A cross-linguistic study of so-called "locative inversion": evidence for the *Functional Discourse Grammar* model[1]

Francis Cornish
CNRS ERSS, UMR 5610 and Département des Sciences du Langage,
Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail,
5, Allées Antonio Machado, 31058 Toulouse Cedex 09, France
Email : cornish@univ-tlse2.fr

1. Introduction

In this chapter, I will try to isolate the internal syntactic, semantic and discourse-pragmatic properties of the "locative inversion" construction in six languages, representing three constituent order types: English, French, Italian, European Portuguese[2], Turkish (rigid SOV) and Arabic (flexible VSO). The term 'inversion' is purely descriptive within this context and is not to be taken as indicating a "movement" derivation of such constructions[3]; and in any case, we shall see later that the F(D)G approach in terms of the subsequent placement of underlyingly unordered constituents in positions within a template is perfectly suited to a proper treatment of this construction. In any event, locative inversion is a distinct construction in its own right, and its properties do not derive from those of the canonical, unmarked construction with which it can be correlated.

My aim, then, is to show that the properties specific to the construction flow from its essential function within discourse, and from its information-structural value. Thus a proper description of the construction presupposes a top-down organisation of the grammar, as in Hengeveld (fc.a,b). It will be shown in what follows that the different types of function of each of the main components of the construction under study need to be determined essentially via specifications at the Interpersonal level. This level <u>precedes</u> the Representational level at which the subject function would be assigned, as well as the Structural Level where the various constituents would be placed within the positional template available at this Level; but in standard FG (Dik, 1997: ch. 10), this level's equivalent <u>follows</u> the Representational Level's counterpart (the extended predication) at which syntactic functions are assigned. Hence the initial locative or temporal term, the non-predicating verb and the subject-cum-Presentational Topic function of postposed subject terms could not be adequately specified within the standard model of FG (see §4 for discussion).

Section 2 outlines four general properties of the construction, in terms of English and French examples; section 3 examines those of the equivalent forms in Italian, Portuguese, Turkish and Arabic in the light of this initial characterization; and section 4 draws together the common features isolated from the specifics of each type of realization, and proposes an account in terms of the Functional Discourse Grammar model (Hengeveld, fc.a,b). Finally, section 5 reexamines the subject-verb agreement patterns evident in the data, particularly where the verb is unaccusative[4], the subject term occurring to its right rather than to its left, as canonically in the SVO langages. Independently of this factor, a number of other properties characteristic of subjects are shown to be lacking in the construction. It is suggested that, at least where the verb is unaccusative, the construction may actually be an impersonal one.

2. Some syntactic, semantic and discourse-pragmatic properties of the locative inversion construction in English and French

The discourse function of the locative inversion construction as a whole is to *present* a referent which is discourse-new[5] within the framework of a locative or temporal context. At the same time, the construction as a whole serves to establish the *setting* for a new discourse unit, indicating that the state, process or event it denotes is to be backgrounded as context for a more foreground event to come (see Huffman, 2002). The essential properties of the construction flow from this discourse function: the presence in clause-initial position of a *locative or temporal* adverbial which is either subcategorized by the verb of the construction, or is a level 1 or level 2 satellite, designating the place or time in which this new referent is to be located within the discourse model being co-constructed by the speech participants; a *locative* or *existential non-predicating verb* whose inherent semantics corresponds or is reduced to this type of denotation, and which is tightly connected syntactically and semantically to the preposed constituent; and a postposed rhematic *subject* term occurring in predicate focus position. 2.1-2.4 below attempt to isolate these essential properties, on the basis of some French and English examples.

2.1. Presence vs. absence of a preposed adverbial of certain types

Before we examine an initial set of French data involving preposed adverbials, it will be useful to present a recent version of the FG language-independent constituent order template, which standardly forms part of the Expression component, and enables particular constituent orders to be imposed upon the underlyingly unordered clause representations. See (1) below for this template, which I have augmented by a clause-final position P0, proposed for Polish by Siewierska (1998) and for Bulgarian by Stanchev (1997), but which is evidently more relevant cross-linguistically.

> (1) P2, P1 (S) (O) (X) V (S) (O) (X) (P0) (X), P3 ((1) in Siewierska, 1998: 246, slightly adapted)

S, O, X and V symbolize 'subject', 'object', 'argument/satellite' and 'verb' respectively, and parentheses indicate optionality (not all languages require description in terms of the subject or object functions, for example). Standard FG (Dik, 1997: 70-71, 391-392) uses a set of placement rules within the Expression component of the grammar for assigning particular constituents bearing specified properties and functions to given positions in the ordering template appropriate for the language in question (that given in (1) is intended as a generalization from such language-specific templates). Subject and object expressions which are unmarked for pragmatic function will go to their respective pattern positions in the template relevant for the language at hand, while constituents marked for either the topic or the focus function will go to P1 position. See (21) for a proposed set of placement rules relevant to the "locative inversion" construction in the six languages under study, in terms of a revised version of template (1) (template (14), §4 below). In the case of an SVO language such as French, where, unlike in English, predicate ("completive") Focus cannot simply be marked via a nuclear pitch-accent on the non clause-final constituent concerned *in situ*, subject-verb inversion - as in the (a) examples in (2)-(5) below -, is needed to place the (Presentational) Focus constituent (the subject expression) in clause-final position, which is where the unmarked predicate-focus function is assigned in French. Thus, the subject expressions in the (a) examples below will be placed in P0 position in template (1).

Borillo (2000: 88), Ono (2001), Fournier (1997: 98-102), and other linguists argue that those verbs which subcategorize a PP complement (locative or temporal in the present case) invert with their subject when this complement is preposed[6]. Compare in this respect examples (2)-(5), which involve the French verbs *se trouver* 'to be found', *s'ouvrir* 'to open', *flamber* 'to blaze', and *gagner* 'to win', respectively:

(2) a   Dans l'armoire se trouvaient les chaussures.
         'In the wardrobe were (to be) found the shoes'
   b   *Dans l'armoire les chaussures se trouvaient. (Nølke, 1995, ex. (36)).
         'In the wardrobe the shoes were (to be) found'

(3) a   Avec cette clé s'ouvre toute porte.
         'With this key opens every door'
   b   ?Avec cette clé, toute porte s'ouvre.
         'With this key, every door opens'

(4) a   Dans une large cheminée flambait un grand feu.
         'In a broad chimney blazed a big fire'
   b   Dans une large cheminée, un grand feu flambait. (Borillo, 2000, ex. (10)).
         'In a broad chimney, a big fire blazed'

(5) a   *D'après mon frère, gagnera ce cheval.
         'According to my brother, will win this horse'
   b   D'après mon frère, ce cheval gagnera.
         'According to my brother, this horse will win'
         (ex. (14) from the Fournier & Fuchs (2002) corpus)

Since where (as in (2a)) a preposed PP is subcategorized by a verb[7], inversion is virtually obligatory (see (2b), in contrast to (2a)), one can postulate that the preposed locative PP is placed in the structural position P1 in the standard FG universal constituent-order template as given in (1) – the initial position within the clause, reserved for expressions given special treatment, particularly for discourse-pragmatic reasons[8].

Now, given that P1 in (2b) is occupied by the locative PP as a quasi-topic, the subject term as clausal topic cannot also be placed there. Level 1 satellites such as *avec cette clé* 'with this key' in (3a,b), make subject-verb inversion a "preferred" option, in Fournier's (1997: 97) words. This would not be the case if the PP were to occupy the extra-clausal position P2, as in (4b). As the verb *flamber* 'to blaze' does not subcategorize the locative PP *dans une large cheminée* 'in a broad chimney', the inversion here is in no way obligatory (see example (4b), which is well-formed). The PP *dans une large cheminée*, a level-2 satellite in FG terms, is thus placed in P2 (at least in the case of (4b)). The choice of inversion or of non-inversion is thus equally well-formed with preposed level-2 satellites, as expected. Finally, "propositional" level 3 satellites, as in the evidential satellite *D'après mon frère* 'according to my brother' in (5a,b), rule out subject-verb inversion completely[9]. So we see here that, as the tightness of the grammatical-semantic relation between verb and preposed adverbial decreases as we move from argument to level-1, then level-2 and finally level-3 satellite, the "attraction" it exerts on the verb lessens, and the pressure for subject-verb inversion within the construction as a consequence decreases.

The presence in initial position of the locative adverbial is motivated by the fact that, to introduce a new referent into a discourse, that referent must be located somewhere, existence

and location being two sides of the same coin, as is well known – see, for example, Lambrecht (1994: 179).

