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In this joint research we study structural aspects of so-called Locative-Inversion (LI) in the principles-and-parameters theory of grammar.

It has been observed that LI constructions involve the syntactic operations of both preposing a locative phrase and postposing the subject, as exemplified in (1):

(1) Into the room walked John.

Rochemont-Culicover (R-C) [9] assign to sentence (1) the structure in (2) in which the "verb-escaped" VP including a locative phrase is adjoined to IP and then the verb (escaping from the VP) is also adjoined to the original (not adjoined) IP:

(2) [\[i_p [v_p, t, \text{into the room}] [i_p \text{ worked}, [i_p \text{ John } [i_p, t_v, t_1]]]]

However, R-C's analysis has both theoretical and empirical problems. First, the "cut-in-line" type of adjunctions could not produce a Subjacency violation in "double-topicalized" sentences suggested by Lasnik-Saito [8]:

(3)?? [\[i_p \text{ On the table}, [i_p \text{ the book}, [i_p \text{ John put } t_2 t_1]]]

Secondly, given the VP-internal Subject Hypothesis, R-C's analysis cannot predict the binding possibilities (cf. Huang [7]):

(4) [Betty and Jill], think that [\[i_p [v_p, t_2 t_v \text{ into each others, rooms}] \[\text{Tom and Mary}, \text{ walked } t_1]]

Notice that even though the subject trace in VP has only the index 2, "Betty and Jill" still can serve as an antecedent of the reciprocal in VP. Thirdly, R-C's assumption of verb Movement at Overt Syntax seems to be implausible under the structure-Preserving Hypothesis.

As far as these above problems are concerned, LI is likely to involve PP Movement rather than VP Movement. If this is the case, how can the surface order "verb-subject" be derived? There are three possible solutions to this problem: (i) the verb moves across the subject; (ii) the subject moves to the right of the verb like Heavy NP Shift
(HNPS); (iii) the linear order "verb-subject" is base, i.e., LI shows unaccusativity.
Solution (i) seems to be incorrect because if an intransitive verb moves to [Agr\theta, head],
(cf. Branigan-Collins [1]) VP-adverbs can appear to the right of the verb; however, the
following sentence with such permutation of word order is ill-formed:

(5) "Into the room [Agr\theta walked, [vp often [vp John t, ]]].
Cf. Into the room often walked John.

Solution (ii) is also rejected because, as R-C claim, LI does not show the same
contrast as HNPS, as in (6):

(6) a. There walked into the room nude [a man no one knows].
   b. *There walked into the room [a man no one knows] nude.
   Cf. a'. "Into the room walked nude John.
   b'. Into the room walked John nude.

We adopt Solution (iii): At D-structure, LI has the following configuration
where the subject NP and the locative PP are both in the complement position of
the verb:

(7) [vp [v walk John [pp into the room ]]]

The following examples count as a piece of evidence that the PP into the room is a
complement of the verb walk (cf.[5]):

(8) a. The bird [vp, flew into the bush] in the yard.
   b. *The bird flew in the yard into the bush.

The following Japanese examples also support our analysis, in which a location-indicating
element is a complement of the verb (cf. [10] and [11]):

(9) a. John-ga heya-no naka-\etai aruite-itta
    -Nom room-Gen inside-\etai walking went
    'John walked into the room'
    b.*John-ga heya-no naka-de aruite-itta
(10) a. John-ga koonen-ni iru
   'John is in the park'
   b. John-ga koonen-ni asonda
   'John played in the park'

A complement of ergative verbs such as aruie-ita in (9) can also cooccur with an NP-ni phrase which is a sister to the verbs. Unaccusative verbs such as iru can occur with an NP-ni phrase as in (10). Thus, LI and its variant have the structures in (11a) and (11b), respectively:

(11) a. \([A_{erg}P \frown \text{ [into the room]}], \{A_{erg}P \ frown \ [VP \ frown \ \text{ John} \ frown \ t_1] \}\) (details omitted)
    b. \([A_{erg}P \frown \text{ [into the room]}, \{A_{erg}P \ frown \ \text{ John}, \ [VP \ frown \ \text{ John} \ frown \ t_1, t_1] \}\]}

Secondary predicates such as mude have the following distribution which is constrained by the two constraints: (1) a predicate and its host NP must be in a mutual c-command relation (cf. [12]); and (2) circumstantial predicates involve PRO (cf. [6]):

(12) (a-c) \([A_{erg}P \ frown \text{ [into the room]}, \{A_{erg}P \ frown \ [VP \ frown \ \text{ John} \ frown \ t_1, t_1] \}\]}
    (d-e) \([A_{erg}P \frown \text{ [into the room]}, \{A_{erg}P \ frown \ \text{ John}, \ [VP \ frown \ \text{ John} \ frown \ t_1, t_1] \}\]}
    (ok(a) *(b) ok(c)
    (ok(d) ok(e)

(12) f. Into the room mude, John walked.

The example in (12b) is ungrammatical because mude is adjoined to \(V'\), whereas the rest of the examples are grammatical since the secondary predicates are adjoined to VP. It is considered that in (12f), mude is originally located in front of John walked, whose structure might be one of the participial constructions.

Though we have thus far assumed that PP is adjoined to IP, there is another possibility that PP moves into [Spec, IP]. Bresnan-Kanerva [2] point out that locative phrases in Chichewa can occur in subject position, and they also suggest that even English locative phrases can undergo NP-raising:

(13) [From the rubbish pit] seems to be emerging something.

Given that NP-raising can apply only to "subject-like" elements, the sentence in (13)
counts as a piece of evidence that the PP in LI occupies [Spec,IP]. Thus, we conclude that LI has the two potential candidates for the subject, namely NP and PP.

This dual nature of the categorial status of the subject can be taken into account in terms of argument structures. The intransitive verb walk, for example, has two different entries in the lexicon, i.e., an ergative verb and an unaccusative one, and the dualism arises in the case of unaccusatives. Though Locative is higher than Theme in the thematic hierarchy (cf. Grimshaw [4]), both of them are equal in respect of prominence, so that the dualism arises.

Furthermore, we assume that AGR feature is relevant to the choice of the subject: that is, either N-feature or Loc(ative)-feature decides which candidates, Theme or Locative, should be chosen as the subject. Given this, we can attribute the inapplicability of Subject-Aux Inversion in LI to the fact that the AGR feature [+Loc] cannot be checked off by the Inverted-Aux in [Head,C].
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