

Three kinds of locative preposing

Chris Bruno
McGill University

Introduction English permits preposing of locative PPs, either with subject-verb inversion (*locative inversion*), or canonical S-V order (*locative topicalization*). Culicover and Levine (2001) show that there is a distinction between two kinds of locative inversion: light inversion (LI) and heavy inversion (HI), evidenced by their divergent behaviour in 7 different syntactic environments. HI is locative inversion when the post-posed notional subject is phonologically heavy (1a), and LI is locative inversion where the subject is light (1b). I consider a third preposing construction: Locative Topicalization. Locative topicalization (LT) is preposing of the locative PP with canonical subject-verb order, usually with a pause after the preposed PP (1c). I show that locative topicalization (LT) patterns with HI on nearly all of these environments.

- (1) a. Into the room walked (slowly) a very large caterpillar. (HI)
b. Into the room walked Robin. (LI)
c. Into the room, Robin walked. (LT)

To account for this, I propose that the syntax of HI consists of a locative topicalization step followed by heavy NP shift of the notional subject. The formal theory that implements this proposal not only accounts for the properties that HI and LT have in common, but also the one property on which they differ. To differentiate LT and HI on the one hand with LI on the other, I follow Rezac (2006) and Stowell (1981), in proposing that the syntax of LI consists of A-movement to subject position followed by an A'-movement step to spec-CP, with the notional subject NP staying in-situ.

Two kinds of inversion Other than the presence of a light or heavy NP subject, Culicover and Levine (2001) distinguish HI from LI with the following 7 properties: (i) PPs in HI can undergo raising, but not in LI; (ii) only PPs in HI are subject to WCO effects; (iii) LI cannot occur in unergatives, HIs can; (iv) only PPs in HI can participate in control; (v) only PPs in HI can strand quantifiers; (vi) only PPs in HI can be extracted from tensed complements; (vii) only PPs in HI can be preposed within non-finite complements, in particular *to*-infinitives complement to ECM verbs and gerundives.

Locative Topicalization I present novel data that shows that LT patterns with HI on properties (i–vi) but does not pattern with HI on property (vii): LT can occur in raising, control, and unergative contexts, are subject to WCO, and can involve quantifier stranding; but LT cannot occur within non-finite complements. The 6 properties that they have in common motivates a theoretical proposal in which HI and LT involve the same topicalization operation. I also show that it turns out that the one property in which they diverge (vii) is also explained by my proposal.

Proposal Assume a derivation for LT where the topicalized PP is A'-moved to the specifier of a head in the C-field, as in (2a), following the derivation given for VP-topicalization in Takano (1995). This paper proposes syntactic derivations for HI and LI: HI consists of PP-topicalization followed by Heavy-NP Shift of the NP subject, schematized in (2b); LI consists of A-movement of the PP to spec-IP, followed by A'-movement of the PP to spec-CP, as in (2c). The derivation for LI was originally proposed independently by Rezac (2006) and Stowell (1981) for locative inversion, but I argue that this is the correct derivation only for locative inversion with light subjects (LI). All properties except (iii) and (vi) can be shown to easily fall out from the derivations in (2), but this analysis also suggests some ways in which property (iii) might be explained.

- (2) a. LT: [CP PP C [IP NP_{subj} [VP V t_{subj} t_{PP}]]]
b. HI: [CP PP C [IP [IP t_{subj} [VP V t_{subj} t_{PP}]] NP_{subj}]]
c. LI: [CP PP C [IP t_{PP} [VP V NP t_{PP}]]]

References

- Culicover, P. W., & Levine, R. D. (2001). Stylistic inversion in English: a reconsideration. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 19(2), 283–310.
- Rezac, M. (2006). The interaction of Th/Ex and locative inversion. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 37(4), 685–697.
- Stowell, T. A. (1981). *Origins of phrase structure* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Takano, Y. (1995). Predicate fronting and internal subjects. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 327–340.