excess profits duty was levied became a central feature in political negotiations
between Labour and other politicians. During the war there were demands
from Labour for increases in the rate of the duty and indeed, one of the ways
in which Lloyd George secured support from Labour in the formation of his
coalition in 1916 had been a promise for a 100% profits tax. There was some
relief when a rate of 80% seemed sufficient for the purpose. When Austen
Chamberlain reduced the rate in 1919 to 40% he used the ‘violent and bitter
and rather threatening opposition by the Labour Party’ as a reason for
refusing further concessions to industry.

But these points should not hide the fact that the general experience of
excess profits duty had not been encouraging for the labour interest. The
Excess Profits Tax was not a sufficient check on greediness’ noted the
*Yorkshire Times*, and there were doubts about whether such taxation would
land where it was intended. The government has no assurance that any new

74. N. W. Leader to chancellor of the exchequer, 30 Nov. 1918, in *P.R.O., Budget Papers, T. 171/622.
75. A. H. Kilner, of Courtaulds, deputation of F.B.I. to chancellor of exchequer, 7 Feb. 1919.
*P.R.O., T. 172/1904.* The proposal was eventually shelved in part because Lloyd George
was concerned about the effects upon newspaper proprietors, and therefore upon the standing
of the government. See note of 14 Apr. 1919 bound in correspondence between N. W. Leader
76. In *Parl. Deb.,* 21 Apr. 1920, cxxvi, cols. 477–8. During his speech Graham was keen to insist
upon the immunity of the Co-operative Society from the corporation tax, and anxiety about the
Co-op’s assets had steered the Labour party away from a capital tax on business as well as on
private assets. There has not been space here to deal with the Co-op, but there
is every reason to suppose that it exerted a restraining influence on Labour’s aggressive
tax strategies, because of its own potential vulnerability to them.
77. Deputation of F.B.I. to chancellor of the exchequer, 5 July 1919, *P.R.O., T. 172/1904.* For
the place of the profits duty in relations between Lloyd George and Labour see the notes by Lord
1917, and papers of Political and Economic Development, 1917–1920, cols. 65–6. For
the principle of the state taking a share of excess profits should not be allowed to fall
into abeyance.”
hobson, w. wakans rather than sidney webb. if anything, excessive profits were passed on in generous depreciation allowances, or avoided entirely by passing on the tax to the consumer. the t. u. c. described the process this way in 1914:

the t. u. c. described the process this way in 1914:

but in 1924, labour, the national political parties, and the labour party were united in their opposition to the war. labour argued that the war was a capitalist war, and that the only way to end it was to redistribute wealth and power.

this was a struggle of classes. the working class was united in their opposition to the war, but the middle class and the aristocracy were divided. the aristocracy supported the war, while the middle class was divided. some middle class people supported the war, while others opposed it.

the working class was united in their opposition to the war, but the middle class was divided.

the aristocracy supported the war, while the middle class was divided. some middle class people supported the war, while others opposed it.

the working class was united in their opposition to the war, but the middle class was divided.

the aristocracy supported the war, while the middle class was divided. some middle class people supported the war, while others opposed it.

the working class was united in their opposition to the war, but the middle class was divided.

the aristocracy supported the war, while the middle class was divided. some middle class people supported the war, while others opposed it.

the working class was united in their opposition to the war, but the middle class was divided.
arguments about a capital levy. This is not to argue that the Labour party’s interest in capital taxation (whether through a capital levy or upgraded death duties) was misplaced; rather, it is to suggest that the evidence is weak that such taxes would have the function of easing working class resentment at the inequalities of income in industry.

