

Some remarks on "locative inversion" in English

journal or publication title	Tsukuba English Studies
volume	13
page range	253-256
year	1994-08-31
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2241/7599

Some Remarks on "Locative Inversion" in English
Toyoko AMAGAWA, Hidehito HOSHI,
Mikinari MATSUOKA, Mika OKUYAMA and Hideki TANAKA

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.

Rochement-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) [_{IP} [_{VP} t_v into the room] [_{IP} worked_i [_{IP} John [_I t_v t_i]]]]

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)?? [_{IP} [On the table]_i [_{IP} [the book]₂ [_{IP} John put t₂ t_i]]]

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

- (4) [Betty and Jill]₁ think that [_{IP} [_{VP} t₂ t_v into each others_{1/2} rooms] [[Tom and Mary]₂ walked t_i]]

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); (ii) 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 [AgrO, 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 [AgrO walked, [VP often [VP John t_i]]].
 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-ni aruite-itta
 -Nom room-Gen inside-ni walking went
 'John walked into the room'
 b. *John-ga heya-no naka-de aruite-itta

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 prominency, 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].

REFERENCES

- [1] Branigan and Collins "Verb Movement and the Quotative Construction in English," *MITWPL* 18/ [2] Bresnan and Kanerva "Locative Inversion in Chichewa," *LI* 20/ [3] Chomsky "A Minimalist Approach for Linguistic Theory," *MITOPL* 1/ [4] Grimshaw *Argument Structure* [5] Gruber *Lexical Structure in Syntax and Semantics* / [6] Hoshi "Circumstantial predicates, PRO, and D-structure Adjunction," *EL* 9/ [7] Huang "Reconstruction and the Structure of VP," *LI* 24/ [8] Lasnik and Saito *Move- α* / [9] Rochement and Culicover *English Focus Constructions and the Linguistic Theory of Grammar* / [10] Takezawa "The predicate/argument dichotomy and ni-marked phrases in Japanese," Workshop on Japanese Syntax and Universal Grammar/[11] Takezawa "Secondary Predication and Locative/Goal Phrases," in *Japanese Syntax in Comprehensive Grammar*/[12] Williams "Predication," *LI* 11.