SYNTACTIC AND FSP ASPECTS OF FRONTING AS A STYLE MARKER

LIBUŠE DUŠKOVÁ

ABSTRACT

The paper examines contextual and emphatic fronting in academic prose, fiction narrative and fiction dialogue in order to ascertain whether the types of fronting can serve as a style marker. The differences in the distribution and their effect on style are assumed to be connected with the respective FSP structures: in emphatic fronting the fronted element is the rheme, whereas in contextual fronting it is the diatheme. Hence emphatic fronting displays a prominent deviation from the basic distribution of communicative dynamism, whereas contextual fronting achieves agreement with it. As compared with the unmarked postverbal ordering, emphatic fronting intensifies the emphatic/emotional character of the content being expressed, which is a feature of speech, while contextual fronting serves as a direct link with what precedes, hence contributes to textual cohesion, which is a characteristic of academic prose, with fiction narrative presumably occupying an intermediate position. The results of the study show more types of fronting with diversified structures and less clear-cut relations between the types of frontings and the examined text sorts.

Keywords: style marker, contextual fronting, emphatic fronting, functional sentence perspective, academic prose, fiction narrative, fiction dialogue.

1. Introduction

The subject of this paper is the fronting of clause elements in three different text sorts, examined with the aim of finding out whether different types of fronting can serve as a style marker. Attention is primarily paid to contextual and emphatic fronting, which are examined in academic prose, fiction narrative, and fiction dialogue representing conversation, on the assumption that the two types of fronting will display different distribution in these text types. Support for it is found in Biber et al. (1999: 910), cf.

"Academic prose favours a dispassionate form of expression, so does not require devices that convey special emphases. However, it does put a premium on explicitness of cohesion, which may be enhanced by predicative fronting. ...

Conversation and fiction, by contrast, strive for greater impact and stylistic effect, so we find types of fronting which chiefly convey special emphasis and contrast ...”

In this paper, the differences in the distribution of fronted elements are considered from the viewpoint of their characteristics at the level of functional sentence perspective (FSP henceforth). In particular, attention is paid to the linear arrangement of the carriers of FSP functions within the respective communicative fields, examined with regard to the basic distribution of communicative dynamism (the ordering theme – transition – rheme) and the stylistic effects involved. In contextual fronting the fronted element is context-dependent and constitutes a component of the thematic section, mostly the diatheme. Accordingly, at the clausal level of the communicative field contextual fronting achieves agreement with the basic distribution of communicative dynamism (CD).[1] In emphatic fronting the fronted element is context-independent; in the underlying regular ordering it represents the post-verbal rheme. Hence emphatic fronting, at the clausal level, displays a prominent deviation from the basic distribution of communicative dyna-mism – the basic position of the rheme in English being final or pre-final. This imparts to the rheme emphatic or emotive intensification. The connection of these types of fronting with different text sorts follows from the above quotation from Biber et al. The fronted element in contextual fronting has a linking function: it serves as a direct link between what precedes and what follows, which contributes to cohesion, a feature of academic prose and also of narrative parts of fiction. On the other hand emphatic fronting involves emotion and emphasis, which are to be sought in fiction, primarily in dialogue.

2. Material and method

Of the types of fronting described in the literature (Biber et al., 1999: 900–908; Hud-dleston and Pullum, 2002: 1366–1382; Quirk et al., 1985: 1377–1379) the following treat-ment is confined to non-clausal realization forms of the fronted elements. The elements primarily involved are integrated clause elements that regularly occupy post-verbal posi-tion, viz. objects, subject complements (the object complement did not occur) and adver-bials. However, a problem arose in connection with conjuncts, as in the case of some of their semantic roles, especially temporal, a distinction between conjuncts and adjuncts is often difficult to maintain. Moreover, even disjuncts have been shown to have a cohesive potential (cf. Pípalová, 2000). Considering that both conjuncts and disjuncts play a role in stylistic differentiation of text sorts, these two categories were included in the excerp-tion as a supplement to the detailed treatment of integrated fronted elements.

Owing to the syntactic and FSP diversity of the points under study, excerption of the research material had to be done manually, with the aid of digitalized texts. Each text sort is represented by two samples drawn from two different sources: the sources of aca-demic writing were a sociobiological text, E. O. Wilson, *On Human Nature*, and a text on psychology, B. R. Hergenhahn and Tracy B. Henley, *An Introduction to the History of Psychology*; the sources of fiction narrative and fiction dialogue (stylized conversation)

---

[1] Where the thematic section contains more elements, initial placement of the diathematic element involves a deviation from the basic distribution of CD within this section (cf. Svoboda, 1981).

were David Lodge's *Changing Places* and P. D. James's *Devices and Desires* (see Sources). Delimitation of the text sorts had been assumed to be a straightforward, formal matter; however, that was the case only in academic prose. Here the only segments left out of account were the biographical data after the names of the discussed philosophers. As regards the two text sorts drawn from fiction, dialogue – delimited graphically by inverted commas – presented the problem of how to treat the reporting clauses. The most problematic point of the narrative part appeared in the streams of thought (free indirect and direct speech in Quirk et al., 1985: 1032–1033). Both the reporting clauses and streams of thought were left out of account, reporting clauses on the ground of forming one unit with direct speech, and streams of thought owing to their specific features that assign to them the status of a sub-sort within fiction.

The measure of the frequency of occurrence of the fronted elements was sought in the number of words needed to obtain 50 fronted elements from each sample, i.e. altogether 300 instances equally drawn from each source.

The distribution of the fronted elements (including conjuncts and disjuncts) in the three text sorts, academic writing, fiction narrative and fiction dialogue, is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of clauses with a fronted element in academic prose, fiction narrative and fiction dialogue

	Number of clauses with a fronted element	Number of words needed	Number of words per one fronted element
Academic prose			
Wilson	50	4774	95.5
Hergenhahn and Henley	50	2414	48.3
Total	**100**	**7188**	**71.9**
Fiction narrative			
James	50	4511	90.2
Lodge	50	6493	129.8
Total	**100**	**11004**	**110.04**
Fiction dialogue			
James	50	6768	135.3
Lodge	50	4426	88.5
Total	**100**	**11194**	**111.94**

Table 1 shows a clear-cut distinction between academic writing on the one hand – nearly 72 words per one fronted element, i.e. a relatively high frequency of occurrence, and fiction narrative and fiction dialogue on the other, respectively, 110 and nearly 112 words per one fronted element, i.e. a notably lower relative frequency of occurrence. However, the two samples of each text sort display smaller or greater differences. These are partly to be ascribed to the subject matter – the content of the respective part of the text and the sub-register of the text within the particular text sort, and partly to the individual styles of the authors.

The greatest difference in this respect is found between the two samples of academic text, where the number of words needed for one fronted element is nearly twice as large in Wilson as in Hergenhahn and Henley. The two fiction samples, narrative and direct speech, quantitatively correspond in a criss-cross pattern, Lodge's narrative being comparable with James's dialogue and vice versa. This is obviously the cause of the similar distribution of fronted elements in these samples. Moreover, the narrative James sample is closely comparable with the academic Wilson sample.

3. Classification and distribution
of the fronted elements in the three text sorts

3.1 Academic sample

The distribution of the syntactic functions of fronted elements in the academic sample is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Syntactic functions of the fronted elements in the academic sample

	Wilson	Hergenhahn and Henley	**Total**
Conjuncts	9	25	34
Disjuncts	1	5	6
Subtotal	**10**	**30**	**40**
Adverbials	38	13	51
Object	1	4	5
Other clause elements	1	3	4
Subtotal	**40**	**20**	**60**
Total	50	50	100

Differences between the two sources of the academic sample shown by larger numbers of instances appear in the distribution of conjuncts and integrated adverbials. Conjuncts are notably more frequent in the psychology sample, while integrated adverbials largely predominate in the sociobiological text.

