

clauses and adverbial clauses of place and time in complex sentence structure (cf 15.25ff).

Note the possible variations in word order with *of*-pronouns (*some, each, all, both*, etc.; cf 6.48ff):

There are two schools here, $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{both of which} \\ \text{of which both} \end{array} \right\}$ are good.

There are several schools here, $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{all/some of which I can recommend.} \\ \text{of which I can recommend all/some.} \end{array} \right\}$

For *both* there is also the possibility of the order *which are both good* (but hardly ?**which I can all recommend*).

Note also the use of the construction with *of*-pronouns when they modify the complement of a preposition:

The hospital admitted several patients that month,
 $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{for all of whom chemotherapy was the appropriate treatment.} \\ \text{*of whom chemotherapy was the appropriate treatment for all.} \\ \text{*whom chemotherapy was the appropriate treatment for all of.} \end{array} \right\}$

Relative pronoun as complement

- 17.25 When the relative pronoun functions as nonprepositional complement in the relative clause, the choice is limited to *which* for both personal and nonpersonal antecedents, in both restrictive clauses (cf 17.14) and nonrestrictive clauses (cf 17.22):

He is a teetotaller, *which* I am not.
 This is a powerful car, *which* my last car was not.

Appositive clauses

- 17.26 The remaining type of finite verb clause that plays a part in postmodification is the appositive (cf 17.35, 17.65ff). This resembles the restrictive relative clause in being capable of introduction by the unstressed *that* /ðət/:

She objected to *the fact that a reply had not been sent earlier*. [restrictive appositive clause]

The appositive clause differs from the relative clause in that

- (i) the particle *that* is not an element in the clause structure (functioning as subject, object, etc, as it must in a relative clause) but a conjunction, as is the case in nominal *that*-clauses generally;

- (ii) the nonrestrictive appositive clause has the same introductory item as the restrictive, ie: *that* (cf 17.33):

She rejected *their excuses*, even this last one, *that* investigations had taken several weeks. [nonrestrictive]

- (iii) the head of the noun phrase must be a general abstract noun such as *fact, idea, proposition, reply, remark, answer*, and the like (cf 16.84):

The fact that he wrote a letter to her suggests that he knew her. [1]
The belief that no one is infallible is well-founded. [2]

I agree with *the old saying that absence makes the heart grow fonder*. [3]

He heard *the news that his team had won*. [4]

As with apposition generally (cf 17.65ff), we can link the apposed units with *be* (where the copula typically has nuclear prominence):

The [fact *is*] that he [wrote a letter to her] [1a]

The belief *is* that no one is infallible. [2a]

The old saying *is* that absence makes the heart grow fonder. [3a]

The news *was* that his team had won. [4a]

We should also note that nouns like *belief* with *that*-clauses correspond to verbs with object clauses (cf 16.30ff):

He *believes that* no one is infallible. [2b]

With both restrictive and nonrestrictive appositive clauses, an antecedent noun is often a nominalization (cf 17.51ff):

The police reported that the drugs had been found. [5]

The police report that the drugs had been found (appeared in the press yesterday). [5a]

These restrictive examples have the definite article before the head noun. This is normal, but by no means invariable (except with a few nouns referring to certainty, especially *fact*):

A message that he would be late arrived by special delivery. [6]

The union will resist *any proposal that* Mr Johnson should be dismissed. [7]

Stories that the house was haunted angered the owner. [8]

Plural heads, as in [8], are also rare with appositive postmodification, and are usually regarded as unacceptable with *belief, fact, possibility*, etc. We may contrast [9] with the perfectly acceptable plural head with relative clause postmodification [9a]:

?Her mother was worried at *the possibilities that* her daughter was lazy and (*that she*) disliked school. [9]

The possibilities that she now offered seemed very attractive. [9a]

However, we occasionally find examples of plural nouns with appositive postmodification, such as *facts* in the following:

The reason probably lies in *the facts that* the Intelligence Service is rather despised, *that* the individual members change rapidly and are therefore inexperienced, and *that* they feel bound to put their own special interests first.

We have seen in 16.70 that certain verbs with *that*-clauses have a construction with putative *should* or with a mandative subjunctive, eg:

They *recommended that* she (*should*) be promoted. [10]

When such verbs are nominalized (cf 17.51ff), the object clause becomes an appositive clause, retaining the putative *should* or the mandative subjunctive:

There was a recommendation that she (should) be promoted. [10a]

The nominalized verb may be separated from the appositive clause under the conditions for discontinuous noun phrases (cf 17.122, 18.39):

The suggestion that the new rule (should) be adopted came from the chairman. [11]

The suggestion came from the chairman that the new rule (should) be adopted. [11a]

- 17.27 Despite the limited number of noun head types that may be postmodified by an appositive clause, the superficial similarity to relative clause postmodification can sometimes cause momentary difficulty. Total ambiguity, however, is rare since so many factors of selection have to be involved before anything like [1] can occur:

A report that he stole was ultimately sent to the police. [1]

The two interpretations ('he stole a report' or 'the report was that he stole') depend upon the possibility that *a report* can be a physical object or an abstraction (that is, nominalizing the verb *report*); upon *steal* being permissibly transitive or intransitive; and several other factors: *made* in place of *sent*, for example, would prevent the ambiguity (though it might not prevent the hearer or reader from having temporary difficulty).

Nonrestrictive appositive clauses like [2] can less easily resemble relative clauses since, irrespective of nonrestrictiveness, they still involve the particle *that*, in sharp contrast with nonrestrictive relative clauses:

This last fact, (namely) that *that* is obligatory, should be easy to remember. [2]

In illustrating the previous point, example [2] also illustrates the next point, (namely) that appositive indicators *namely* or *viz* can be optionally introduced in the nonrestrictive appositions, as can *that is (to say)* or *ie* (cf 17.73). It also illustrates the fact that with this type of clause, the antecedent head noun may be freely premodified by adjectives and with a choice of determiners. It will be recalled that, with restrictive appositives, *the* was obligatory before *fact*, and it may now be added that the only adjectives admissible would be nonrestrictive in scope (cf 17.3ff). Contrast [3], where the restrictive clause permits only the nonrestrictive adjective, with [3a], where the nonrestrictive clause permits a restrictive adjective:

The ugly fact that he was holding a gun indicated his guilt. [3]

The more relevant fact, that the gun had not been fired, was curiously ignored. [3a]

- Note The nonrestrictive apposition may be closely related to a nonrestrictive relative clause (cf appositive *wh*-interrogative clauses, 15.5). Compare:

His last request, $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{which was} \\ \text{(ie)} \\ \text{(viz)} \end{array} \right\}$ that his wife should come and visit him, was never granted.