IV

This article has emphasized the tensions imported into the tax system by the wider conflicts in British society during the war and its aftermath. It provides a corrective to the view of patriotism and compliance which is gained if the focus is on the large amounts of revenue raised for the war. It also indicates limits to the integrative potential of the tax system. Events in 1916–20 showed that as the tax point moved down the income scale it engaged not only with the diverse and disaggregated interests of the middle classes but also with the effectively organized working-class interests. This had not been an automatic outcome. Within the Labour movement there had been those who had believed that the workers should fend for themselves as taxpaying citizens, and the benefits of a working-class income tax had been shared by the dour Herbert Smith and the virtuous Philip Snowden. But in the end the balance which impressed the tax authorities was the view that the working class should be spared a burden of income tax and treated circumspectly with regard to indirect taxes, a conclusion which depended on the linking of tax opposition with class conflict in industry. Equally, there was no strong evidence that the working class was convinced about the ability of profits taxes to hit the wealth of others, nor that it was imbued with the same enthusiasm for taxing personal wealth as middle class socialists. It was unlikely then, to see the fairness (or otherwise) of its economic position to be much alleviated by the tax system.

Because of the extent to which governments tried increasingly to soothe grievances about pay by non-wage payments and benefits, particularly during efforts at wage restraint, this approach to the tax system was to make the political management of the working class more rather than less difficult after 1945.
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### Table 1

Breakdown of numbers of words, sentences and paragraphs in the history sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Harriss</th>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Whiting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2272</td>
<td>2162</td>
<td>2923</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraphs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indep</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All indep</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S per par</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W per par</td>
<td>206.6</td>
<td>204.5</td>
<td>308.9</td>
<td>224.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W per sent</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals for corpus of four articles

- **Sentences**
  - Introduction: 134
  - Body: 979
  - Conclusion: 89
  - Total: 1202

- **All independent clauses**
  - Introduction: 148
  - Body: 1052
  - Conclusion: 106
  - Total: 1306

- **All independent clauses**
  - Introduction: 164
  - Body: 1243
  - Conclusion: 119
  - Total: 1525

---
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Table 2

Breakdown of the move structure in the four introductions in terms of Swales’s (1990) CARS model

**Harriss**
Move 1: Establishing a territory
  - Step 2: making topic generalisations: Par 1 - Ss1 & 2
  - Step 3: reviewing items of previous research: Par 1 - Ss1-3; Pars 2-7; Par 11 - S9
Move 2: Establishing a niche
  - Step 1A: counter-claiming: Par 1 - S1; Pars 8-9; Par 10 - S1
Move 3: Occupying the niche
  - Step 1B: announcing present research: Par 1 - S4; Par 11 - Ss7-8
  - Step 2: announcing principal findings: Par 1 - S4; Par 10 - Ss2-4; Par 11 - Ss1-6, S10
  - Step 3: indicating RA structure: Par 11 - S8

**Walker**
Move 1: Establishing a territory
  - Step 1: Establishing centrality Par 1 - S1
  - Step 2: Making topic generalisations: Par 1 - S2; Par 2 - Ss1-3; Par 3 - S2
  - Step 3: Reviewing items of previous research: Par 2 - Ss1-2; Par 3
Move 2: Establishing a niche
  - Step 1A: Counter-claiming: Par 2
Move 3: Occupying the niche
  - Step 1A: Outlining purposes: Par 1 - S4; Par 3 - S1
  - Step 1B: Announcing present research: Par 3 - Ss3-5
  - Step 3: indicating RA structure: Par 3 - S3

**MacKenzie**
Move 1: Establishing a territory
  - Step 2: Making topic generalisations: Par 1
  - Step 3: Reviewing items of previous research: Par 2
Move 2: Establishing a niche
  - Step 1A: Counter-claiming: Par 2 - Ss3, 5, 6, & 8
  - Step 1B: Indicating a gap: Par 3 - Ss1-3
Move 3: Occupying the niche
  - Step 1A: Outlining purposes: Par 3 - S4
  - Step 3: indicating RA structure: Par 3 - S4

**Whiting**
Move 1: Establishing a territory
  - Step 1: Claiming centrality: Par 1 - S1
Move 3: Occupying the niche
  - Step 1B: Announcing present research: Par 1 - S2
  - Step 2: Announcing principal findings: Par 1 - Ss3-9; Par 2 - Ss1-4, 5-7
  - Step 3: indicating RA structure: Par 2 - S4
Table 3

Relative proportions of marked, unmarked and non-prototypical themes in the history sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Harriss</th>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Whiting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4