3.1.1 Wilson
As shown in Table 2, all but two fronted elements in the Wilson sample are accounted for by adverbials. The FSP functions of adverbials are generally connected with their semantic roles, temporal and locative adverbials being semantically disposed to operate within the theme. These two semantic roles account for more than a half of all fronted adverbials in this sample: there were 10 temporal + another 3 in the examples with two fronted adverbials, and 9 locative, the latter including 4 instances with inversion. Altogether, temporal and locative adverbials account for 22 out of 38 instances of fronted adverbials, i.e. 57.8%.

The disposition of these two semantic roles to constitute scene-setting elements was clearly shown in the case of temporal fronted adverbials: all of them were components of the theme where they served as links between what precedes and what follows, cf. (1) a. and b.

(1) a. [They devote lifetimes to special entities and patterns] and <u>during the early period of exploration</u> they doubt that these phenomena can be reduced to simple laws.

<div align="right">Wilson, p. 7</div>

b. [Cytology forced the development of a special kind of chemistry and the use of a battery of powerful new techniques, including electrophoresis, chromatography, density-gradient centrifugation, and x-ray crystallography.] <u>At the same time</u> cytology metamorphosed into modern cell biology.

<div align="right">Wilson, p. 9</div>

This was also partly the case of locative adverbials, cf. (2).

(2) [The societies of wasps, bees, and ants have proved so successful that they dominate and alter most of the land habitats of the Earth.] <u>In the forests of Brazil</u>, their assembled forces constitute more than 20 percent of the weight of all land animals, including nematode worms, toucans, and jaguars.

<div align="right">Wilson, p. 12–13</div>

Besides these, there was a succession of locative adverbials whose fronting was contrastive, cf. (3).

(3) "as a spectrum of possibilities, all of which properly blend into one another … <u>At one end,</u> we have *the hard, bright lights of science*; <u>here</u> we find *information*. <u>In the center</u> we have *the sensuous hues of art*; <u>here</u> we find *the aesthetic shape of the world*. <u>At the far end,</u> we have *the dark, shadowy tones of religious experience*, shading off into wave lengths beyond all perception; <u>here</u> we find *meaning*." No, <u>here</u> we find *obscurantism*!

<div align="right">Wilson, p. 10</div>

Example (3) displays, in addition to three instances of contextual fronting (*At one end, In the center, At the far end*), four occurrences of the context-dependent anaphoric proform *here*, referring to these three different locations. The locations are partly derivable from the situational context (a spectrum is a continuum with a distinguishable centre and two ends), but in connection with the immediately preceding linguistic context they introduce novel features. The proform *here*, which is prototypically context-dependent and operates within the thematic section, is here disengaged from context-dependence by the decontextualizing factors of contrast, identification of the particular location and purposeful repetition (cf. Firbas, 1995; Stehlíková, 2016). As a result, (3) displays an FSP

structure with two foci, a contrastive diatheme, constituted by *here* at the beginning, and the rheme in the post-verbal, final position.

Moreover, unlike temporal fronted adverbials, locative adverbials appeared in clauses with subject-verb inversion (3 instances) constituting a series. They are of particular interest in that they show resemblance to (3); cf. (4).

(4) [but the distribution of its intensity will have been drastically altered.] <u>At one end of this distribution will be the minority of the people</u> whose work will keep intact the technology that sustains the multitude at a high standard of living. <u>In the middle of the distribution will be found a type, largely unemployed,</u> for whom the distinction between the real and the illusory will still be meaningful … He will retain interest in the world and seek satisfaction from sensual pleasures. <u>At the other end of the spectrum will be a type largely unemployable,</u> for whom the boundary of the real and the imagined will have been largely dissolved, at least to the extent compatible with his physical survival.

<div align="right">Wilson, p. 4</div>

In (4), the fronted adverbials are partly context-dependent owing to their anaphoric postmodifier; however, they appear in a series of differing locations, just as in (3). They are thus disengaged from context dependence by the same decontextualizing factors of contrast and identification, and constitute a contrastive diatheme. As compared with (3), fronting here endows the adverbials with lesser prominence, its apparent cause being the use of inversion. Cf. the description of the function of S–V inversion after initial adverbials as a contribution to the maintenance of a consistent perspective in Biber et al. (1999) "There is a preferred distribution of this information [given – new] in the clause, corresponding to a gradual rise in information load." (pp. 896, 899) With direct word order, the fronted adverbial would be more prominent as a result of a potential pause after it, cf. *At one end of this distribution*(,) *there will be the minority of the people whose work* ... Another factor of the lesser prominence of the fronted adverbials in (4) is the complexity and weightiness of the sentence structure, as compared with the more succinct structure of (3).

The other instances with inversion (which here serves the same function as in (4)) represented contextual fronting of a context-dependent, thematic element with the linking function, cf. (5) a. and b.

(5) a. Educated people everywhere like to believe that <u>beyond material needs lie fulfillment and the realization</u> of individual potential.

<div align="right">Wilson, p. 3</div>

   b. <u>Thus does ideology bow to its hidden masters the genes</u>, and the highest impulses seem upon closer examination to be metamorphosed into biological activity.

<div align="right">Wilson, p. 4</div>

The other semantic roles involve cause/source, measure/degree, means/instrument, manner/comparison, accompanying circumstances, addition/exception, accordance.

Twelve of the 16 adverbials with semantic roles other than temporal or locative (including 2 instances with inversion and two of contrastive contextual fronting) represented contextual fronting with connective function, cf. (6) a. and b.

(6) a. [The situation can be summarized by saying that biology stands today as the antidiscipline of the social sciences.] <u>By the word "antidiscipline"</u> I wish to emphasize the special adversary relation that often exists when fields of study at adjacent levels of organization first begin to interact.

Wilson, p. 7

b. Sterile castes engaged in rearing siblings are the essential feature of social organization in the insects. <u>Because of its link to haplodiploidy,</u> insect social life is almost limited to the wasps and their close relatives among the bees and ants.

Wilson, p. 12

Contrastive fronting of context-dependent adverbials was found in two instances with the semantic role of accompanying circumstances, cf. (7):

(7) It is the essential first hypothesis for any serious consideration of the human condition. <u>Without it</u> the humanities and social sciences are the limited descriptors of surface phenomena, like astronomy without physics, biology without chemistry, and mathematics without algebra. <u>With it</u>, human nature can be laid open as an object of fully empirical research, biology can be put to the service of liberal education, and our self-conception can be enormously and truthfully enriched.

Wilson, p. 1–2

Although this example displays dual focus like (3), owing to the weightiness of the predication, the degree of communicative dynamism of the verb complementation is much higher.

Proceeding to the types of fronting displayed by the non-adverbial elements, we find that both, an object and a subject complement, represent emphatic fronting, but of a different kind, cf. (8) and (9).

(8) [The situation can be summarized by saying that biology stands today as the antidiscipline of the social sciences. By the word "antidiscipline" I wish to emphasize the special adversary relation that often exists when fields of study at adjacent levels of organization first begin to interact.] <u>For chemistry</u> there is *the antidiscipline of many-body physics*; <u>for molecular biology</u>, *chemistry*; <u>for physiology</u>, *molecular biology*; and so on upward through the paired levels of increasing specification and complexity.

Wilson, p. 7

(9) [Robert Nozick begins *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (1974) with an equally firm proposition: "Individuals have rights, and there are things no person or group may do to them (without violating their rights).] <u>So strong</u> and far-reaching are

these rights they raise the question of what, if anything, the state and its officials may do."