However, while the nature of the preposed adverbial is one determinant of the inversion following it - and no doubt the most important such determinant -, it is not the only one, by any means, as Fournier (1997) also points out. Whether or not there is subject-verb inversion within the construction is a function of the **interaction** of several factors, in particular, the information-structural value of the utterance as a whole, the syntactic and semantic nature of the verb, and the internal structure of the subject term. Let us briefly examine each of these factors in turn.

2.2. Information-structure influences on the construction

A central factor explaining the unnatural status of examples like (2b) is the positioning in clause-final position (unmarked Focus position) of an informationally "light" predicate: that is, not involving any specific semantic feature capable of being highlighted via this syntactic and prosodic treatment. This is also the reason for the difficulty, or even impossibility, of the non-inverted variants of (7a,b and g) and (7a´, b´ and g´) in §2.3 below, where the verbs are *be able to be seen/se voir*, *stand/se dresser*, and *be/être*.

Nølke (1995) argues that the assignment of the Focus function in French always involves the setting up of a paradigm of entities established as a function of the context - entities which are potential focus targets - and the marking of a contrast between one member of this paradigm and all the others. He suggests that, where the focus is assigned to a single lexeme rather than to a whole phrase, the element on which the focus operates is the SPECIFIC semantic feature which makes it possible to differentiate that element from all the other elements within the same lexical or semantic field. That feature is thereby highlighted, and the predicate has its full semantic value (see the (a) examples under (6) below); where inversion occurs, on the other hand, as in the (b) examples under (6), the verb's specific semantic feature is not highlighted, and only the GENERIC semantic feature(s), which establish(-es) the sortal category of entity to which the predicate may be applied, is/are in evidence. The verbs or past participles in the (b) examples below have a purely existential or locative, and not predicating, interpretation in this inversion context. In (6a-f), syllables in upper-case indicate nuclear pitch-accent. ((6c-f) are my examples; see Cornish, 2002: §4 for fuller discussion of this issue).

> (6) a   Dans l'armoire, les chaussures étaient ranGÉES. (Ex. (33a) in Nølke,
>   1995; originally presented in Borillo, 1990, ex. (a), p. 80)
>   'In the wardrobe, the shoes were neatly arranged'
>   b   Dans l'armoire étaient rangées les chauSSURES. (Ex. (33b in Nølke, 1995)
>   'In the wardrobe were stored the shoes'
>
>   c   A l'horizon, un orage couVAIT.
>   'On the horizon, a storm was brewing'
>   d   A l'horizon couvait un oRAGE.
>   'On the horizon was brewing a storm'
>
>   e ? #Dans la vallée, une rivière COULE[10].
>   'In the valley, a river flows'
>   f   Dans la vallée coule une riVIÈRE.
>   'In the valley flows a river'

2.3. The type of verb involved in locative inversions

In general, locative inversion is only possible in English and French when the verb involved is *intransitive*[11]. Involved here are, in particular, intransitive verbs denoting the existence, localisation, appearance/emergence or disappearance of an entity: *stand* in (7b), *hang* in (7c), *run* in (7e) and *work* in (7h); "unaccusative" or "ergative" verbs[12]: *sink* in (7d)); passive verbs (especially those interpretable as stative-resultative): *be seen* in (7a), *be engraved* in (7f); pronominal verbs: *se voir* 'be seen' in (7a´) and *se dresser* 'stand' in (7b´); attributive or copular verbs: *be* in (7g); and more generally, verbs which are interpretable in context as "light", from the point of view of their informational contribution[13]. Birner (1994: 254), on the basis of the data she collected to carry out her study of subject-verb inversion in English, argues that the constraint involved here is pragmatic in nature, and reflects the need for the verb in the construction to "contribute no new (i.e discourse-new) information". Thus the verbs in her data represented only evoked or inferable information. We may add to the explanation the fact that, if the verb in question were to contribute new information in context, then it would necessarily be predicative, and the referent of the postposed subject term would then be potentially topical, a value which is excluded in this type of construction. The parallel sets of illustrative examples from English, followed by their French counterparts under (7), form a standard group of examples which are used as a baseline on which to view the locative inversion facts in the four other languages examined here:

(7) a   In a clearing *could be seen* a charming cottage.
    b   At the end of a courtyard *stood* some ageing huts.
    c   On the wall *hung* an antique chimney hook.
    d   In the distance *was* slowly *sinking* a patched-up oil tanker.
    e   Into the garden suddenly *ran* three young barefoot boys.
    f   On the door *was engraved* in gothic letters a mysterious inscription.
    g   Nestling in a pile of dead leaves *was* a tiny reddish bird.
    h   ? In this office *work* four people.

(7) a´   Dans une clairière *se voyait* une coquette chaumière.
    b´   Au fond d'une cour *se dressaient* de vétustes baraquements.
    c´   Sur le mur *pendait* une antique crémaillère.
    d´   Dans le lointain *coulait* lentement un pétrolier rafistolé.
    e´   Dans le jardin *accoururent* soudain trois jeunes garçons aux pieds nus.
    f´   Sur la porte *était gravée* en lettres gothiques une inscription mystérieuse.
    g´   Tapi dans un tas de feuilles mortes *était* un oiselet rougeâtre.
    h´   Dans ce bureau *travaillent* quatre personnes.

So we can say, with Levin & Rappaport-Hovav (1995: 230) in the case of English, and Fournier (1997: 116) in that of French, that it is the presence of the inversion which gives these verbs an informationally "light" interpretation[14]. These authors argue, moreover, that, in order for the inversion to be acceptable, the sense of the inverted verb should *characterize* the referent of the postposed subject term: in other words, there should be an effect of redundancy in the subject-verb relation, the verb expressing an activity or state which is characteristic of the type of entity represented by the subject referent. This property is obviously closely connected to the criterion of "informational lightness" which the verb needs to assume in context.

2.4. The syntactic form and semantic content of the postposed subject term, and its relation to

the verb

First of all, the postposed subject term does not have to be placed immediately to the right of the verb involved: (7d)/(7d´), (7e)/(7e´) and (7f)/(7f´) show clearly that an adverb ((7d)/(7d´), (7e)/(7e´)) or a modifying PP ((7f)/(7f´)) may be closely dependent on the verb. Thus it is the subject and the verb group or V′, in the X´ notation[15], which invert.

The postposed subject in the eight examples under (7) (both the English and the French series) is morphologically indefinite, since a form of the indefinite article, or a non-definite numeral determiner, in (7e,h), is used in each case. This is not obligatory, though, the important factor being that the referent of this term should constitute discursively new and not topical information once it is brought into relation with its immediate context (see Birner, 1994: §9, pp. 252-3). This phrase may therefore be morphologically definite, but may certainly not be expressed by an unaccented definite 3rd person pronoun, which carries the presupposition that its potential referent is already highly active, psychologically, for the addressee (a GivTop, in FG terms)[16]. Birner (1994:253) points out that the postposed subject may be formally definite, since it is not "<u>hearer</u>-oldness" which that subject's referent is prohibited from expressing, but "<u>discourse</u>-oldness". A postposed subject may well refer to an entity with which the addressee is familiar (of which s/he has knowledge), but so long as that entity is construable as evoking discourse-new information in context, the postposed subject which expresses it will be felicitous.

The longer and more complex the subject term is, the more likely it will be to be positioned to the right rather than to the left of its verb. This is predictable in terms of discourse, since if the information contribution associated with a nominal term is relatively more substantial, then it will tend to be interpreted as rhematic (introducing new information relative to the context) and not as thematic; and the default position for placing such constituents is generally towards the end rather than at the beginning or the middle of the clausal utterance. In addition, as Daniel García Velasco points out to me, another motivation for subject-verb inversion in such cases is the placing of complex terms in clause-final position in order to facilitate processing (as in the case of extrapositions).

Finally, as far as semantic content is concerned, the animacy of the subject term (human-denoting or inanimate) will cause a potentially movement verb to tend to be interpreted as dynamic and agentive when it is human-denoting, or as stative when it is inanimate. In the first case, the subject will tend not to be postposed, while in the second, it is likely to be.

2.5 Summary of the properties of the locative inversion construction, based on the English and French data

To summarize the situation established so far on the basis of the English and French data we have seen in sub-sections 2.1-2.4, the presence in P1 of an argument of the predicator, or of a level 1 (locative or temporal) satellite, tends to result in the subject being placed to the right of the verb, in P0 position on template (1). The effect of this is that the verb in question (an intransitive verb in both languages) is non-predicating, and simply denotes the existence, localisation, appearance or disappearance on the scene of the referent of the subject expression. The subject expression thereby receives presentational focus and is marked both by its non-canonical position in the clause, and by a pitch-accent. All these properties follow directly from the discourse functionality of the construction as a whole: to present a discourse-new entity in terms of a locative or temporal framework set up via the argument or level-1 satellite in P1. This constituent serves also as a link with the preceding discourse (cf. Birner & Ward, 1998).