Semantic categorisation of marked themes in the total sample, including fronting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time RW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Disc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space RW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Disc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalising</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 40 444 39 523
Table 5
Semantic categorisation of marked themes in the total sample, excluding fronting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time RW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Disc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space RW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Disc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalising</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 417 38 492
Table 6

Comparison between Gosden’s findings and those for the present sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gosden</th>
<th>History Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>Exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time RW</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Disc</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space RW</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Disc</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Contrast/Concession)</td>
<td>(22.0)</td>
<td>(4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalising</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Viewpoint)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
Distribution of subject roles in Gosden's (1993) science research articles (percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Mean percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactive participant</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant viewpoint</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse participants</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total this section</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive discourse entity</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty discourse theme</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro discourse entity</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro discourse entity</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse event/process</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total this section</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H and O domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized entity</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty and O theme</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivized viewpoint</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized viewpoint</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total this section</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real world domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty real world theme</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real world entity</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real world event/process</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental process</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total this section</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>96.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>77.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates a value below 1.0 per cent
### Table 8

Sentence-level GS in the history sample according to Gosden's (1993) classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive P</td>
<td>H   12.7</td>
<td>Wa  9.5</td>
<td>M   7.1</td>
<td>T   10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H   0.8</td>
<td>Wa  0.0</td>
<td>M   0.0</td>
<td>T   0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse P</td>
<td>H   0.2</td>
<td>Wa  0.8</td>
<td>M   0.4</td>
<td>T   0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H   0.3</td>
<td>Wa  10.5</td>
<td>M   0.0</td>
<td>T   2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total this section</td>
<td>H   0.0</td>
<td>Wa  0.0</td>
<td>M   0.0</td>
<td>T   0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H   3.6</td>
<td>Wa  0.8</td>
<td>M   0.3</td>
<td>T   0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Domain</td>
<td>H   1.3</td>
<td>Wa  4.8</td>
<td>M   7.1</td>
<td>T   2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H   0.8</td>
<td>Wa  0.0</td>
<td>M   0.0</td>
<td>T   0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro D Entity</td>
<td>H   0.0</td>
<td>Wa  9.5</td>
<td>M   12.5</td>
<td>T   3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H   0.0</td>
<td>Wa  0.0</td>
<td>M   0.0</td>
<td>T   0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total this section</td>
<td>H   0.0</td>
<td>Wa  0.0</td>
<td>M   0.0</td>
<td>T   0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H &amp; O Domain</td>
<td>H   1.3</td>
<td>Wa  0.0</td>
<td>M   12.5</td>
<td>T   2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H   0.0</td>
<td>Wa  23.1</td>
<td>M   31.3</td>
<td>T   39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total this section</td>
<td>H   0.0</td>
<td>Wa  0.0</td>
<td>M   0.0</td>
<td>T   0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real World Domain</td>
<td>H   0.0</td>
<td>Wa  22.6</td>
<td>M   19.0</td>
<td>T   34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H   3.8</td>
<td>Wa  16.5</td>
<td>M   4.8</td>
<td>T   21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total this section</td>
<td>H   0.0</td>
<td>Wa  0.0</td>
<td>M   0.0</td>
<td>T   0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Domain</strong></th>
<th><strong>Participant</strong></th>
<th><strong>Discourse</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interactive</strong></td>
<td><strong>Empty</strong></td>
<td><strong>Macro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entity</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Domain</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interactive</strong></th>
<th><strong>Empty</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entity</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Domain</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interactive</strong></th>
<th><strong>Empty</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entity</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Domain</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interactive</strong></th>
<th><strong>Empty</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entity</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Domain</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interactive</strong></th>
<th><strong>Empty</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entity</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Sentence level GS in the history sample according to MacDonald’s (1994) classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H Wa M Wh T</td>
<td>H Wa M Wh T</td>
<td>H Wa M Wh T</td>
<td>H Wa M Wh T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1: Particulars</td>
<td>2.4 0.0 7.1 0.0 2.2</td>
<td>1.6 16.8 12.6 10.7 10.1</td>
<td>10.5 0.0 0.0 0.0 10.1</td>
<td>2.3 15.2 11.8 9.6 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2: Groups</td>
<td>26.5 19.0 0.0 6.3 20.1</td>
<td>32.3 21.9 29.9 17.6 25.8</td>
<td>26.3 6.5 14.3 20.0 13.5</td>
<td>30.6 19.0 27.8 17.0 24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3: Attributes</td>
<td>41.0 23.8 21.4 75.0 40.3</td>
<td>58.6 51.5 55.8 64.8 57.9</td>
<td>52.6 52.2 85.7 40.0 56.2</td>
<td>54.1 49.4 55.6 64.4 55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4: Reasons</td>
<td>13.3 47.6 57.1 18.8 23.9</td>
<td>6.0 9.7 6.6 5.7 0.0</td>
<td>26.1 0.0 40.0 18.0 7.4</td>
<td>15.6 4.2 8.5 8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 5: Research</td>
<td>14.5 9.5 7.1 0.0 11.2</td>
<td>0.8 0.0 0.0 0.4 0.3</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>4.0 0.8 0.3 0.4 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 6: Audience</td>
<td>2.4 0.0 7.1 0.0 2.2</td>
<td>0.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.2</td>
<td>10.5 0.0 0.0 0.0 2.2</td>
<td>1.7 0.0 0.3 0.0 0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