<div align="right">Wilson, p. 5</div>

The *for* PrepP in (8) marks a participant in the existential predication, hence it is assigned the syntactic status of object, not adverbial. It is partly context-dependent, being related to the preceding statement about biology as an antidiscipline of social sciences. However, it is disengaged from this broader context dependence by the decontextualizing factors of contrast and selection: biology x chemistry. Moreover, it is contrasted with the primary participant in the existential predication, the notional subject 'the antidiscipline many-body physics'. This contrast is further developed in the following sentences by means of parallel structures: a discipline and an antidicipline, and the relation between them, are expressed in the same way, i.e., respectively, as fronted object and existential subject, albeit elliptically (hence counted only as one example). We thus have a communicative clausal field with two foci, the first focus falling on a contrastive diatheme at the beginning and the second on the rheme at the end.

The clausal communicative field of (9) is simpler. It contains only one focus on the fronted element while the final element, the subject, is context-dependent, with no decontextualizing factor within the scope of the retrievability span. The fronted subject complement is context-independent and in the underlying ordering constitutes the rheme in the regular post-verbal position, cf. (9)':

(9)' These rights are so strong and far-reaching ...

When fronted, the rheme acquires additional emphasis. Inversion is here obligatory, fronted intensified and negated elements triggering inversion as a concomitant feature.

The findings obtained from this sample of academic writing show a great prevalence of contextual fronting, as was supposed, but exceed the initial assumptions in displaying other types fronting, contextual contrastive and emphatic, the former recurrently in series of parallel structures. Also notable is the relatively frequent occurrence of S–V inversion.

3.1.2 Hergehahn and Henley

Apart from the different representation of conjuncts and disjuncts, the psychological sample presents a fairly similar picture as the sociobiological text (3.1.1). Integrated fronted adverbials again considerably outnumber the other fronted clause elements, viz. 13 as compared with 7. Their semantic roles are varied, temporal and locative adverbials accounting for, respectively, 3 and 1 instances. Other semantic roles included accompanying circumstances, manner, respect and result, the first two recurrently, cf. (10) a., b., c., and d.

(10) a. <u>During the month-long delay</u>, Socrates was imprisoned but met regularly with his friends.

<div align="right">Hergenhahn and Henley, p. 42</div>

b. <u>In Chapter 20,</u> we will see that the extreme relativism of the Sophists has much in common with the contemporary movement called postmodernism.

<div align="right">Hergenhahn and Henley, p. 40</div>

c. <u>In his search for truth,</u> Socrates used a method sometimes called inductive definition, which started with an examination of instances of such concepts as beauty, love, justice, or truth ...

<div align="right">Hergenhahn and Henley, p. 41</div>

d. <u>In this way,</u> he sought to discover general concepts by examining specific examples.

<div align="right">Hergenhahn and Henley, p. 41</div>

With the exception of one instance, all fronted adverbials represented contextual fronting, cf. the examples listed under (10).

The only instance other than contextual fronting is the fronting of a context-independent manner adjunct, hence an example of emphatic fronting with dual focus, with the second, main focus on the verb complementation, cf. (11):

(11) Nor is it proper for him to move from one place to another. But <u>effortlessly</u> he shakes all things *by thinking with his own mind*.

<div align="right">Hergenhahn and Henley, p. 41</div>

As regards the fronted objects, they have the realization forms of prepositional *for-* and *on*-phrases, cf. (12) and (13):

(12) It is important to note that although Socrates sought the essence of various concepts, he did not believe that essences had abstract existence. <u>For him,</u> an essence was a universally acceptable definition of a concept – a definition that was both accurate and acceptable to all interested parties.

<div align="right">Hergenhahn and Henley, p. 42</div>

(13) Socrates was charged with corrupting the youth of Athens because he caused them to question all things, including many cherished traditional beliefs. <u>Perhaps on the latter charge</u> he *was guilty*.

<div align="right">Hergenhahn and Henley, p. 42</div>

Example (12) is an instance of non-contrastive contextual fronting, *for him* referring to the same referent in the preceding sentence that lacks any other potentially contrastive elements. On the other hand (13) represents contrastive contextual fronting with dual focus: the fronted object *on the latter charge* is disengaged from context dependence by the factor of selection, hence performs the FSP function of contrastive diatheme carrying the first focus while the second, main focus is on the rheme constituted by the positive polarity of the copula and its context-independent complement *was guilty* (Socrates' having been charged does not entail that he was guilty). The other two instances of object fronting have an FSP structure similar to (12).

The other three instances of fronted clause elements other than objects display a fronted modifier (cf. *he complete sees*) in parallel structure, cf. (14). The example illustrates emphatic fronting with dual focus, the first focus being on the fronted element, context-independent in the first use, and disengaged from context dependence in the following uses

by the factor of purposeful repetition and by being related to new predicates; the second, main focus is on the rhematic predicates, constituted by context-independent verbs.

(14) <u>Complete</u> he *sees*, <u>complete</u> he *thinks*, <u>complete</u> he *hears*.

<div align="right">Hergenhahn and Henley, p. 41</div>

3.1.3 Academic samples compared

As appears from Table 2, the differences between the two sources of the academic sample mostly concern adverbials. The psychology text contains a considerably larger amount of conjuncts and disjuncts (respectively, 25 and 5) than the sociobiological text (respectively, 9 and 1). This is reflected in the representation of integrated and non-integrated fronted elements in the two texts: while in the psychology text it is the non-integrated fronted elements that predominate (30 as compared with 20), in the sociobiological text it is the integrated elements (40 as compared with 10). The differences in the distribution of both integrated and non-integrated fronted elements is connected with the different character of the two texts: the excerpted part of Wilson's sociobiological text (pp. 1–15) deals with the role and development of different species, which involves their habitats and the relevant periods, whereas the excerpted part of Hergenhahn and Henley's text is a subchapter of an introduction to the history of psychology, concerned with the relativity of truth (pp. 39–42). Moreover, the psychological text is expository instructional, whereas the book on sociobiology is more expository argumentative. Yet another, not negligible factor of the differentiation appears to be the auctorial style, Wilson's style being livelier and more varied.

Despite the much lower absolute representation of integrated fronted adverbials in the psychological text (13 as compared with 38 in the sociobiological text), they still considerably preponderate over the other integrated fronted elements (13 as compared with 7, i.e. 65% and 35%, respectively; in the Wilson text, the respective figures are 38 [95%] and 2 (5%]). The low representation of integrated fronted adverbials in the psychology text appears to be primarily due to the scarce incidence of temporal and locative adjuncts (3 and 1, respectively; as compared with 13 and 9 in the Wilson text). As mentioned above, these differences derive from the different subject matter of the two texts.

What appears to be characteristic of adverbials in the whole academic sample is the type of fronting. Prototypically, adverbials of all semantic roles (in particular temporal and locative) represent contextual fronting serving as a link between what precedes and what follows: among the 51 adverbials, this type was found in 44 instances (86.3%). Six of the other seven instances represent contrastive contextual fronting while one is a case of emphatic fronting. On the other hand, unlike the adverbials the non-adverbial integrated elements represent four different types of fronting, contextual, contextual contrastive, emphatic and emphatic fronting with two foci. Though suggestive, the figures are too small to allow generalization.

<div align="center">3.2 Narrative sample</div>

The distribution of the syntactic functions of fronted elements in the narrative sample is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Fronted elements in fiction narrative

	Lodge	James	**Total**
Conjuncts	2	1	3
Disjuncts	6	3	9
Subtotal	**8**	**4**	**12**
Adverbials	38	46	84
Object	2	–	2
Other clause elements	2	–	2
Subtotal	**42**	**46**	**88**
Total	**50**	**50**	**100**

As shown in Table 3, the two sources of fiction narrative basically display a similar picture: in both, integrated fronted elements greatly preponderate over non-integrated fronted elements, and within the integrated elements, it is the adverbials that largely predominate, similarly as in the academic sample.