3. Locative inversion in four other languages

3.1 Italian and European Portuguese

3.1.1 Italian

Let us now compare the situation in relation to English and French with that which characterizes the Southern Romance languages, Italian and European Portuguese. First, Italian. In this language (as in European Portuguese), lexical subject-full verb inversion seems to be completely free (unconstrained). It can involve all kinds of verbs – unaccusatives, unergatives, transitives, even without the co-presence of a preposed overt locative or temporal PP (according to Pinto, 1997). However, when transitive verbs are involved, only the order VOS is possible, and never VSO, according to João Costa (p.c.). The only verb (here, a quasi-verb) which is excluded from this construction is the copula *essere* 'to be', which when it occurs induces the selection of the existential construction with *ci* 'there (is)' (see example (7g´´) below). The translation into Italian of the English examples of locative inversion given under (7a-h) is presented under (7a´´-h´´). As in the case of the English and French examples, the verb of each example is in italics[17]:

(7) a´´ In una radura *si vedeva* una casetta graziosa.
b´´ Nel fondo di un cortile *sorgevano* delle baracche vecchie.
c´´ Sul muro *pendeva* una catena di camino antica.
d´´ In lontananza *stava affondando* lentamente una petroliera rappezzata.
e´´ In giardino *accorsero* subito tre giovani ragazzi scalzi.
f´´ Sulla porta *era incisa* in lettere gotiche un'iscrizione misteriosa.
g´´ Rannicchiato in un mucchio di foglie morte c'*era* un uccellino rossiccio.
h´´ In questo ufficio *lavorano* quattro persone.

Note that, with the exception of (7g´´), where the copula *essere* is obligatorily accompanied by the locative clitic expletive *ci* (Carminati, 2001: 66), Italian expresses this construction in the same way as French. Maria Nella Carminati informs me that in many cases, preposing of the locative adverbial cannot co-occur with *the absence* of subject-verb inversion – that is, in the absence of inversion, the adverbial must be placed in its canonical position to the right of the verb. Among the examples (7a´´-h´´) above, the last two, (7g´´) et (7h´´), would not be possible without inversion – in the last-mentioned case, even if the preposed locative is not a governed complement of the verb *lavorare* 'to work': *In questo ufficio quattro persone lavorano* 'In this office four people work'. She proposes the example of the verb *nascere* 'to be born' (an unaccusative verb like *morire* 'to die'), where we find the locative inversion construction: *In questa casa è nato un poeta famoso* 'in this house was born a famous poet', as well, as in English and French, as the variant without preposing and without inversion: *Un poeta famoso è nato in questa casa*, but not the variant with locative preposing and no inversion: *In questa casa un poeta famoso è nato*.
Nascere, morire, arrivare etc. are unaccusative, intransitive verbs, though possessing a locative argument at the level of their lexical-semantic structure; this argument may be analyzed as a "default argument" in Pustejovsky's (1995: 63-67) terminology. We may consider that such is also the status of the locative PP *in questo ufficio* in relation to the unergative verb *lavorare* 'to work' which we have just seen.
The generalization which seems to apply here is that when the preposed constituent is either subcategorized syntactically, or is a "*default argument*" of the predicate to which the

verb corresponds at the lexical-semantic level, subject-verb inversion is either obligatory or strongly preferred in relation to the canonical order.

In fact, it would be incorrect to say that inversion in Italian is completely free: as Pinto (1997) stresses, the inversion involving the majority of unaccusative verbs may have either a wide or a narrow focus, whereas that involving unergative or transitive verbs only allows narrow focus. For Carminati (and Pinto), the postposed subject is focal, rhematic, whereas the preverbal subject is topical or thematic.

Pinto (1997: 8) suggests that in general, verbs allowing inversion with wide focus interpretation in Italian are characterized by the presence in their argument structure of a locative or temporal argument denoting the spatio-temporal context in which the proposition expressed is asserted as true or false (cf. Erteschik-Shir's 1997 notion "stage topic"). Verbs not allowing inversion with wide focus interpretation[18] would lack this extra argument (the unergative verb *telefonare* in (8e) below is exceptional in this respect). For Pinto, this phonetically null argument is basically deictic in character, with its interpretation being oriented towards the speaker. As an illustration, let us look at the pairs of examples (8a-b), (8c-d), and (8e-f): note in particular the differences apparent in the English translations of the members of each pair:

(8) a   E' entrato Dante.
          has entered Dante
          'Dante has come in (here/in this place)'
    b   Dante è entrato
          'Dante has entered (somewhere)'

    c   E' morto Fellini.
          has died Fellini
          'Fellini has just died (…I've just heard it)'
    d   Fellini è morto.
          'Fellini has died (at an unspecified time)'

    e   Ha telefonato Beatrice.
          has telephoned Beatrice
          'Beatrice telephoned (here, at this place)'
    f   Beatrice ha telefonato.
          'Beatrice telephoned (somewhere, has made telephone calls)'
          (Pinto, 1997, exs. (19)-(21), ch. 1)

When the subject occurs in postverbal position with 'invertible' verbs (i.e. verbs where wide focus interpretation correlates with inversion), the verb selects an extra locative or temporal argument. In fact, this argument is present even in the non-inverted variant, the two "objective"/"subjective" readings also being possible. Pinto concludes then that it is the implicit presence of this locative/temporal argument – which she symbolizes as LOC – which motivates the verb-subject order in the case of those verbs which allow it. Subject-verb inversion in Italian would therefore only be "marked" where it can only give rise to a narrow-focus interpretation.

3.1.2 European Portuguese

According to the description put forward by Costa (2001a,b), in terms of subject-verb inversion, Portuguese would appear to behave like Italian rather than French, within the

Romance group of languages - as in fact would be expected. This language allows inversion with all sorts of verbs, unccusative as well as unergative or transitive. According to Costa (2001a: 2), in "wide focus" sentences (thetic utterances, then[19]), the subjects of unaccusative verbs may be either pre- or postverbal.   See (9a) vs. (9b) below:

(9) *What happened?*

  (a) *O Paulo   chegou*
     the Paulo arrived
  (b) *Chegou o Paulo*
     arrived the Paulo'
     'Paulo arrived'
     (Costa, 2001a, exs. (2a,b))

On the other hand, with intransitive verbs other than unaccusatives, only subject-verb order, as in (9a), would be possible as a realisation of a thetic sentence - in response, then, to a question of the type *What happened?*. Costa (2001b) confirms the inference one can draw from this, on the basis of the situation characterizing Italian, that in Portuguese, verb-subject order for verbs other than unaccusative ones can only give rise to a narrow-focus interpretation.

One factor connected with verb-subject order in Portuguese which we have not observed in the case of Italian concerns subject-verb agreement. According to Costa (2001a: 8-9), in familiar spoken discourse[20], agreement of an unaccusative verb with a *post*verbal subject in number may not occur, whereas it is obligatory when the subject precedes the verb. This possibility is absolutely ruled out with the other categories of invertible Portuguese verbs (unergative and transitive). Interestingly, Maria Nella Carminati informs me that her native Bergamasco dialect in northern Italy also shows this possibility under exactly the same conditions. See the pairs (10a, a´), (10b, b´) and (10c, c´) below:

(10) a *Chegaram*　　　　　*o*　　*Pedro e*　　*o Paulo*.
      arrive-PAS[21]-3PL　　the　　Pedro and　　the Paulo
   a′ *Chegou*　　　　　　*o Pedro*　　*e*　　*o*　　*Paulo*.
      arrive-PAS-3SG　　the Pedro　　and　　the　　Paulo
    'Pedro and Paulo arrived'

  b *Fecharam*　　*muitas*　　*fábricas*.
    close-PAS-3PL numerous　　factories
  b′ *Fechou*　　　*muitas*　　*fábricas*.
    close-PAS-3SG numerous　　factories
   'Many factories closed'

  c *Chegaram*　　　　　*as cadeiras*.
    arrive-PAS-3PL　　the chairs
  c′ *Chegou*　　　　　　*as cadeiras*.
    arrive-PAS-3SG　　the chairs
   'The chairs arrived'
   (Costa, 2001a, exs. (19a-c))

I will not follow Costa in his attempt to explain this phenomenon (in Minimalist terms, as a function of alternative Case assignment mechanisms), but will look at it rather in terms of

information structure. I suggest the following hypothesis: Amongst the different types of verbs, only the unaccusatives in pre-subject position allow a "thetic" reading of their containing clause. Now, in familiar spoken Portuguese, postverbal subjects in such conditions may not trigger number agreement with their preceding verb. Why? Because in this case, *neither* the referent of the subject, *nor* the denotatum of the verb would be topical. And agreement in number (at least in the colloquial, spoken language) is sensitive to the informational status of the potential controller (in this case, the term fulfilling the subject function), and not solely to its purely grammatical status (that of subject, in opposition to object or to other grammatical functions). This combination of statuses - preposed focal verb and postposed focal subject - is what distinguishes preposed unaccusative verbs in relation to the other types of verbs in Portuguese: indeed, whereas transitive and unergative verbs may be preposed in relation to their subject, in this case, only the "narrow-focus" interpretation is possible – in other words, where only the referent of the subject will constitute contextually new information once the content expressed by the sentence is integrated with its discourse context. The denotatum of the preposed verb will correspond in this case to presupposed, anaphoric information. However, one must treat this generalization somewhat carefully (as João Costa cautions), since there is wide variation in current usage. See §5 below for further development of this analysis.