Relative proportions of research, evaluation and report GS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GS</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H Wa M Wh T</td>
<td>H Wa M Wh T</td>
<td>H Wa M Wh T</td>
<td>H Wa M Wh T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>31.3 57.1 71.4 18.8 38.1</td>
<td>8.8 9.7 1.8 7.8 6.7</td>
<td>10.5 26.1 0.0 40.0 20.2</td>
<td>14.2 16.3 4.9 9.6 11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>37.3 28.6 14.3 31.3 32.8</td>
<td>39.8 55.6 39.9 35.7 41.9</td>
<td>52.6 43.5 64.3 30.0 47.2</td>
<td>39.9 51.3 39.9 35.2 41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>31.3 14.3 14.3 50.0 29.1</td>
<td>51.4 34.7 58.3 52.2 50.2</td>
<td>36.8 30.4 35.7 30.0 32.6</td>
<td>45.9 32.3 55.2 51.2 46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotes</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0 4.3 1.1</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0 3.9 0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Semantic categories of all themes as proportions of the total number of sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalising</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB Evaluation used in the sense it is used in Chap 7 (7.5.1), not the broader sense used in Chap 5.
The two sentences consisting entirely of quoted material are included in the quotes category.
Table 12

Semantic categories of all themes as proportions of the total number of sentences categorised according to whether they realise research or phenomenal reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalising</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHENOMENAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalising</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>908</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>1203</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 134 980 89 1203

NB *Evaluation* used in the sense it is used in Chap 7 (7.5.1), not the broader sense used in Chap 5
The two sentences consisting entirely of quoted material are included in the quotes category.
Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason/cause/result</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict initial</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
<td>38 0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 0 0 45 0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceded by one MT</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>10 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 0 0 11 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceded by two MTs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceded by three MTs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFM's</td>
<td>8 1 0</td>
<td>32 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 0 1 46 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reason</td>
<td>11 1 0</td>
<td>82 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11 0 1 104 3 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTs (strict initial)</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>3 0 2</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>4 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFM's</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total purpose</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
<td>3 0 2</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>5 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total</td>
<td>13 1 0</td>
<td>85 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11 0 1 109 3 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 14

**Reason: strict initial MTs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$S$</td>
<td>$Se$</td>
<td>$S$</td>
<td>$Se$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>because</em> finite clause</td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>since</em> finite clause</td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>given that</em> finite clause</td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>in light of the fact that</em> cl</td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ing clauses</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-en clauses</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep phrases</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj phrase</td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>thus</em></td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>as a result</em></td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>in consequence</em></td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>consequently</em></td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hence</em></td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>so</em></td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>therefore</em></td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>for</em></td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### REASON: preceded by one MT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>because finite clause</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep phrases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for this reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therefore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REASON: preceded by two MTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep phrases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REASON: preceded by three MTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj Phrase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**REASON:** after complement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>because</em> verbless clause</td>
<td>S :/</td>
<td>S :/</td>
<td>S :/</td>
<td>S :/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>since</em> finite clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>as</em> finite clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>for</em></td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>in that</em> finite clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>with the result that</em> finite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>with the consequence that</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>-ing clauses</em></td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>-en clauses</em></td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prep phrases</em></td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The clause is in parentheses, and followed by a co-ordinator (Wh/B/2/5/3)
Table 15

**PURPOSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marked Themes</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>to-infinitive clause</strong></td>
<td>S ;/ ;</td>
<td>S ;/ ;</td>
<td>S ;/ ;</td>
<td>S ;/ ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>in order to + infinitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seeking to + infinitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FFMs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>so that + finite clause</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 16

Functions of conditional elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type 1 Recurrent temporal contingency</th>
<th>Type 2 Historical participant viewpoint</th>
<th>Type 3 Projected author viewpoint</th>
<th>Type 4 Research viewpoint or process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>FFM</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>FFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finite</td>
<td>M/B/1/22</td>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/1/6/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbless</td>
<td>M/B/1/24</td>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/1/6/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-finite (-ed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/1/2/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/2/6/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whatever</td>
<td>M/B/1/6/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whether</td>
<td>H/B/3/9/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/2/6/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/2/6/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-finite clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ing</td>
<td>M/B/1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/1/3/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prep phrase</td>
<td>H/B/1/6/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>H/B/3/6/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H/B/1/7/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/1/2/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H/B/3/8/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/1/2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/1/2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/1/4/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/3/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/3/8/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/3/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/4/5/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/3/8/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/1/12/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/1/6/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/1/12/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/1/7/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/2/6/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/1/1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/1/3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/1/1/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/B/3/4/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/1/3/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/C/2/8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh/B/3/4/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 19 5 6 1 9 0 10 50
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Table 17

**ADDITION**

**Total strict initial MTs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emphatic</td>
<td>4 0 0 21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1 0 0</td>
<td>23 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-emphatic</td>
<td>2 1 12</td>
<td>23 3</td>
<td>151 2 0 7</td>
<td>27 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 1 12 44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>152 3 0 7</td>
<td>50 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strict initial MTs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic Moreover</td>
<td>Harriss 0 0 0</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 3</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacKenzie 0 0 0</td>
<td>5 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 5 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whiting 0 0 0</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in addition</td>
<td>Harriss 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacKenzie 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further</td>
<td>Harriss 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whiting 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeed</td>
<td>Harriss 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walker 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacKenzie 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whiting 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in fact</td>
<td>Whiting 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again</td>
<td>Harriss 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacKenzie 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondingly</td>
<td>Harriss 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor</td>
<td>Harriss 1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacKenzie 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 0 0 21</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 0 0 23</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-emphatic</strong></td>
<td>S :/; ,</td>
<td>S :/; ,</td>
<td>S :/; S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>And</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1 1 12 2 1 39 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 3 0 30</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>3 2 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 28 0 0 6 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 31</td>
<td>0 0 0 4 1 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 4 0 0 1 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0 0 0 3 0 51 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 3 0 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Similarly</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likewise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equally</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Together</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>just as clause</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>as clause</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>together with</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>in agreement with</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>in accordance with</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>in line with</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>beside phrase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>as phrase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 4 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>4 0 0 4 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3 1 12 23 3 151 2 0 7 28 4 170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ADDITION: preceded by one MT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In fact</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Too</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Neither</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>So</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>as clause</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>just as clause</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>like phrase</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Total</em></td>
<td>1 0 0 8 0 1 0 0 0 9 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITION: preceded by two marked themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Again</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Too</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>as phrase</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Total</em></td>
<td>0 0 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITION: after complement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
<td>S :/;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>As-clause</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>2 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITION**

| Overall Total | 6 1 12 55 4 153 3 0 7 65 5 172 |

381
Table 18

Total sentence-level contrast/concession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S /;/</td>
<td>S /;/</td>
<td>S /;/</td>
<td>S /;/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SI Displacement</td>
<td>0 0 1 2 2 2 1 0 4 4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SI Difference</td>
<td>1 0 13 2 5 1 0 15 2 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SI Additive</td>
<td>1 0 4 2 3 0 1 5 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SI Concess MTs</td>
<td>5 1 77 4 30 6 2 3 88 7 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