3.2.1 Lodge

The Lodge sample of narrative text contains 42 clauses with an integrated fronted element, among which over 90% (38 instances) are accounted for by adverbials. The most frequent semantic role is the temporal (16 occurrences, 42% of all fronted adverbials). With the exception of one instance, all temporal adjuncts represent contextual fronting with the linking function, cf. (15) a. and b.

(15) a. This new behaviour implied that they all knew perfectly well who he was, thus making any attempt at self-introduction on his part superfluous, while <u>at the same time</u> it offered no purchase for extending acquaintance.

Lodge, p. 39

b. Simply keeping warm was Morris Zapp's main preoccupation in his first few days at Rummidge. <u>On his first morning</u>, <u>in the tomb-like hotel room</u> he had checked into after driving straight from London airport, he had woken to find steam coming out of his mouth.

Lodge, p. 31

The single temporal adverbial displaying a type of fronting other than the prevalent contextual type is illustrated in (16).

(16) [When he had moved his baggage into the O'Shea house, he filled the micro-refrigerator with TV dinners, locked his door, turned up all the fires and spent a couple of days thawing out.] <u>Only then did he feel ready to investigate</u> the Rummidge campus and introduce himself to the English Department.

Lodge, p. 31

This example represents emphatic fronting of a context-dependent element *then*, reinforced by the focalizer *only*; apparently, *then* alone is too weak an expression to be able to carry the main and only focus of the clausal communicative field. The predicative part is context-dependent through the broader preceding context. Inversion is here grammatical, being an obligatory concomitant feature of the fronting of an intensified element.

The next best represented semantic role was displayed by locative adverbials (12 instances). All fronted locative adverbials represent contextual fronting with the linking function, cf. (17) a.; a fronted locative adverbials also appears in (15) b. as a second fronted element in addition to the temporal. In two instances the fronting of locative adverbials is accompanied by subject-verb inversion, cf. (17) b.

(17) a. The faculty began to trickle back to their posts. <u>From behind his desk</u> he heard them passing in the corridor, greeting each other, laughing and opening and shutting their doors.

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 39</div>

    b. <u>In the top right-hand one was an envelope</u> addressed to himself.

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 34</div>

As noted above, Biber et al. (1999: 898) describe inversion as a means serving the maintenance of a consistent perspective, viz. gradual rise in information load (ibid.: 896).

Of the other semantic roles (altogether 10 instances) the most frequent role was accompanying circumstances, illustrated in (18).

(18) a. <u>In his lonely isolation</u>, Morris turned instinctively for solace to the media.
<div align="right">Lodge, p. 39</div>

    b. <u>With Wily Smith's assistance he telephoned</u> the Chairman of the Department.
<div align="right">Lodge, p. 36</div>

One instance of contextual fronting was also found among the other fronted clause elements. It is illustrated in (19). Here the fronted element is the postmodifier of the subject complement (cf. the reference of the proform *the one: the question of the two questions he was asked at the cocktail party by everyone he met*).

(19) 'How are you liking Euphoria?' <u>Of the two questions he was asked </u>at the cocktail party by everyone he met, this was the one he preferred.

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 35</div>

The two fronted objects and the fourth fronted non-adverbial clause element, a subject complement, represent different types of fronting.

The fronted objects represent contrastive fronting of context-dependent elements disengaged from context dependence by the factor of contrast, cf. (20). The two sentences display dual focus, the second, main focus being on the predicative parts.

74

(20) [There were, of course, no commercials on the programme, but just to annoy the rival networks Boon would sometimes give an unsolicited and unpaid testimonial to some local restaurant or movie or shirt-sale that had taken his fancy.] <u>To Philip</u> it seemed obvious that beneath all the culture and the eccentricity and the human concern there beat a heart of pure show-business, but <u>to the local community</u> the programme evidently appeared irresistibly novel, daring and authentic.

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 42</div>

The fronted subject complement is emphatic fronting of the rhematic element, i.e. fronting with one focus on the fronted element, cf. (21) (the explicit expression of the subject in right dislocation constituting a separate communicative field).

(21) <u>And an extraordinary variety of listeners they were</u>, those who faithfully tuned into QXYZ at midnight ...

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 41</div>

3.2.2 James

The James sample of narrative text presents a sparsely diversified picture insofar as all integrated fronted elements (46) are adverbials out of which 37 instances (74%) are temporal. A recurrent realization form is the adverb *then*, which was found in 9 instances, all expressing the basic temporal meaning 'afterwards' and signalling successive steps in the development of a particular narrative episode, cf. (22):

(22) She stared ahead, frowned, <u>then</u> shook her head and let in the clutch. Her companion hesitated, looked at her, <u>then</u> leaned back and released the rear door.

<div align="right">James, p. 2</div>

Another recurrent adverb was *now* (6 occurrences), introducing an action happening at the particular moment. In one case it is contrasted with *already*, the two communicative fields constituting an instance of contrastive fronting with dual focus, cf. (23)

(23) It would be the end of her Friday evenings with Wayne and Shirl and the gang. <u>Already</u> they teased and pitied her because she was treated as a child. <u>Now</u> it would be total humiliation.

<div align="right">James, p. 1</div>

In a tense passage, displaying a parallel adverbial structure, the last unit contains *then* contrasting with *now*, which heightens the dramatic effect of the passage, cf. (24):

(24) She felt herself falling through time, through space, through an eternity of horror. <u>And now</u> the face was hot over hers and she could smell drink and sweat and a terror matching her own. Her arms jerked upwards, impotently flailing. <u>And now</u> her brain was bursting and the pain in her chest, growing like a great red flower, exploded in a silent, wordless scream of 'Mummy! Mummy!' <u>And</u>

<u>then</u> there was no more terror, no more pain, only the merciful, obliterating dark.

<div align="right">James, p. 4</div>

Locative adverbials had three occurrences, two of them with inversion which was also found with one temporal adverbial, cf. (25) a. and b. Adverbials with other semantic roles (five instances) are illustrated in (26).

(25) a. <u>On the uncluttered desktop was</u> a small glass vase of freesias.

<div align="right">James, p. 5</div>

b. <u>And then came</u> salvation.

<div align="right">James, p. 2</div>

(26) She was glad when, <u>still without a word,</u> the driver drew up at the crossroads and she was able to scramble out with muttered thanks.

<div align="right">James, p. 2</div>

There were two instances of contrastive contextual fronting one of which was adduced above, cf. (23). The other instance is listed under (27) as (27) a., owing to the same realization form of the adverbial as in (27) b. and c.: all of them are de-adjectival adverbials formed by the suffix *-ly*. Their FSP functions, however, along with the respective clausal communicative field differ.

(27) a. She didn't question <u>how, so mysteriously,</u> this slim, slow-walking figure had materialized.

<div align="right">James, p. 3</div>

b. And then, <u>miraculously,</u> her prayer was answered.

<div align="right">James, p. 3</div>

c. After four years of silence, his new book of poetry, *A Case to Answer and Other Poems*, had been published to considerable critical acclaim which was <u>surprisingly</u> gratifying, and to even wider public interest <u>which, less surprisingly,</u> he was finding more difficult to take.

<div align="right">James, p. 4</div>

Example (27) a. is an instance of emphatic fronting of a context-independent element realized by an intensified manner adjunct, representing the same type of fronting as the manner adjunct in (11) (*effortlessly*) and the subject complement in (9) (*So strong*). In the underlying regular ordering it is a component of the rheme; when fronted it acquires additional emphasis. The communicative field of (27) a. has only one information peak (one focus), the rest of the sentence being context dependent. In (27) b., the adverbial *miraculously*, whether interpreted as a manner adjunct or a disjunct with a scope over the whole sentence, is again a context-independent element, but so is the verb and its

polarity, hence the communicative field of (27) b. has two foci, the first on the fronted adverbial and the second on the verb. Example (27) c. displays the only non-integrated fronted element, a disjunct, whose fronting may be regarded as contrastive owing to the comparative component expressing a lesser degree than in the adverbial's first occurrence, through which it is disengaged from context dependence; hence the communicative field displays a contrastive diatheme and the rheme in the verb complementation. Moreover, not only does *less surprisingly* stand in contrast to *surprisingly* in the preceding sentence, but also the predicative part *was finding more difficult to take* contrasts with *was gratifying*.