3.2 Turkish

Turkish, an "agglutinating" language which is a member of the Altaic group, is a rigid SOV language. Let us see then how it deals with the locative inversion sentences in the SVO languages which we have been examining up to now. The Turkish equivalents of (7) are given below[22]:

(7) a´´´ Ag6aç-sız   bir alan-da   sirin   bir   kulübe görün-üyor-du
        tree-without one zone-LOC pretty one   cottage see-REFL-PROG-PAS

   b´´´ Bir avlu-nun   uc-u-nda   birkaç yıkkın   kulübe dur-
        one courtyard-GEN   end-POSS.3-LOC some old   huts   be-
                                  uyor-du.
        immobile   PROG-PAS

   c´´´ Duvar-da   antik   bir ocak   çengel-i   asılı   dur-
        wall-LOC   antique one chimney hook-POSS.3 hanging   stand-
        uyor-du.
        PROG-PAS

   d´´´ Uzak-lar-da defa-lar-ca   tamir   ed-il-mis   bir tanker
        far-PL-LOC time-PL-ADVR   repair make-PASS-PART   one tanker
        yavas yavas bat-ıyor-du.
        slow   slow sink-PROG-PAS4

   e´´´ Birden   yalınayak   üç   genç çocuk kos-arak   bahçe-
        suddenly   feet-bare   three young child run-PART   garden-
        ye   gir-di
        ALL   enter-PAS

   f´´´ Kapı-da   gotik   harf-ler-le   kaz-ıl-mıs   gizemli

    door-LOC gothic letter-PL-COM engraved-PASS-PART mysterious
    bir yazıt   bul-un-uyor-du.
    one inscription find-REFL-PROG-PAS

  g´´´ Bir yıg5ın kuru yaprak-lar-da   küçük kırmızımsı bir kus yuval-
ıyor-

    one heap dry leaf-PL-LOC small reddish   one bird nestle-PROG
    du.
    PAS

  h´´´ Bu büro-da   dört kisi   çalıs-ıyor.
    D1 office-LOC   four persons work-PROG

Among these examples, it is worth mentioning example (7e´´´´), which cannot work in the same way as the parallel examples (7e), (7e´), (7e´´) and (7e´´´); the reason is that *bahçe-ye* 'in the garden', since it is a complement of the verb *girmek*, cannot be separated from it by being preposed clause-initially[23]. This is interesting in the sense that it reinforces an observation made by Nathalie Fournier and Catherine Fuchs during their paper on locative inversion at the University of Paris III (1st February 2002): namely, that when the term preposed clause-initially in French is tightly governed by the verb, the latter is strongly "attracted" to it, a feature which is expressed via its placement in second position in the clause, in front of the subject. Since in Turkish, the verb is constrained to occupy the final position in the clause, preposing of the locative phrase which it governs, and hence the separation of these two constituents, is impossible.

  The immediate observation to make on the basis of the Turkish data is that there is no subject-verb inversion in this language; the most we can say is that there is "inversion" between subject and preposed locative/temporal adverbial, the verb remaining in its canonical position clause-finally. We thus have the following order of constituents: *Locative/temporal adverbial + subject + verb*. Turkish being, as already noted, an SOV language, the unmarked canonical order of the constituents at issue in these examples would be *Subject + locative/temporal adverbial + finite verb*. A constant feature in relation to the examples of subject-verb inversion which we have seen so far in terms of the SVO languages would be the placement of the rhematic, focal subject in the position reserved for this purpose in the type of language at issue: *postverbal* in the SVO languages, and *immediately preverbal* in SOV languages such as Turkish (see also Hungarian in this respect). If the constituent placed in this position carries the nuclear pitch-accent, it is assigned contrastive focus. When the subject is in second position, but not the immediately preverbal one[24], it is most often interpreted as part of the rheme, even if it does not bear contrastive focus in this position (Gerd Jendraschek, p.c.).

  Moreover, in Turkish – as also in Arabic and Russian, amongst other languages -, subject-adverb order signals the definiteness and hence potential topicality of the subject (no articles existing in Turkish – apart from the indefinite article *bir*): *Çocuk-lar yer-de yat-ıyor* child-PL ground-LOC lie-PROG 'The children are lying on the ground', in contrast to *Yer-de çocuk-lar yat-ıyor* ground-LOC child-PL lie-PROG 'Children are lying on the ground' (examples due to Gerd Jendraschek). So all the examples (7a´´´´-h´´´´), which show adverbial-subject order, would contain indefinite subjects – with the exception of example (7e´´´´) with the adverb *birden* 'suddenly', according to Gerd Jendraschek, which is a sentence adverb, and so is more autonomous in relation to the clause. On the other hand, when there is no adverbial phrase in front of the subject, the sentence is ambiguous with respect to definiteness.

3.3 Classical and modern Arabic[25]

Arabic is a basic VSO language (cf. Dahlgren, 1988, Moutaouakil, 1984); however, Ahmed Moutaouakil informs me that it is currently changing from a more or less flexible VSO order towards a rigid SVO one.

Like Turkish, Arabic is a case-language, a property which in principle allows for flexibility in word order. According to Albert Abi Aad (p.c.), when the sentence is marked for past tense, a quasi-auxiliary morpheme is used, namely *ka3na*[26] with the lexical verb occurring later on in the sentence in the neuter imperfective form. Still according to Abi Aad, in this case, the subject would occur to the left of this second verb, since it will have been "thematised" by *ka3na*. According to Moutaouakil, the Arabic sentence requires two special positions clause-initially rather than one (as in (1) above), since P1 contains the complementizers and P0 the interrogative pronouns, or a constituent marked for contrastive focus, or (optionally), a non-subject topic[27]. See (11) below, the positional template proposed specifically for Arabic by Moutaouakil (1989: (170), p. 60) (the two clause-initial positions here are to be seen as solely relevant to the facts of Arabic):

(11) P2, P1 P0 V S 0 X, P3.   (Moutaouakil, 1989: (170), p. 60: positional template
        required for Arabic):

(12) a *h;a"lidan* (PatObj)   *)abs9artu*   *(la" 'amran)*
        Halid-ACC   have-seen-I   (not 'Amr-ACC)
        'It's Halid that I saw (and not 'Amr)'

     b *??? zaydun* (AgSuj)   *g$a4)a*   *(la" 'amrun)*
        Zayd-NOM   has-come   (not (Amr)'
        'It's Zayd who came (and not (Amr)'
        (Moutaouakil, 1989: 62, exs. (182) et (183))

As in the other languages analyzed so far, the (canonical, in Arabic) positioning of the subject to the right of the verb signals its rhematic, and not thematic, status – though according to Moutaouakil (1989:76-77), topic constituents *may* remain in their canonical position rather than being placed in P0. However, he also notes (ibid., p. 77) that the preferred position of topic constituents is towards the beginning rather than the end of the clause.