Contrast: displacement

### DISPLACEMENT: strict initial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>far from + -ing</td>
<td></td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instead of + -ing</td>
<td></td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instead + -en</td>
<td></td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instead</td>
<td></td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather</td>
<td></td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by contrast</td>
<td></td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td></td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0 0 1 2 3 2 2 1 0 4 4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISPLACEMENT: preceded by one MT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instead</td>
<td></td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISPLACEMENT: between subject and verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>far from + -ing</td>
<td></td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISPLACEMENT: between auxiliary and verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instead</td>
<td></td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
<td>S :;/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Displacement | 0 0 1 4 3 4 2 1 0 6 4 5 |
Table 20

Contrast: difference

**DIFFERENCE: strict initial**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>unlike PP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>by contrast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 2</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 3</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>however</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>1 0 0 2</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 3</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>on the one hand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>but</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 1 3</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0 0 0 5</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 5</td>
<td>0 1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total but</strong></td>
<td>0 0 0 7</td>
<td>2 0 5</td>
<td>0 0 7 2</td>
<td>2 5 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1 0 0 13</td>
<td>2 0 5</td>
<td>1 0 0 15</td>
<td>2 5 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DIFFERENCE: preceded by one MT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>while</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>whereas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>however</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 3</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 4</td>
<td>0 0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 6</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 6 0</td>
<td>0 0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>on the other hand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0 0 0 12</td>
<td>0 1 1</td>
<td>1 0 0 13</td>
<td>0 1 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DIFFERENCE: between subject and verb**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>however</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIFFERENCE: between main verb and complement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by contrast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIFFERENCE: after complement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>while</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>however</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Difference 3 0 0 28 3 6 2 0 0 33 3 6
Table 21

Contrast: additive

**ADDITIVE: strict initial**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S,/:;</td>
<td>S,/:</td>
<td>S,/:;</td>
<td>S,/:;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the other (hand)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 2</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 2</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>1 0 0 2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 3</td>
<td>0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 0 0 4</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>0 0 1 5</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 0 0 4</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>0 0 1 5</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIVE: preceded by one MT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S,/:;</td>
<td>S,/:</td>
<td>S,/:;</td>
<td>S,/:;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the one hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the other hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIVE: between subject and verb**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S,/:;</td>
<td>S,/:</td>
<td>S,/:;</td>
<td>S,/:;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIVE: after complement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S,/:;</td>
<td>S,/:</td>
<td>S,/:;</td>
<td>S,/:;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>4 0 0 6</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 10</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 11</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>2 0 0 13</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0 4</td>
<td>0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4 0 21</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 0 27</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not merely...but</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Additive</td>
<td>5 0 28</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>2 0 35</td>
<td>5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 22

**Concession**

**CONCESSION: strict initial**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(although clause</td>
<td>Finite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ed clause</td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while clause</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even though clause</td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other verbless clause</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>despite PP</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other PP</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yet</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even so</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the same time</td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Whiting</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Still</td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in fact</td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total clauses</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PPs</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total adverbs</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Concess SI MTs</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCESSION: preceded by one MT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(al)though clause</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>;/</td>
<td>;/</td>
<td>;/</td>
<td>;/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>despite the fact that cl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Though</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it was true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in any case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCESSION: preceded by two MTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while clause</td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCESSION: preceded by three MTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(al)though clause</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total MT clauses | 4 0 0 40 2 2 4 1 0 48 3 2 |
| Total MT PPs | 0 0 0 4 0 0 0 0 0 4 0 0 |
| Total MT adverbs | 2 1 2 57 2 3 4 1 3 63 4 37 |
| Total | 6 1 2 81 4 34 8 2 3 115 7 39 |