On the whole the fronted elements in the James sample appear to reflect the character of narrative text: the prevailing temporal adverbials mark successive stages in the development of series of actions depicting an episode, and thus perform an important function in the build-up of the narrative. Discernibly, however, their distribution and particular uses are also ascribable to the auctorial style. Whether the absence of fronted clause elements other than adverbials may be regarded as a feature of narrative text needs to be ascertained by a more extensive search.

3.2.3 Narrative samples compared

Overall, the two sources of fiction narrative present a similar picture not only in the distribution of integrated and non-integrated elements – in both texts integrated fronted elements vastly preponderate (accounting for 92% in James and 84% in Lodge), but also in the representation and the types of fronting of fronted adverbials. In both samples, fronted adverbials overwhelmingly outnumber other clause elements (in James to the exclusion of any other fronted integrated clause elements; in Lodge the proportion of fronted adverbials to other fronted clause elements is 38 : 4). The two samples also correspond in the types of fronting: both predominantly display the contextual type with the linking function. Some of the specific features of the two sources are to be ascribed to the auctorial style.

3.3 Fiction dialogue

The distribution of the syntactic functions of fronted elements in fiction dialogue is shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Fiction dialogue

	Lodge	James	**Total**
Conjuncts	28	14	42
Disjuncts	5	19	24
Interjections	5	1	6
Subtotal	**38**	**34**	**72**
Integrated elements			
adverbials	6	15	21
other clause elements	6	1	7
Subtotal	**12**	**16**	**28**
Total	**50**	**50**	**100**

3.3.1 Lodge

As shown in Table 4, the Lodge sample of fiction dialogue displays only 12 integrated clause elements, all other non-subject openings of clauses being accounted for by non-integrated elements. Although conjuncts may be regarded as an intermediate category between integrated and non-integrated elements – especially in the case of the semantic role of time, this does not apply to the most frequent conjunct in this sample, viz. *well*, which has 23 occurrences, a notable feature of the utterances of the British protagonist of the novel and other British characters. The connective function of *well* can hardly be described as primary among the many diverse functions of this polyfunctional device largely serving as a discourse marker rather than a conjunct. Compare the two uses of *well* in (28). In (28) a. *well* serves as a hesitant response gambit with an attitudinal undertone. On the other hand, in (28) b. (continued turn of the same speaker) it performs a connective function.

(28) a. 'Mrs Swallow, may I ask you a personal question about your husband?'
    She looked at him in alarm. <u>'Well, I don't know.</u> It depends...'

    Lodge, p. 50

    b. 'The schools are pretty good,' he said. <u>'Well, one or two</u> –'

    Lodge, p. 47

The connective function of the other conjuncts was more pronounced, cf. (30) a. and b., but these were few: *so* (2 occurrences), *also*, (inferential) *then* and *after all*.

(29) a. ['Your wife with you?'
    'No.' She responded with a gesture which implied clearly enough that his assumption was therefore demonstrably unwarranted.] 'I would have liked to have brought her,' he said. 'But my visit was arranged at rather short notice. <u>Also we have children</u>, and there were problems about schooling and so on.'

    Lodge, p. 45

    b. [Also we have children, and there were problems about schooling and so on. And there was the house...' ... 'Do you have children yourself?' he concluded desperately. 'Two. Twins. Boy and girl. Aged nine.'] 'Ah, <u>then</u> you understand the problems.'

    Lodge, p. 45

As for the disjuncts, also numerous in this sample (24 instances), nearly all were of the epistemic type expressing a degree of factivity (*sure, as a matter of fact, really*), with the exception of *on second thoughts*, which presupposes an antecedent.

A specific feature of this sample was the occurrence of interjections, both primary and secondary:

(30) a. 'You don't mean my copy of *Playboy,* by any chance? But that's ridiculous, *Playboy* isn't pornography, for heaven's sake! <u>Why, clergymen read it</u>. Clergymen write for it!'

    Lodge, p. 64

b. 'Exactly!' cried Mrs Zapp. 'I do, I do!' She looked at her watch suddenly, and said, '<u>My God, I must go</u>,'

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 47</div>

The integrated fronted elements displayed the following patterns of fronting. One locative (*here*) and one temporal adverbial (*now*) had deictic reference, cf. (31) a. and b. Two other temporal adverbials and the remaining one (accompanying circumstances) were instances of contextual fronting, cf., respectively, (31) c. and d.

(31) a. <u>here's</u> th' old josser himself.

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 40</div>

   b. <u>Ah, now</u>, that's better, that's better ...

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 41</div>

   c. [Boon was still talking away in the background, about his plans for a TV arts programme:] 'Something entirely different... art in action... train a camera on a sculptor at work for a month or two, <u>then run the film through </u>at about fifty thousand frames per second, see the sculpture taking shape... put an object in front of two painters, ...

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 44</div>

   d. '<u>In that case,</u> you take my bed, and I'll sleep in here.'

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 62</div>

It is to be noted that (31) a., b. and c. are monologues, (31) a. and b. a spectator's running commentary on a TV show, (31) c. a description of a future arrangement.

Two other instances of contextual fronting with the linking function, albeit as anacolutha, were also found among the other fronted integrated elements. In (32) a. the initial context-dependent element, which takes up what was said before, introduces the theme of the following utterance, in (32) b. the conversational topic is suggested by an object in the current situation.

(32) a. '<u>And the one I went to,</u>' said the Confederate Soldier, 'we didn't know who was the group leader,

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 58</div>

   b. 'Tell me, <u>that badge you're wearing</u> – what is Kroop?'

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 37</div>

While with the exception of (31) c. and d. none of these types have been encountered either in academic writing or fiction narrative, the four remaining instances of fronted integrated elements appear to be non-specific to a text-sort. Presumably significantly, these instances are again constituted by fronted objects and fronted subject complements. Example (33) illustrates contextual contrastive fronting with two foci, the first on the

fronted object with the FSP function of contrastive diatheme, the second, main focus on the predicative part.

(33) ['What bargain?' said the woman sharply. 'Just a figure of speech.] I mean, <u>for me</u>, it's a great opportunity, a paid holiday if you like. But <u>for her </u>it's just life as usual, only lonelier.

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 45</div>

One of the remaining two fronted elements is again an object, the other is a subject complement; both constitute emphatic fronting of the rheme which in the underlying regular ordering occurs in post-verbal position. The clausal communicative fields have only one focus on the emphatically fronted initial element, the rest being context-dependent.

(34) a. '<u>Terrific cheek </u>he had, that chap Boon. I wonder what became of him.'

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 53</div>

b. [somebody just told me there's an English guy at this party who asked Hogan to introduce him to Karl Kroop. I'd love to have seen the old man's face.' 'Ask him,' said Ringbaum, nodding towards Philip. Philip blushed and laughed uneasily. 'Oh my God, you aren't the English guy by any chance?' 'You goofed again, Sy, dear,' said the woman.]
'I'm terribly sorry,' said the man. '<u>Sy Gootblatt</u> is the name.

<div align="right">Lodge, p. 43</div>

Apart from the type of fronting, (34) a. shows another specific feature of conversation, right dislocation of the subject (cf. also (21) in 3.2.1).