See (7a´´´´´-h´´´´´) below for translations into modern Arabic[28] of examples (7a-h), which we have already seen in English, French, Italian, German and Turkish:

(7) a´´´´´ fi3   fush[atin   min alg?a"bati ka"na yatara")a ku"h;}-un
)ani"qun
        in   an.opening   of   DEF-forest was visible-V cabin-NOM   pretty

     b´´´´´da"h;ila   alfina!)i   ka"nat taqu"mu   masa"kinu

             inside-LOC   DEF-courtyard   was   stand-V-3SG.F hut-PL.NOM
        qadi"matun
        ageing

     c´´´´´(ala" alh[a")it[i   ka"nat tatadalla   us5ratun   (at|4qatun

on DEF-wall   was   hang-IMPERF chimney-hook-NOM old-NOM

d´´´´´ fi" alb(a4di   ka"nat na"qilatu naft[in   ba"liyatu"n   tag?raqu
in DEF-distance was   tanker   patched-up   sink-IMPERF-3SG.
bibut[)in
slowly

e´´´´´´fag\})atan (ada"   fi alh9adi"qati   t;ala"t{atu s5ubba"nin h9ufa"tu
suddenly run.up-3SG.PERF in DEF-garden   three   boys   bare-GEN
al)aqda"mi
DEF-feet-GEN

f´´´´´´(ala" alba"bi   ka4nat (qad) nuqis6at   bih9huru"fin
on DEF-door   was-3SG.F   engraved-PASS.PERF in-letters-F. NOM
g?ut[iyyatin   (iba"ratun   g?a4mid[at-un
gothic-F.PL   formula-NOM obscure-F.NOM

g´´´´´´f?""i   kawmati)awra4qin   maytatin ka"na yarbud[u
t[ayrun
in heap   leaves-GEN   dead   was nestled-PERF   bird-NOM
ma")ilun   ila"   alh[umrati
veering   towards   redness-GEN

h´´´´´´f|4   ha"d;a almaktabi   ya(malu   )arba(at-u
)as]h;}a4s9in
in this-F. DEF-office-F. there-work-3SG   four-NOM   persons-PAR

Apart from example (7d´´´´´), all the Arabic examples translated from (7a-h) show the same basic structure: LOC/TEMP ADV- (*ka4na(t)*) – V (+ ADV) – SUBJECT. Arabic prefers the order *theme-rheme* to the opposite - according to Abi Aad, when the verb is clause-initial in the canonical VSO order, it is itself thematised, in fact. Thus the preposed locative or temporal adverbial, as in all the examples (7a´´´´´- h´´´´´) here, would necessarily be understood as thematic. In this case, a definite subject (also thematic, then) could not precede the verb. According to the positional template given in (11), we might say that the initial locative adverbial occupies either P0, or P2. In P0 (as in the examples here), it would be interpreted as topical, in the strict sense – which would prevent a definite, also topical, subject from occurring therein.   And in P2, it would have a "framing" type of interpretation, rather than a topical one.

Regarding subject-verb agreement in classical Arabic, (13) below gives the rules formulated by the *Grammaire active de l'arabe* by M.Neyereneuf and G. Al-Hakkak:

(13) Rules for subject-verb agreement in Arabic (*Grammaire active de l'arabe* by M.Neyereneuf and G. Al-Hakkak, *Le Livre de Poche* (1996), Librairie Générale Française)

-    in the first and second persons, ... the verb agrees in gender and in number with the subject;
-    in the third person, when the verb precedes the subject, it remains in the singular and agrees with the subject if the latter is animate (in both singular and plural) or inanimate (in the singular);
-    the verb assumes the feminine form if the subject is inanimate and plural.

Indeed, as far as the second rule is concerned, we see in examples (7b´´´´´), (7e´´´´´) and (7h´´´´´), where the postverbal subject is plural, that the verb takes the 3rd person singular

form. The situation is similar to what one finds in Russian, according to Corbett (2001: 17), where a verb with a quantified subject may take either 3rd person singular form, or 3rd person plural – the order subject-verb favouring plural agreement, while verb-subject order prefers singular "agreement".

4. Towards an account of the "locative inversion" construction within Hengeveld's *FDG* model

First of all, we note the existence of certain common constraints within the six languages represented here, in three of the four major features of the construction, initially isolated on the basis of a consideration of English and French in section 2. First, the **preposed locative or temporal phrase** - in initial position in all the six languages - fulfils a thematic function, assuring the link with the discourse context upstream and also the anchoring 'ground' in which the new subject referent is to be located (Hannay, 1991: 145-6 proposes the term "Stager" as a characterization of the function of such constituents within P1; but his examples of this (see (19) below) involve predicates and not locative or temporal adverbials, which I would argue are not only "topical", but (Sub)Topics; yet since they do nonetheless perform a "stager" function with respect to the discourse-new entity to be presented, they share these two functions). Next, **the subject** occupies a rhematic position in relation to the verb, occurring either to its right in the four basic SVO languages, and in the one VSO one (Arabic), or to its left, but nonetheless in a special focus position "P4" immediately in front of the verb in the SOV one (Turkish) (see the "extended" template under (14) below); it may also occur to the left of this position but belonging to the rheme, in the case of Turkish. Finally, from the point of view of **information structure**, the order VS is indicated for unaccusative verbs in five of the six languages, expressing by default a thetic interpretation (wide focus, including the verb); for the unergative verbs, in Italian and Portuguese this order normally expresses a narrow, contrastive focus, excluding the verb, which would in this case be presupposed. Both types of reading - thetic and contrastive focus - are possible in this case only for Arabic and Turkish: in the latter case, the subject does not invert with the verb but with the preposed adverbial. We can see, then, that the common properties in the realization of this construction across the six languages, representing three basic order types, far outstrip the differences.

(14) below presents an extended version of the positional template given under (1), which takes account of Turkish and Arabic. Note that I have replaced the position "P0" proposed by Moutaouakil (1989) in the template for Arabic under (11) by "P5", since a position "P0" has independently been proposed for the Slavic languages by Stanchev (1997) and Siewierska (1998) clause-finally. This latter position was already included in template (1). In addition, position "P4" immediately in front of the position available for the verb, would be needed for Turkish as well as for other SOV languages. According to this extended template, the subject may be placed within this construction, depending on the language at issue, either in its "pattern position" for the language in question, otherwise in position P4, or else in the special position P0 clause-finally. Given that Turkish is a strict V-final language, however, this latter position would not be available for subjects in that language.

(14)   P2, P1 (P5) (S) (O) (X) (P4) V (S) (O) (X) (P0) (X), P3

Several properties of the "locative inversion" construction are specific to it, as we have seen: the locative or temporal preposed argument, level 1 or level 2 term placed in P1 rather than P2 (which position may well be filled by level 2 satellites, cf. §2.1); the non-predicating, purely locative or existential verb in second position (more or less equivalent here to a copula,

as is suggested in §5); and the rhematic subject term in P4 or P0 (according to the language type), signalling new information relative to the context. Within a wider discourse context, the construction as a whole serves to background the situation evoked, including the new subject referent (cf. Huffman, 2002, Borillo, 2000, Cornish, 2001).

What we see from our examination of the construction across six languages is that there are a number of interacting dependencies holding between the various components of the construction: If (as is the most common situation) the preposed locative or temporal term is closely linked to the verb, then the fact that it is preposed and does not occur in its canonical position to the right of that verb (in the five languages besides Turkish examined here), attracts the verb into second position, so that it is adjacent to it - again, Turkish is the one exception to this tendency. The initial position (P1) occupied by the locative or temporal term is determined by the discourse functionality of the construction as a whole (cf. Birner, 1994, Birner & Ward, 1998, Huffman, 2002). The fact that, when the verb is tightly connected with this preposed term, it "inverts" with (or, in the basic SVO languages, occurs to the left of) its subject, and, as a corollary, the subject is rhematized, entails that the verb is non-predicating, but simply points towards the existence of the entity denoted by the subject.

In order to account adequately for all these properties, it is necessary to have available a level of analysis at which the determining discourse properties of the construction may be represented. Such a level is provided in Hengeveld's (fc.a,b) *Functional Discourse Grammar* (FDG) model in the shape of the Interpersonal Level. Unlike standard FG, FDG is a top-down, hierarchical, modular discourse- and not sentence-grammar model of language, which interfaces with a Cognitive and a Communicative Context component. These latter components are in part non-linguistic in nature. As Hengeveld (fc.a: 2) notes, "decisions at higher levels and layers of analysis determine and restrict the possibilities at lower levels and layers of analysis" (this property reflects the top-down character of the model). Each of the levels or modules within the grammatical Component connects with the module immediately below it via a set of mapping or interface rules, which convert the representation issuing from the higher module into that appropriate at the lower level. At the Interpersonal level, then, message management strategies would be planned and structured (in terms of potential moves, and the discourse, referential and ascriptive acts which may implement them). The representations established at this level then feed the Representational Level at which the grammatical and semantic structuring of the construction may be specified, prior to the Structural Level (morphological form, syntactic function assignment and constituent ordering) and Expression Level, at which matters of phonological and prosodic form are specified. The highest Interpersonal Level also feeds (and is in turn fed by) the Conceptual and Contextual components (see Fig. 3 in Hengeveld, fc.b: 9)), assignments from which are also clearly necessary for an adequate and complete analysis of the construction under study. See Cornish (2003: §4) for brief discussion of the possible treatment of the four FG Topic functions within the FDG model.

At the initial *Interpersonal Level* in the FDG model, we may specify the speaker's discourse intentions in terms of Hannay's (1991: 148) five "modes of message management" ("All-New information", "Topic", "Reaction", "Neutral" and "Presentative"). Hannay envisages these types of message mode as being subcategories of the DECL illocution (mood) operator (DECL-A: All-new mode, DECL-N: Neutral mode, DECL-P: Presentative mode, DECL-R: Reaction mode, DECL-T; Topic mode (Hannay, 1991: (21), p. 148)). Examples illustrating Hannay's message management modes are as follows:

"All new mode" (= "thetic" utterances)
(15) *A bomb exploded yesterday in Armington Valley high street*.

