Background: The syntax of extraposed clauses such as those in (1) has been subject to extensive debate.

(1) a. (i) It is possible that John left early.
    (ii) That John left early is possible.
 b. (i) It worries the teacher that the students did not understand the accounting equation.
    (ii) That the students did not understand the accounting equation worries the teacher.
 c. (i) It is a tragedy that pollutants harm bees.
    (ii) That pollutants harm bees is a tragedy.

The major questions of discussion are (i) the base-position of the clause (subject or complement to predicate); (ii) the relationship of the clause to the word it (correlate, cataphoric pronoun, nominal head, expletive), (iii) whether or not there are different subclasses of predicates within English, most notably unergative vs. ergative ones. We can distinguish the following types of analyses with respect to the assumptions about (i) and (ii). The Adjunct Analyses (AAs) takes it to be the selected subject while extraposed clause is an adjunct (see for verbal complements Koster 1978, Bennis 1986, Vikner 1995). The Complement Analyses (=CAs) take the clause to be a selected argument while it is assumed to be an expletive in TP (see for ergative adjectives Bennis 2000, for seem in Alrenga 2005). The Complex Constituent Analyses (CCAs) assume that the sentence and it form a nominal constituent from which the clause is necessarily extraposed (see Rosenbaum 1967, Sonnenberg 1992, partly Büring & Hartmann 1997, Müller 1995). While the CCAs and AAs are compatible with both unergative and ergative predicates, the complement analysis is only compatible with ergative adjectives.

Data. In this talk I present two experimental studies (acceptability study, thermometer technique) that investigate the possibility of the that-clause to occur in subject position and the availability of wh-extraction from the extraposed clause with adjectival predicates, plus two pilot studies that tests the same with a small number of psych verbs and nominal predicates. That-clauses are expected to be acceptable in most analyses that take extraposition to be movement from the subject position. Wh-extraction on the other hand is expected to be available in those analyses that take the that-clause to be the complement of the adjectival predicate (without it as a nominal head). Example sentences for four of the five studies are provided in the examples in (2) to (4) (nominal predicates are designed as Adjectives 1)

(2) Adjectives 1

a. Extraposition: It is possible that Peter sold his school books.

b. Extraction: Which books is it possible that …?

c. In-situ Subject: That Peter sold his school books is possible.

(3) Psych verbs

a. Base: It worries the teacher that the students did not understand the accounting equation.

b. Extraction: Which equation does it worry the teacher that …

(4) Adjectives 2:

1. Extraposition: It is clear that the parliament will vote against the proposal.

2. Extraction: Which proposal was it clear that the parliament will vote against?

3. In-situ subject: That the parliament will vote against the proposal was clear.

4. Extraposition mit PP: It is clear to the public that the parliament will vote against the proposal.

5. Extraction with PP: Which proposal was it clear to the public that the parliament will vote against?

The results show across all configurations (see the figures for adjectives in Figure 1 and Figure 2) (i)
that *that*-clauses are overall not tolerated in subject position (with the exception of a few selected adjectival predicates) and (ii) that *wh*-extraction is not possible out of *that*-clause with all investigated adjectival predicates. Post-hoc tests reveal that with a small set of unergative predicates (disallowing that-drop, occurrence in as-is constructions and DP+INF, see Cinque 1989, Bennis 2000, 2004) *wh*-extraction is rated significantly worse than clausal subjects, while *wh*-extraction and occurrence in subject position are rated equally bad with ergative adjectives.

**Discussion.** Based on this study, *wh*-extraction is generally not possible out of extraposed clauses, both with unergative and ergative adjectives. This result is not expected under the Complement Analyses, but it is under the Adjunct Analyses and Complex Constituent Analyses. Considering the availability of the clause in subject position being dependent on the nature of the predicate as unergative or ergative suggests that the *that*-clause without *it* can be a selected subject. Taking this together extraposed clauses are either adjoined with *it* as a kind of cataphoric pronoun in subject position (both with unergative and ergative adjectives) or they are base-generated in complement position with the correlate extracted to subject position (ergative adjectives) or they are base-generated as *that*-clauses in subject position (unergative adjectives).
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