3.3.2 James

The James sample of fiction dialogue, as shown in Table 4, also contains relatively few integrated clause elements, viz. 16 instances, all of them adverbials except one. As regards the non-integrated elements, conjuncts and disjuncts have a fairly comparable distribution (14 and 19, respectively), interjections being marginal (1 instance). The conjuncts included *well* (5 occurrences, i.e. nearly a third of the conjuncts in this sample: 5 out of 14); equally represented was *then*, the other conjuncts being *anyway* (with 3 occurrences) and *so*. Like Lodge's group of disjuncts, the disjuncts in the James sample were mostly epistemic content disjuncts (*perhaps*, *of course*, *presumably*, all recurrent), with the exception of two occurrences of the style disjunct *honestly*.

The integrated fronted elements in this sample include 15 adverbials and one subject. Most of the adverbials are instances of contextual fronting serving as diathemes in the thematic section of the clause. By being fronted they serve as a device contributing to the basic distribution of CD. This is especially the case of temporal adjuncts, which account nearly for a half of all fronted adverbials in this sample. Compare (35) a. and b.

(35) a. And <u>now</u> he's got the latest Comare report to fuel his spurious concern.

<div align="right">James, p. 38</div>

b. 'Two weeks. Two weeks too bloody many. <u>Then</u> I ran away and found a squat.'

<div align="right">James, p. 25</div>

Other semantic roles, which were very diverse (manner, cause, accompanying circumstances, place and others) are illustrated in (36) a. and b.

(36) a. '<u>In the interests of the station</u> I think you should drop it.'

<div align="right">James, p. 36</div>

    b. <u>All over the world</u> ordinary people are marching, demonstrating, making their voices heard,

<div align="right">James, p. 28</div>

The contribution of fronted adverbials to the ordering of clause elements according to a gradual rise in communicative dynamism is reinforced where they co-occur with subject-verb inversion, as in (37).

(37) <u>And out there somewhere is a mass murderer</u> who enjoys strangling women and stuffing their mouths with their hair.

<div align="right">James, p. 43</div>

Example (38) shows another locative adverbial followed by subject–verb inversion.

(38) <u>and out pops an Identikit of sonny</u> complete with prints, collar-size and taste in pop music.

<div align="right">James, p. 45</div>

Unlike (37), which is an instance of contextual fronting of a context-dependent thematic element, here the adverbial is context-independent (in the underlying regular ordering it is the rheme in its usual post-verbal position) and the fronting is emphatic. By being fronted the rhematic adverbial acquires a higher degree of CD and becomes more emphatic. Again unlike (37), which is a presentation sentence offering optional insertion of existential *there*, here the inversion occurs in a quality scale with a context-independent carrier of quality and final specification, cf. the underlying structure without inversion '*and an Identikit of sonny complete with prints, collar-size and taste in pop music pops out.*' The communicative field contains two foci, a minor one on the initial adverbial[2] and the main on the final subject.

The last example of a fronted element is the only instance of fronted subject. In English, subject fronting appears to be a contradiction since the subject is the canonical initial clause element, hence movement to the left is ruled out. Consequently, a special construction is required; in (39), fronting of the subject is achieved by left dislocation. The dislocated subject has a weighty structure due to its apposition construed with a comment clause.

---

[2]   The possibility to front the adverbial element of the verb phrase is adduced as one of the criteria for distinguishing a free combination of intransitive verbs + adverbs from intransitive phrasal verbs (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 1153 (16.3).

(39) <u>This proposed job</u> – rumoured job, I should say – I suppose we're entitled to ask whether <u>it</u> has been formally offered to you yet? Or aren't we?

<div align="right">James, p. 33</div>

Example (39) is an instance of contextual fronting. The fronted subject introduces a known discourse topic that operates both as the theme in the sense of 'what is going to be talked about' (i.e. the textual theme) and the theme in FSP terms, here the diatheme, with the theme proper realized by its pronominal postcedent in the regular position.

Comparing this example with (34) and (21), which also display dislocated subjects, two points are to be noted: first, fronting involves only movement to the left and leaves an unfilled gap in the regular ordering; dislocation involves movement of a clause element either to the left or to the right (as shown in (21) and (34)), with concomitant employment of a pro-form in the regular position (cf. postponed and anticipated identification in Quirk et al. 1985: 1310) Secondly, and more importantly, unlike (39), the fronted and the dislocated elements in (21) and (34) are not identical, the fronted elements being, respectively, the subject complement and the object, while the dislocated elements are the subjects. Consequently, there is no relation between the two processes – the sentences undergo both fronting and right dislocation independently of each another. In (39) the fronted and the dislocated element are identical, viz. the subject, and left dislocation here serves as a device of fronting. What is common to all three instances is the stylistic effect produced by dislocation: this structure is a feature of informal speech, which is here imitated by the fiction dialogues.

3.3.3 Dialogue samples compared

The fiction dialogue is the only of the three examined text sorts in which the non-integrated elements outnumber the integrated ones. In this respect, the two sources of fiction dialogue appear to be basically similar, cf. 38 non-integrated and 12 integrated fronted elements in the Lodge sample, with 34 and 16, respectively, in the James sample. However, within these groups there are considerable differences which at least in the more numerous group of non-integrated elements may be considered significant indicators of the character and content of the two novels, as well as of the auctorial style.

The two major groups of non-integrated elements, conjuncts and disjuncts, have a patently different distribution. While in the Lodge sample it is conjuncts that greatly predominate (28 as compared with 5 disjuncts), the James sample displays a noticeable preponderance of disjuncts (19 as compared with 14). Notably, however, the cause of the relatively high representation of conjuncts in the Lodge sample is the recurrence of *well* (23 out of 28), which here serves as a characteristic of British speech and attitudes. A similar ground may be sought in the James sample for the much higher representation of disjuncts (19 as compared with 5 in Lodge) insofar as a half of the epistemic content disjuncts were expressions lowering the truth value of the statement being made (cf. six occurrences of *perhaps*, two of *presumably*).

Unequal distribution was also found with the third non-integrated element registered in both samples, interjections, which is evidently connected with the different character of the two novels, Lodge's humoristic subject matter providing more situations for their occurrence than James's grim story (5 and 1 respectively).

The representation of the integrated fronted elements is too small to offer ground for ascertaining source-specific features, even though the equal number of adverbials and other clause elements (6 instances each) in the Lodge sample suggests more diverse language, again resulting from the character of the story.

4. Discussion of the results

4. 1 Distribution of fronted elements in the three text sorts

The distribution of fronted elements in all three text sorts is shown in Table 5.

As appears from the figures, the fronted elements in the three text sorts show a clear-cut distinction between academic writing and narrative text on the one hand, and fiction dialogue on the other, with respect to the distribution of the integrated and non-integrated clause elements. While in both academic writing and narrative text it is the integrated clause elements that predominate (60 instances of integrated elements as compared with 40 instances of non-integrated in academic writing; in the narrative part, the predominance of integrated elements is even more prominent: 88 instances as compared with 12), in fiction dialogue the number of integrated elements forms a minor part: 28 instances, the remaining 72 initial elements being accounted for by conjuncts, disjuncts and interjections. These figures call for further research into fiction dialogue, the number of integrated fronted elements being too small to allow drawing plausible conclusions.

Differentiation is moreover found between the two sources of each sample, which is largely to be ascribed to their different content and sub-register, and partly also to the auctorial style. On the other hand, there are similarities between the academic and the narrative sample as regards the representation of different fronted integrated clause elements. In both samples, they include a large majority of adverbials which account for 85% (51 out of 60) in the academic sample and for 95.4% (84 out of 88) in the narrative sample. This partly reflects the optional character of adverbials, and their different syntactic status and diversified semantics which enable them, in contrast to the constitutive clause elements, to occur side by side in the same sentence (cf. (11), (15) b., (26), (27) b).