(15) (my example) is a so-called "thetic" utterance (see also examples (9a,b) from European Portuguese presented in §3.1.2). Here, the context is minimal, no constituent being singled out for special treatment by means of word order (at least in the case of English). (15) might be the first utterance of a Radio or TV news bulletin. Such utterances respond to the very general question "What happened?", and serve to create context for what is to come. In particular, the 'starting point' constituent has no special importance relative to the remainder of the clause. I therefore disagree with Hannay (1991: 146-7) when he claims that the subject of such utterances will be placed in P1 position, simply because this is "in keeping with the idea that clause-initial position is the unmarked position for Subject constituents in English" (1991:147). P1 position, after all, is a position which marks constituents singled out for special treatment, in particular, for pragmatic reasons; and yet in thetic utterances such as (15), no constituent is "singled out" in this way (this is the hallmark of thetic utterances, precisely). I would argue, then, that in "All-new" (thetic) utterances, the clause constituents will each be assigned to their pattern positions.

"Topic" mode
(16) Q: *Have you thought of going to London?*
    (a)   *No, I hadn't considered London actually.*
    (b)   *No, London I hadn't considered actually.*
    (Hannay, 1991, exs. (1a,b)

Here, in both (16a and b), there is a relation of aboutness holding between 'London' and the pragmatically-construed proposition (Lambrecht, 1994) – particularly so in (16b), where *London* is in P1, since this constituent's referent is singled out for special treatment as topic, according to Hannay. Here, the speaker has clearly chosen to anchor his message to the common ground presented in the question ('going to London'). The Focus would then be the subject (which would be 'topical', but not Topic, in (16b)) and the verb complex *hadn't considered*.

"Reaction mode"
(17) Q: *Did you get wet? …*
    Wet? Bloody soaking I was.
    (Hannay, 1991, ex. (2b))

The "Reaction" mode involves the preposing of immediate, expressive-subjective material bearing the Focus function. Here, the foundation chosen by the speaker for his message is "the most important focal information" ("bloody soaking" in the second pair-part utterance in (17)), in conformity with Givón's (1988) "first-thing-first" principle, as Hannay points out (1991: 151). There is no topic here, according to Hannay (p. 143) – in fact, the highly predictable (and thus presupposed) subject-copula segment following the adjective phrase in (17) may be analysed as a "Tail" constituent: indeed, it has the intonational markings of Tails. Moreover, it could be replaced in (17) with very little effect by a corrective phrase such as …, *more like it!*, which would clearly be a Tail constituent.

"Neutral mode"
(18) *It was surprising that the Greens won the election.*

The "Neutral" mode is said not to involve an initial Topic or Focus expression and comprises a "dummy" subject (*it* or *there*). (18) (my example) is not constructed from the standpoint of a Topic (there is none); rather the speaker "just builds up the Focus" (p. 147).

Now, as in the case of examples of type (15) (in the "All new mode"), impersonal constructions such as (18) are clearly thetic utterances, since no constituent is singled out for special treatment, and the entire clause is in Focus. The only significant difference between (15) and (18) is that in the first case, the subject is a term phrase (*a bomb*), and in the second, it is an impersonal pronoun. I would thus analyse both (15) and (18) as exemplifying subtypes of the "All new (thetic) mode". Hannay also places "dummy *it*" in examples like (18) in P1 – presumably on the same basis as for lexical subjects like *a bomb* in (15), i.e. the fact that it is a subject expression, and "the normal position for subjects in English is P1". But there is even less justification for this treatment than in the case of *a bomb* in (15), since a "dummy" element has no reference at all, and is simply a "place-holder" – English main clauses requiring a subject in the syntax. Thus such constituent types can hardly be said to be "singled out for special treatment" in any conceivable way, and so should not be placed in P1, but in the pattern position for subjects in English.

> "Presentative mode"
> (19) CONTEXT: *I will now turn my attention to various implications of the analysis.*
>   *Particularly interesting is its influence on Topic assignment.*
>   (Hannay, 1991, ex. (19b)

The predicate constituent *particularly interesting* in (19) is neither Topic nor Focus, according to Hannay, but corresponds to what he calls a "staging device" (*Stager*). The information it conveys in context is clearly inferable from the context clause, and as such is topical. Thus it is used by the speaker to introduce a new discourse topic. The definite subject term phrase *its influence on Topic assignment* is therefore assigned the pragmatic function Focus. Clearly, the constituent bearing the "Stager" function will be placed in P1. As for the "locative inversion" construction as analysed in sections 2 and 3 above, it is clear that this is a particular subcategory of the "Presentative mode" of message management.

Now, clearly, each message management mode, with the exception of the first and the fourth (the "All-New" and "Neutral" modes), presupposes a specific kind of context. This must be represented in the Communicative Context component, whose task is to provide a representation of the discourse developed prior to the utterance about to be produced, as well as of the prevailing situational context. A very important part of this discourse representation must be (a) an indication of the current (local and global) macro-topics and (b) the structure of this discourse (i.e. the level or 'unit' of the discourse under development which the discourse has reached). The "Presentative", "Neutral" and "All-New" modes may serve to initiate a new discourse unit, since their essential function is to <u>introduce</u> new referents or states of affairs. In the case of the "Presentative" mode, as we saw in example (19) as well as those illustrating the "locative inversion" construction in sections 2 and 3 above, there is often a preposed thematic locative, temporal (or more generally, circumstantial) phrase introducing the constituent manifesting it; in which case, the content of the clause as a whole is presented as tightly connected with the preceding co-text. Thus, such clauses may serve either as transitions between one discourse unit and the next, or as links between utterances within the same unit.

The structure of the discourse corresponding to a particular Move is thus established at the Interpersonal Level in the new model, in terms of a coherence relation with respect to the last such Move, and to the wider discourse and thematic structure as specified by the Communicative component. The mode of message management adopted at this level will in part determine at the lower Representational level a particular underlying clause structure, with Topic and Focus assignments marked (as appropriate) as a function of the message

structure indicated at the Interpersonal level. Finally, the Structural and Expression components will convert these specifications into an actual object language expression

Let us focus now particularly on Hannay's (1991) "Presentative mode". Let's take the English example (7c) from §2.3 as a basis for the demonstration (repeated below as (20) for convenience).

(20) (= (7c)) *On the wall hung an antique chimney hook.*

The first factor to be specified is the communicative context presupposed by the construction – to be provided, then, by the Contextual component. This is that there is an inferential relation in terms of the place or time at which the state of affairs is situated, with respect to a place or time accessible within the prior context of the occurrence of the construction. This relationship may be one of identity (coreference), of part in relation to whole, of "ingredient" within a frame, or simply of an association of some kind (e.g. via metonymy). Birner & Ward (1998: 17) call this a "po-set" (partially-ordered set) relationship[29]. This information then is fed from the Contextual component to the Interpersonal level.

At this level, the speaker's *move* is one of wishing to present a discourse-new referent to the addressee within such a staging context. In terms of the ascription of a property to an argument, there is none here, as we have seen (cf. §2.3), the verb in the construction being non-predicating. There are however two referential *acts*, involving the establishment of the existence of a discourse-new referent within a given locative or temporal context. According to these values, then, the locative argument or level 1 or 2 satellite in the construction will be assigned (by hypothesis) the pragmatic function "Topic" (more specifically, I would argue, "Sub-Topic" as well as Hannay's 1991 "Stager" function); and the argument whose referent is to be introduced in this context, the function "Presentational Focus". At this level, then, we derive (20a) (note that the locative adverbial *on the wall* in (20) is an argument of *hung*, and not a level 2 satellite):

(20a) $[M: (A_1 [DECL\text{-}T (P_1)_S (P_2)_A (C_1: [(R_1 (loc/temp)_{Sub\text{-}Top/St})])]), (A_2 [DECL\text{-}P (P_1)_S (P_2)_A (C_2: [(R_2 (x)_{Pres\text{-}Foc})])])]$ **INTERPERSONAL LEVEL**

(20a) says that we have a single move consisting of two acts, the first involving reference to a locative or temporal entity bearing the dual function "SubTopic/Stager", and the second, to an entity bearing the function "Presentational Focus". The symbols used in (20a) include the following: 'M' = 'Move'; 'A' = 'Discourse Act'; 'DECL-T' = 'Declarative illocution in Topic mode'; 'DECL-P' = 'Declarative illocution in Presentative Mode'; '$(P_1)_S$' = 'the Speaker of A_n'; '$(P_2)_A$' = 'the Addressee of A_n'; '$C_{1/2}$' = 'the communicated content associated with Discourse Act$_{1/2}$'.