CONCESSION: between subject and verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>though clause</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However</td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>1 0 0 7</td>
<td>0 0 2 0 0 10 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Though</td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still</td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be sure</td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevertheless</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 2</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 0 3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 0 0 15 0 0 3 0 0 19 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCESSION: between auxiliary and verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
<td>$S$ ;/; , $S$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still</td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indeed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCESSION:** between verb and complement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Introduction</strong></th>
<th>S /;</th>
<th>S /;</th>
<th>S /;</th>
<th>S /;</th>
<th>S /;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>However</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admittedly</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Though</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indeed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCESSION:** after complement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Introduction</strong></th>
<th>S /;</th>
<th>S /;</th>
<th>S /;</th>
<th>S /;</th>
<th>S /;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(al)though cl</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-en clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbless clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>even though</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>despite + -ing clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>however</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anyway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Concession</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 23

**$(Al)though$ clauses with scope over more than one sentence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marked Themes</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Part of paragraph</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Wa/B/1/5/2$</td>
<td>$H/I/3/6$</td>
<td>$H/B/3/10/1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Wa/C/1/3$</td>
<td>$M/B/1/27/1$</td>
<td>$Wa/B/1/3/1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$Wh/B/1/16/4$</td>
<td>$Wa/B/4/6/9$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final free modifiers</td>
<td>$Wa/B/2/1/1$</td>
<td>$H/I/3/1$</td>
<td>$H/I/4/10$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$Wh/B/1/23/9$</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>$Wa/B/3/3/11/7$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = retrospectively

### Table 24

**Opening and closing sentences with $(Al)though$ clauses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marked Themes</th>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Closing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Wa/B/1/3/1*$</td>
<td>$H/I/3/6*$</td>
<td>$Wa/B/3/3/9$, $Wa/B/4/6/13$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M/B/1/27/1*$</td>
<td>$Wh/B/1/16/4*$</td>
<td>$Wh/B/1/16/4*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Wh/B/1/4/1$, $Wh/B/1/17/1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final free modifiers</td>
<td>$H/I/3/1,*$, $H/B/1/7/1$</td>
<td>$Wa/B/4/1/7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Wa/B/2/1/1,*$, $Wa/B/4/8/1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$Wh/B/1/23/9*$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 25

**Discourse functions of MT (al)though and while clauses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harriss</th>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Whiting</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>(al)though</td>
<td>H/I/3/4</td>
<td>H/B/3/12/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(al)though</td>
<td>Wa/I/3/8</td>
<td>Wa/B/3/2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/3/5/6</td>
<td>Wa/B/3/2/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/3/2/8</td>
<td>Wa/B/3/5/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/3/2/2</td>
<td>Wa/B/4/2/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/3/4/12</td>
<td>Wa/B/4/6/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/3/5/10</td>
<td>Wa/C/2/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/3/8/10</td>
<td>Wa/C/2/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/3/8/53</td>
<td>Wa/I/3/4/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary or evaluative comment</strong> for sentence sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>(al)though</td>
<td>H/I/3/6</td>
<td>H/B/3/10/1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H/I/2/2/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making the implicit explicit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the</td>
<td>(al)though</td>
<td>H/I/3/6</td>
<td>H/B/3/16/17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H/I/3/5/6</td>
<td>H/B/3/2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H/I/3/2/7</td>
<td>H/B/3/7/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>while H/I/8/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>while H/I/3/5/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paraphrase - local tie</strong></td>
<td>(al)though</td>
<td>H/I/3/7/1</td>
<td>H/I/3/4/10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H/I/3/7/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = prominent sentence

Table 26

**Discourse function of FFM (al)though clauses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harriss</th>
<th>Walker</th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Whiting</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>H/I/3/1</td>
<td>H/I/4/10</td>
<td>Wa/I/3/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/3/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/4/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/3/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/4/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/4/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/4/5/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/8/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/8/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/C/6/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualificatio</strong>n</td>
<td>(al)though</td>
<td>H/I/3/7/1</td>
<td>H/I/3/7/4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/3/5</td>
<td>Wa/I/3/10</td>
<td>Wa/I/3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/3/7</td>
<td>Wa/I/4/12</td>
<td>Wa/I/4/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wa/I/4/5/9</td>
<td>Wa/I/8/1</td>
<td>Wa/C/6/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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