However, there are notable differences in the distribution of semantic roles. Most adjuncts in the narrative text are temporal (63.1%), while in the academic sample they account for only 27.4%. The largest group of adverbials in the academic sample has semantic roles other than temporal and locative: adjuncts of cause, means, manner, accompanying circumstances and others together comprise 27 instances of the total of 51 adverbials, i.e. 53%). The different distribution of adverbial semantic roles in the two samples reflects the respective character of the text. The greater variety of semantic roles in the academic sample derives from its expository and argumentative nature, while the prevailing temporal adverbials in the narrative mark successive stages in the development of series of actions depicting the current episodes. Discernibly, however, the distribution and particular uses of adverbials are also due to the auctorial style.

Fiction dialogue appears to differ from the other two samples in all the examined points, apparent similarities being either source-specific, rather than text-sort specific, or superficial. Thus the predominance of adjuncts over other fronted integrated clause

Table 5. Distribution of fronted elements

	Wilson sociobiology	Hergenhahn and Henley psychology	Acad. sample	Narrative Lodge	Narrative James	Narrat. sample	Fiction dialogue Lodge	Fiction dialogue James	Fiction dialogue sample
Conjuncts	9	25	34	2	1	3	28	14	42
Disjuncts	1	5	6	6	3	9	5	19	24
Interjections	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	1	6
Non-Integrated elements	10	30	40	8	4	12	38	34	72
Temporal adjuncts	13	2	14	16	37	53	3	6	9
Locative Adjuncts	9	1	10	12	3	15	2	3	5
Other Adjuncts	16	10	27	10	6	16	1	6	7
Subtotal	38	13	51	38	46	84	6	15	21
Other clause elements	2	7	9	4	–	4	6	1	7
Integrated elements	40	20	60	42	46	88	12	16	28
Total	50	50	100	50	50	100	50	50	100
Instances with S–V inversion	6	–	6	3	3	6	2	2	4

elements, comparable with that in the narrative and academic samples, was found only in one fiction-dialogue source (15 and 1, respectively, in James), whereas the other source shows an equal distribution (6 and 6, respectively, in Lodge). Similarly, the relative correspondence of the representation of conjuncts in fiction dialogue and the academic sample is due only to one source in each (psychology and Lodge). Moreover, there are essential qualitative differences between them: while in the psychology sample 18 of the 25 conjuncts were different lexical items, the only recurrent conjunctive adverbials being *therefore* with six occurrences, and *furthermore*, *in other words* and sets of listing conjuncts with two occurrences each, the 28 conjuncts in Lodge are with five exceptions accounted for by *well*.

Table 5 also includes, in addition to the fronted clause elements, instances of subject-verb inversion.[3] While the distribution of the different clause elements in the three samples displays significant differences, inversion apparently tends to equal or near-equal distribution: cf. the same number of instances – six – in academic writing and narrative text, and four instances in direct speech. What these figures show conclusively is a comparatively infrequent occurrence of inversion, 16 instances in 300 clauses. The ascertained distribution of instances with subject–verb inversion is partly comparable with the corpus findings given in Biber et al. (1999: 926); here inversion is described as "more frequent in written registers than in conversation, with the highest frequency in fiction. ... At the other extreme, inversion is least common in conversation."

4.2 Types of fronting in the three text sorts

The distribution of the types of fronting of integrated clause elements in all three samples is shown in Table 6.

The table shows a larger number and diversity of the types of fronting than the two proposed at the beginning as the distinguishing features of the text sorts under study, viz. contextual fronting and emphatic fronting of a rhematic element. In addition to these two types, the examined samples displayed three other types, fronting of a deictic element, contextual contrastive fronting and emphatic fronting with two foci.

Contextual fronting, defined as fronting of a context-dependent element that constitutes a component of the thematic section, and hence contributes to the basic distribution of the principal FSP functions, theme, transition and rheme, appears to be the most common type of fronting in all three text sorts. The greatest prevalence of this type is shown in the narrative sample (nearly 91%, 80 instances out of 88), academic writing ranking second with 73.3% instances of contextual fronting (44 out of 60) and fiction dialogue showing the relatively lowest percentage of contextual fronting, viz. 67.85% (19 instances out of 28). These results fail to confirm the initial assumption of contextual fronting as a characteristic of academic writing. Yet at least a partial confirmation of the expected stylistic distinctions may be seen in the highest representation in fiction dialogue of the fronting of other types, which here account for 32.15% (9 instances out of 28), as compared with 26.7% (16 out of 60) in academic writing and 9% (8 instances

---

3   One of the realization forms of the presentation sentence (cf. Adam, 2013; Chamonikolasová and Adam, 2005; Dušková, 2015).

Table 6. Types of fronting in academic prose, fiction narrative and fiction dialogue

	Fronting of deictic element	Contextual fronting	Contextual contrastive fronting	Emphatic fronting of rheme	Emphatic fronting with 2 foci	**Total**
Wilson	–	29	10	1	–	40
Hergehahn and Henley	–	15	1	–	4	20
Academic Sample	–	**44**	**11**	**1**	**4**	**60**
Lodge narrative	–	38	2	2	–	42
James narrative	–	42	2	2	–	46
Narrative sample	–	**80**	**4**	**4**	**–**	**88**
Lodge Fiction dialogue	3	5	2	2	–	12
James Fiction dialogue	1	14	–	–	1	16
Fiction dialogue	**4**	**19**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**28**

out of 88) in fiction narrative. The fact that these figures show more similarity between the academic sample and fiction dialogue than between fiction narrative and fiction dialogue is due to the different content and sub-registers of the samples and partly also to the auctorial style.

As regards the syntactic functions of the contextually fronted elements, nearly all were adverbials. Of the other fronted clause elements, only two had non-adverbial functions, viz. a prepositional object in (12) and the postmodifier of a subject complement in (19).

In all three samples some of the instances of contextual fronting displayed subject-verb inversion (altogether 16 instances, see Table 5). In Quirk et al. (1985: 1377), this type, illustrated by *To this list may be added ten further items of importance*, is described as "very common both in speech and in conventional writing, often serving the function of so arranging clause order that end-focus falls on the most important part of the message as well as providing direct linkage with what has preceded." According to Biber et al. (1999: 926), quoted here on p. 85, inversion is least common in conversation and most frequent in fiction. The figures in Table 5 appear to support the more general statement of Quirk et al., but being small, do not offer ground for a founded comparison. On the other hand all the examples of contextual fronting with inversion corroborate the contributive role of inversion in textual cohesion.

The second initially proposed type, emphatic fronting of the rheme, defined as fronting of a context-independent element that constitutes the postverbal rheme in the regular ordering, was expected to favour fiction dialogue and fiction. It is represented by 7 instances most of which come from the narrative sample. The syntactic functions of the emphatically fronted elements are mostly adverbials, viz. 4 instances, (16), (27) a., b., (38); the other non-adverbial syntactic functions include 2 subject complements, (9) and (21), and one object (34) a. The prevalence of adverbials over other clause elements here again reflects the generally much higher frequency of occurrence of this clause element, due to its prevalent valency-independence, differing degree of integration, and semantic specificity and diversity, as compared with the constitutive elements, pointed out on p. 83 in Section 4.1.

Besides these two initially proposed types of fronting, the material under study displayed three other types: fronting of a deictic element, contextual contrastive fronting and emphatic fronting with two foci.

Fronting of a deictic element is a situational counterpart of contextual fronting: the speaker takes up, as a starting point, an element present in the situation of utterance. As follows from the nature of deixis, its province is informal speech, which is reflected in the material under study in the restriction of this type of fronting to the sample of fiction dialogue. This is presumably at least partly the reason for its being the least frequent type: there are four instances, three adverbials, (31) a., b., (35) a., and one object, (32) b.