At the following Level in the derivation, the *Representational Level,* a predication whose verb merely denotes existence or localisation (here, *hang*) is chosen, in conformity with the absence of property-ascription specified at the preceding Interpersonal Level. This verb, as we have already seen, has two arguments - an entity- and a locative-denoting one, respectively. This yields (20b):

(20b) $[DECL\text{-}P \ E_i : [POS \ p_i : [PAS \ e_i : [hang \ [V] \ (i1x_i: chimney\text{-}hook \ [N]_{\varnothing}: antique \ [A]_{\varnothing Pres\text{-}Foc}) \ (d1x_j: wall[N]_{LocSubTop/St})]]]]$ **REPRESENTATIONAL LEVEL**

Furthermore, at the next stage in the derivation, that of the *Structural Level* (Hengeveld, fc.b), the first argument will be assigned the syntactic function "Subject":

(20c) [DECL-P E_i : [POS p_i : [PAS e_i : [*hang* [V] ($i1x_i$: *chimney-hook* [N]$_ø$: *antique*
[A]$_{øPres-FocSubj}$) ($d1x_j$: *wall*[N]$_{LocSubTop/St}$)]]]]   **STRUCTURAL LEVEL**

Finally, still within the *Structural Level*, the locative argument $(x_2)_{Loc/TempSub-Top/St}$, or alternatively the level 1 $(y_1)^1{}_{Loc/TempSub-Top/St}$ or level 2 satellites $(y_1)^2{}_{Loc/TempSub-Top/St}$ (whichever of these form types is chosen in any instance) will be placed in P1 position[30] on the constituent order template in (14), the locative or existential verb in V, and the first argument $(x_1)_{Pres-FocSubj}$ will go to P0. In the case of the SOV language represented here (Turkish), the latter will be placed under P4, there being no 'P0' position available for such languages (cf. Herring & Paolillo, 1995). (21) gives the placement rules relevant for the constituents of the locative inversion construction in the six languages represented, in terms of template (14).

(21) <u>Placement rules relevant for the "locative inversion" construction</u>

1. $A^2{}_{Loc/Temp}$ → P1, else
2. $\sigma^1{}_{Loc/Temp}$ → P1, else
3. $\sigma^2{}_{Loc/Temp}$ → P1 (if "SubTop/St"), and → P2 (if "Theme")
4. V → V
5. If any of (21.1-21.2) or the first part of (21.3) have applied, then $Subj_{Pres-Foc}$ → P0 (if the basic constituent order is SVO or VSO), else → P4 (if basic c.-order is SOV)

5. Concluding remarks: the agreement properties of the construction in certain languages, the subjecthood of the postposed "subject" term, and the impersonal status of locative inversion

Finally, let us turn to the question of agreement, and whether the postposed subject is still a genuine "subject". We have noted at several points in the comparison of the locative inversion construction in the six languages up to now that agreement in number could be lacking between preposed verb and postposed subject: this was the case with the unaccusative verbs in European Portuguese (examples (10a´, b´ et c´)), but only in the context of the colloquial, spoken language[31]; as well as in the case of Arabic, whatever the type of verb involved[32]. Arabic goes even further than colloquial European Portuguese, in that it allows non-agreement in number even in the case of the order subject-verb: this would be motivated by the fact that the subject is inanimate and plural.

This state of affairs, that is, the absence of agreement between a verb and its subject, where agreement is otherwise regularly expressed between these two items in the language in question, is not rare in the world's languages, as Lazard (1994) reminds us. One factor which would motivate this, according to Lazard, is what he calls the speaker's "communicative goal" ("la visée communicative") – in other words, the thematic or rhematic status assigned either to the verb, or to the subject, or to the subject+verb (or verb+subject) unit:

(22) "…En règle générale, l'accord tend à ne pas se faire quand l'actant concerné et le verbe appartiennent au même membre (rhème ou, plus rarement, thème) de la structure de visée. Au contraire, un actant thématique tend à être coréférencié dans la forme verbale, qui est par nature typiquement rhématique." (Lazard, 1994: 212)
'As a general rule, agreement tends not to occur when the argument concerned and the verb belong to the same unit (rheme, or more rarely, theme) of the information structure. On the other hand, a thematic argument tends to be cross-referenced on the verb, which is by nature typically rhematic'

Although it does not involve subject-verb inversion, one of the examples presented by Lazard is particularly instructive.   See the pair of Persian sentences taken from Lazard (1994: (2a,b), p. 174) under (23a and b):

(23) a mehmân-hâ   âmad-and.
        guest-PL   come/PAS-3PL
        'The guests have come'

     b mehmânhâ   âmad-ø
                      come/PAS-3SG
        'There have come a number of guests'

As Lazard (1994: 214) explains, from the point of view of information structure (la "visée communicative"), (23a) includes two units, a theme, *mehmânhâ* 'the guests', and a rheme, *âmadand* 'have come', and the verb agrees in number and person with the theme constituent. According to Lazard (1994: 214), "the sentence is pronounced with two pitch-accents". In (23b), on the other hand, there is only a single pitch accent, which falls on the nominal term, the sentence is "entirely rhematic", and the verb does not agree (at least in number). Lazard's comment (p. 234) on the rhematic subject which no longer determines an agreement marking on the verb in this configuration, is eloquent: "…can we still call it a subject?"; for indeed, one of the cross-linguistic properties of the subject is the determination of an agreement marking in the verb with which it is in construction.

It is precisely this state of affairs which characterizes the examples mentioned a moment ago where the subject is postverbal, bearing a rhematic function, then, and where agreement with the subject (in number, at least) is not expressed. It is in fact no accident that, in every case, it is the 3rd person singular form of the verb which appears; for it is precisely these values which are the unmarked feature values of the morphosyntactic categories involved – namely, 3rd for the category of person, and singular for that of number.

Perlmutter (1983), in a very interesting article in relation to constructions with and without inversion in Italian, claims that inversions involving unaccusative verbs (whose subject corresponds to an "internal" but not "external" argument, in relation to the verbal predicate) are equivalent to an impersonal construction, where the subject is an unexpressed expletive pronoun. Whenever the verb does not agree with its (lexical) subject, as in the examples of spoken Portuguese and standard Arabic we saw earlier, the true impersonal status is manifest, via the "default" verbal inflections, i.e. 3rd person, singular number and neuter gender, where relevant – the subject then being an unexpressed expletive pronoun. This is manifest overtly in French with the impersonal construction which is possible with unaccusative verbs, as in: *Il est arrivé/venu quinze touristes* 'There arrived/came 15 tourists'. The impersonal status which inversion constructions would represent - where there is a choice with respect to an uninverted variant - would be entirely congruent with the "presentational" function of inversion constructions generally.

Moreover, the postposed subjects of unaccusative verbs in Italian cannot control the reference of the unexpressed subject ("PRO" in Generative terminology) of an embedded infinitival or participial clause, nor even act as antecedent for a 3rd person pronoun within the sentence of which the preposed verb is main verb, according to Carminati (2001: ch. 3). I would explain these "defective antecedent" properties in terms of the following consideration: a definite unaccented pronominal expression is *ipso facto* thematic, in other words, its referent is assumed to be familiar to the addressee; yet at the same time, the referent of the postposed subject (in SVO languages) is rhematic, focal, hence presented as "discourse-new" to the

addressee: whence the contradiction and the impossibilities observed. The following (constructed) example of defective cataphora illustrates the problem:

> (24)   #While *he*ᵢ was leaving the house *he*ᵢ had just broken into, the alarm was accidentally set off by *a Dover-based burglar*ᵢ[33].

For Relational Grammar (the framework chosen by Perlmutter for his study), postposed subjects of unaccusative verbs would have the status of grammatical "chômeurs", since their prime function of acting as 'pivot' at an earlier stratum in the derivation would have been "usurped" by another nominal constituent at a later stratum – in the present case, that of the null expletive, which we can identify with the abstract LOC constituent proposed by Pinto (1997) (see §3.1 above).

   If the locative inversion construction is at base an impersonal construction, then it should be possible to insert in preverbal subject position, in those SVO languages which do not allow the non-realization of a pronominal subject, an expletive pronoun (e.g. *there* in English and impersonal *il* in French). Let us try to apply such insertions first of all in the canonical English, then the French examples presented earlier in (7a-h) and (7a´-h´), respectively:

> (25)a In a clearing there *could be seen* a charming cottage[34].
>   b At the end of a courtyard there *stood* some ageing huts.
>   c On the wall there *hung* an antique chimney hook.
>   d   In the distance there *was* slowly *sinking* a patched-up oil tanker.
>   e Into the garden there suddenly *ran* three young barefoot boys.
>   f ?On the door there *was engraved* in gothic letters a mysterious inscription.
>   g Nestling in a pile of dead leaves there *was* a tiny reddish bird.
>   h ?In this office there *work* four people.

