

On the Locative Inversion Construction in English

Suguru Mikami

In this study, I discuss the Locative Inversion Construction in English (henceforth, LIC), in which a locative PP occupies the preverbal position and a subject DP appears postverbally, exemplified by a sentence like the following:

- (1) In the corner was a lamp.

Sentence (1) means that it was *a lamp* that existed *in the corner*, and has a special discourse function of introducing the sentence-final DP to the discourse as the focus of the sentence (see Rochemont (1986) and Bresnan (1994)).

The LIC has attracted much attention in the literature and a lot of studies on the construction have been done from syntactic and pragmatic perspectives. Each of them, however, can account for only a part of the nature of the LIC. In this study, thus, for a better understanding of the LIC, I attempt to consider the relation between syntax and pragmatics under a theory of AGREE (cf. Chomsky (2000, 2001)). In particular, using the articulated Left Periphery of CP advocated in Rizzi (1997), I offer the derivation of the LIC which gives us a comprehensive account of both the syntactic and pragmatic properties.

Let us examine the properties of the LIC. First of all, the sentence-final DP can trigger agreement with finite verbs and bear nominative Case, as in (2):

- (2) a. In the swamp {*was/were} found two children.
b. Under the garden wall sat {I/*me}.

In (2a), the unaccusative verb *be* shows plural agreement with the DP, manifested as *were*; and in (2b), nominative Case is assigned to the DP, manifested as *I*. It follows that T enters into an AGREE relation with the DP (see Radford (2004)). Moreover, when the LIC is paraphrased into cleft sentences appropriately, only the DP can occupy the focus position, as in (3):

- (3) a. Out of the house walked John.
b. It was John that walked out of the house.

In (3b), the focus position in the cleft sentence is filled by the DP *John*. This fact leads us to the claim of the DP bearing [+Focus]. On the other hand, the sentence-initial PP can occur in the raising construction, as in (4):

- (4) [On that hill]_i appeared [t_i to be located a cathedral].

In (4), the PP *on that hill* undergoes A-movement out of the A-position in the embedded clause, which means that the PP occupies [Spec, TP] at a point in the derivation to satisfy the EPP on T. Furthermore, like topical XPs in Topicalization, the PP in the LIC must appear in the previous context, as in (5):

(5) I found a glass case on the table. In the case were trophies.

In (5), the explicit expression that evokes the PP in the LIC, *a glass case*, exists in the preceding context. This similarity strongly suggests that the PP bears [+Topic].

Keeping in mind these properties, I propose that the derivation for the LIC converges as follows:

(6) $[_{TopP} PP_i [_{Top} [_{FocP} DP_j [_{Foc} [_{TP} PP_i [_{T'} T [_{vP} v-V_k [_{VP} PP_i [_{V'} t_k DP_j]]]]]]]]]]$

A Theme DP and a Location PP are Merged in Comp and Spec of VP, respectively. As soon as T is introduced by Merge, it searches down the tree for a goal, and enters into an AGREE relation with the DP; consequently, the ϕ -feature on T and the case-feature on the DP are deleted. Then, the PP moves to [Spec, TP], satisfying the EPP on T. Furthermore, when Foc is introduced by Merge, it AGREES with the DP bearing [+Focus], and then only the formal feature (f-feature) and the semantic feature (s-feature) of the DP move to [Spec, FocP]. Finally, in the same way, when Top is Merged, it establishes an AGREE relation with the PP bearing [+Topic], and then only the f-feature and the s-feature of the PP move to [Spec, TopP]. Note that the overt movement of the PP from [Spec, TP] to [Spec, TopP] causes an economy violation, because the movement without any visible effects is costly (see Takano (1996)). Similarly, it is not necessary for the DP to move overtly from its original position in VP to [Spec, FocP] in terms of another kind of economy principle.

The proposed derivation in (6) can capture some interesting facts: The DP located in VP can control PRO in adjunct phrases adjoined to vP, and the DP embedded in non-finite clauses can bind an element in the main clause, as in (7):

- (7) a. ? On the corner stood [a woman]_i; without PRO_i being near another woman.
 b. The photos showed [TP behind this very hedge to have been hiding [Jill and Tony]_i] during [each other]_i's trails.

In (7a), the DP *a woman* can control PRO in the adjunct phrase; and in (7b), the DP *Jill and Tony* in the embedded clause can bind *each other* in the main clause. These facts suggest that the DP occupies a higher position c-commanding the PRO and the reciprocal. Given the above derivation in (6), I can easily account for the facts: Because the DP bears [+Focus], the relevant features of the DP are Merged into [Spec, FocP]; consequently, the DP can c-command them covertly.

In conclusion, I have shown through this research that movement operations can be triggered by such discourse-related features as Topic and Focus, and that the proposed derivation in (6) can attain higher empirical adequacy.