Contextual contrastive fronting ranks second in the frequency of occurrence, next to contextual fronting but greatly separated from it in absolute figures: 17 instances (11, 4 and 2, respectively, in academic prose, fiction narrative and fiction dialogue) as against 143 instances of contextual fronting.

In contextual contrastive fronting the first contrasted element is context-dependent, but disengaged from context-dependence by one of the decontextualizing factors (cf. Firbas, 1995: contrast, selection, identification, summarizing effect and purposeful repetition; Stehlíková, 2016), here by contrast. By being contrastive, the fronted element acquires a heightened degree of communicative dynamism, hence constitutes a contrastive diatheme within the thematic section. Due to the nature of contrast, at least two items are intrinsically involved. Moreover, it is not only the two items that are contrasted, but also what is said about them. Hence contextual contrastive fronting typically occurs in parallel structures in which each unit carries two foci. In addition to the main focus on the context-independent predicative part (the intonation centre/nuclear tone is as a rule carried by the rheme), there is a second, minor focus on the contrastive diatheme. The FSP structure has two information peaks, realized by the contrastive diatheme and the rheme in the predicate (cf. divided focus in Quirk et al., 1985: 1378; Hajičová et al., 1998: 151). Compare examples (3), (7), (8), (13), (20), (23), (33).

The last type of fronting, emphatic fronting with two foci, differs from contextual contrastive fronting in that the first contrasted element is context-independent whereas in contextual contrastive fronting it acquires its context-independence owing to a decontextualizing factor. Since in emphatic fronting with two foci the contrastive element is introduced into discourse for the first time, it carries a higher degree of CD than the contrastive diatheme in contextual contrastive fronting, hence both contrastive items can be assigned the same degree of prosodic prominence. Clear examples of this type of fronting are (11), the first clause of (14) and (27) b.; example (38) is an instance of potentiality.

5. Conclusion

Considering the aim of the study in the light of the obtained results, it appears that both the proposed structures, and the relations between the structures and the three examined text sorts are more complicated and diversified than was assumed. First, the types of fronting found in the excerpted samples are more diverse. Still, the types found in addition to the proposed ones, deictic fronting, contextual contrastive fronting and emphatic fronting with two foci are based on the latter and may be regarded as their subtypes.

As regards the stylistic aspect of the different types of fronting, the initial assumption of contextual fronting as a distinctive feature of academic prose and fiction narrative was shown to be erroneous, contextual fronting being the most frequent type even in fiction dialogue. Moreover, the best represented sample in this respect was not academic prose, as was supposed, but fiction narrative. On the other hand, stylistically relevant distinctive features appeared in the distribution of the fronted integrated and non-integrated elements. In fiction dialogue fronted integrated elements were much less frequent than in the narrative parts and in academic prose. The small number of fronted integrated elements in fiction dialogue (28 instances out of 100) calls for a study based on a much more extensive material. A finding of stylistic, as well as of structural and textual interest appeared in the relatively frequent occurrence of contextual contrastive fronting in series of parallel structures, which contributed to the second rank of this type in the frequency of occurrence, even though greatly distanced in absolute figures from the contextual fronting.

While the results concerning the fronting of integrated clause elements in the three text sorts brought few stylistically notable points, features of stylistic significance appeared in the distribution and realization forms of non-integrated clause and sentence elements: conjuncts, disjuncts and interjections. Interjections – to which can be added dislocation and deictic reference – were exclusive features of fiction dialogue, while disjuncts and conjuncts showed significant differences in the distribution and occurrence of particular semantic roles and realization forms. An important stylistic factor was moreover demonstrated in the differences between the samples of the same text sort. The differences appeared to be due not only to the different subject matter and different sub-registers of the same text sort – sociobiological expository argumentative vs. psychological expository instructional, a humoristic vs. a dark novel, but also to the auctorial style, both in fiction, where it is expected as a matter of course, but also in academic prose, which is generally greatly standardized.

REFERENCES

Adam, M. (2013) *Presentation Sentences (Syntax, Semantics and FSP). Spisy Pedagogické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity* 162. Brno: Masaryk University.

Chamonikolasová, J. and M. Adam (2005) The presentation scale in the theory of functional sentence perspective. In: Čermák, J., A. Klégr, M. Malá, P. Šaldová (eds.), *Patterns. A Festschrift for Libuše Dušková,* 59–69. Prague, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, and Czech Modern Language Association (Kruh moderních filologů).

Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad and E. Finegan (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English.* Harlow: Longman.

Dušková, L. (2015) Syntactic forms of the presentation scale and their differentiation. In: *From Syntax to Text: the Janus Face of Functional Sentence Perspective*, 202–208. Reprinted from *Linguistica Pragensia* 8, 1998/1, 36–43.

Firbas, J. (1992) *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*. Cambridge: University Press.

Firbas, J. (1994) Substantiating Daneš's view of givenness as a graded phenomenon. In: Čmejrková, S. and F. Štícha (eds.), *The Syntax of Sentence and Text*, 119–129. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Firbas, J. (1995) Retrievability span in functional sentence perspective. *Brno Studies in English* 21, 17–45.

Hajičová, E., B. Partee and P. Sgall (1998) *Topic-Focus Articulation, Tripartite Structures and Semantic Content*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Huddleston, R. and G. K. Pullum (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: University Press.

Pípalová, R. (2000) Intersentential connectives – a textual analysis. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica,* 5/1997, *Prague Studies in English,* XXII, 91–115.

Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Stehlíková, L. (2016) *Contextual Disengagement in FSP*. Doctoral dissertation. Brno: Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts.

Svoboda, A. (1981) *Diatheme*. Brno: Univerzita J. E. Purkyně, *Spisy Filozofické fakulty* 229.

Sources

Academic sample

B. R. Hergenhahn and T. B. Henley, *An Introduction to the History of Psychology*. 1st ed. 1986. Wadsworth CENgage Learning, 7th ed. 2014, United Kingdom, United States.

E. O. Wilson, *On Human Nature*. With a New Preface. 1st ed. 1978. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2004, London, England.

Narrative sample

D. Lodge, *Changing Places: A Tale of Two Campuses.*1st ed. 1975. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1978.

P. D. James, *Devices and Desires*. Faber and Faber, London, 1989.

Fiction dialogue

D. Lodge, *Changing Places: A Tale of Two Campuses.*1st ed. 1975. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1978.

P. D. James, *Devices and Desires*. Faber and Faber, London, 1989.

PREPOZICE POSTVERBÁLNÍCH VĚTNÝCH ČLENŮ JAKO UKAZATEL FUNKČNÍHO STYLU

Resumé

Článek se zabývá otázkou prepozice postverbálních větných členů s cílem zjistit jejich distribuci a typy v odborném stylu, narativní části beletrie a v dialogu beletrie, reprezentujícím konverzaci. Zkoumají se dva typy prepozice, kontextuální a emfatická. Předpokládané rozdíly v jejich distribuci vycházejí z různého řazení aktuálněčlenských funkcí, které se v kontextuální prepozici shoduje se základním rozložením výpovědní dynamičnosti, zatímco v emfatické prepozici stojí v počáteční pozici réma. V prvém případě prepozice přispívá k textové kohezi, což je rys odborného stylu, v druhém případě intenzifikuje emfázi/emotivitu vyjadřovaného obsahu, což je rys konverzace. Beletristický narativ je podle předpokladu disponován k výskytu obou typů. Výsledky výzkumu ukázaly více prepozičních typů s rozmanitější strukturou a složitější vztahy mezi prepozičními strukturami a zkoumanými druhy textu.

Libuše Dušková
Department of English Language and ELT Methodology
Faculty of Arts, Charles University
libuse.duskova@ff.cuni.cz