> (26)a   Dans une clairière il *se voyait* une coquette chaumière.
>   b   Au fond d'une cour il *se dressait* de vétustes baraquements.
>   c   ?Sur le mur il *pendait* une antique crémaillère.
>   d   ?Dans le lointain il *coulait* lentement un pétrolier rafistolé.
>   e   ?*Dans le jardin il *accourut* soudain trois jeunes garçons aux pieds nus.
>   f   ?* Sur la porte il *était gravée* en lettres gothiques une inscription mystérieuse.
>   g   Tapi dans un tas de feuilles mortes il *y avait* un oiselet rougeâtre.
>   h   ?* Dans ce bureau il *travaille* quatre personnes.

On the whole, such insertions do not greatly affect the grammaticality of the inversion sentences, nor the type of interpretation to which they give rise – though this is more clearly the case in English with expletive *there* than with the impersonal pronoun *il* in French. As far as the latter realizations are concerned, we may observe that the more the preposed verb is 'empty' semantically (tending towards a mere copula, as in (26a,b) – cf. Blinkenberg (1928: 105) -, the less the insertion of impersonal *il* is likely to modify the meaning and grammaticality of the original example. In (26g), the copula *était* 'was' would be replaced by the existential presentational form *il y avait* 'there was'. (26e) and (26h) would not be candidates for the impersonal construction, since their verbs (respectively, *accourir* 'to run up' and *travailler* 'to work') are unergatives and not unaccusatives. As such, their sole argument is not internal, but external. This supports Perlmutter's (1983) analysis, then, according to which it is only unaccusative verbs which give rise to an impersonal construction

when their 'subject'[35] is postposed in relation to the verb. It is for the same reason that (25h) is not fully acceptable in English (as was already its inverted counterpart (7h)).

      Yet, rather than subscribing entirely to Perlmutter's (1983) hypotheses, it would seem preferable to conclude from these non-subject properties of postposed subjects of unaccusative verbs[36], that these NPs are still "subjects", but not canonical ones (see note 34). This is also the position defended by Lambrecht (1994: 22). It is in the last analysis the subject's marked status as bearer of the pragmatic function Presentational Focus, and not the unmarked one of Topic, strongly expected in the case of canonical subjects, which seems to lie behind all these non-subject properties. This would be yet another example of a pragmatic property overriding a syntactic one.

Notes

[1] The present chapter is an expanded and revised version of a paper presented at the 10th International Conference on Functional Grammar (26-29 June, 2002, University of Amsterdam), entitled "Locative inversion in 8 languages: syntax, semantics, discourse-pragmatics and functional position". I would like to thank John Connolly, João Costa, Daniel García Velasco and Ahmed Moutaouakil for their help in revising the original paper, as well as an anonymous external reviewer and the editors of the present volume for their advice on revising the originally submitted version. I am also grateful to Christian Molinier, Maria-Nella Carminati, Gerd Jendraschek, Ahmed Moutaouakil, Joseph van den Reysen and Albert Abi Aad, for their help with the French, Italian, Turkish and Arabic data presented in the chapter. Any remaining errors are my sole responsibility.

[2] All basic SVO languages, at least in main clauses.

[3] Functional Grammar rules out movement rules, and in fact Transformational rules in general.

[4] Below are some technical terms used in other frameworks than the FG one, and which I will be using in what follows, together with their definitions : *unaccusative* (or *ergative*) verbs : verbs having an "internal argument" (i.e. A^2) which is a Patient or Zero in terms of semantic function, but no "external" argument (i.e. A^1). In their (basic) intransitive use, these verbs have an inchoative or stative value; they may also be used transitively, however, in which case they acquire an Agent or Force A^1, which induces a causative sense. Examples from English are verbs like *burn, melt, cook, sink… Unergative verbs* are intransitive verbs with an A^1 (i.e. "external argument" in Generative frameworks), but which may not be used transitively. Examples are *work, stroll, laze, think…*

[5] A NewTop, in standard FG terms.

[6] See also in this regard Birner & Ward (1998: 31), who note that the preposing of "lexically governed" constituents is more restricted than that of other types of (merely modifying) constituents.

[7] Witness *Les chaussures se trouvaient* *'The shoes were to be found'.

[8] See also Connolly (1991: 78) for further evidence of the placement in P1 position giving rise to subject-verb inversion in English.

[9] Presumably because the grammatico-semantic connexion between verb and satellite is too tenuous to "attract" the verb into second position. Nonetheless, João Costa (p.c.) suggests to me that it would be prudent to test for the possibility that it might be the type of verb (here unergative) rather than the nature of the preposed PP itself as such, which rules out the inversion here. However, if we take an unaccusative verb in place of the unergative one (*gagner*), the result is little better:?*Selon mon frère, sont arrivés une dizaine de garçons* 'According to my brother, have arrived about ten boys'. It would seem, then, that it is clearly the level 3 (and not argument, level 1 or level 2) status of the preposed adverbial phrase, and not the nature of the verb *per se*, which is at issue here. If we replace the level 3 adverbial here by a level 2 one, the result is acceptable: *Avec une heure de retard, sont arrivés une dizaine de garçons* 'With an hour's delay, have arrived about ten boys'.

[10] (6e) is pragmatically odd, since there is no (obvious) predicate with which the verb *couler* 'to flow' could contrast, occurring as it does in end-focus position: after all, 'flowing' is the only normal thing which rivers can do.

[11] For exceptions to the intransitive condition concerning French, see Korzen (1996) and Hobaek Haff (2000). João Costa points out to me that locative inversion and the inversion one finds with transitive verbs in the Romance languages other than French, are two different phenomena, with distinct properties.

[12] For an in-depth study of this type of verb in English, see Levin & Rappaport-Hovav (1995).

[13] It is exactly this situation which characterizes the possibility of inversion of subject and verb in the locative inversion construction in the Bantu language Chichewa, according to Bresnan & Kanerva (1989).

[14] Christian Molinier (p.c.) points out that in the following pair of examples with the verb *travailler* 'work', subject-verb order, as in (i), can easily be interpreted as bearing an actualised temporal value (where the people involved are actually at work at the time of utterance). The felicity of the progressive aspect in the English gloss reflects this interpretation. However, such an interpretation is ruled out in the case of (ii), which manifests verb-subject order. Here, only the "habitual" interpretation seems possible. This factor is no doubt closely connected to the need for preposed verbs in this construction to be semantically light, and non-predicating:

(i)   *Dans ce bureau quatre personnes travaillent*. 'In this office four people work/are working'
(ii)   *Dans ce bureau travaillent quatre personnes* 'In this office ?work/#are working four people' (cf. (7h´) in the text).

[15] What Korzen (1996) calls "the predicative unit".

[16] In this respect, lexical subject-full verb inversion is clearly distinct from pronominal subject-auxiliary or -verb inversion - as in French interrogative structures, for example.

[17] Thanks are due to Maria Nella Carminati for having helped me with these translations.

[18] Unergative and transitive verbs, as well as some unaccusative verbs, according to Pinto.

[19] A *thetic utterance* is the use of a clause which presupposes no particular prior context, and in which no constituent is singled out for special treatment in pragmatic terms – the entire clause being in Focus. See the European Portuguese examples (9a,b). An English example is (15) in section 4 below.

[20] Costa (2001a: n.4, p. 8) points out that the data involving verbs which do not agree in number with their postposed subject would not be acceptable by normative grammars of Portuguese, despite the fact that such forms are "quite often" produced spontaneously by speakers. He also points out (p.c.) that when native speakers see such utterances written down, they often experience a (mild) shock, even though such forms would pass unnoticed in their spoken realization.

[21] The abbreviations used in the glosses for the examples from now on are as follows: ABS = absolute; ACC = accusative case; ADVR = adverbialiser; ALL = allative case; COM = comitative; D1 = 1st person demonstrative (i.e. "proximal"); DEF = definite article; F = feminine; GEN = genitive case; IMPF = imperfective; INDIC = indicative; LOC = locative; M = masculine; NEG = negation; NEUT = neuter; NOM = nominative case; PAR = partitive; PART = participle; PAS = past tense; PASS = passive; PERF = perfective; PL = plural; POSS = possessive; PRES = present tense; PROG = progressive aspect; 1 = 1st person; 3 = 3rd person; REFL = reflexive; SG = singular.

[22] I thank Gerd Jendraschek for having translated these examples, in conjunction with a native speaker.

[23] Thanks go to Gerd Jendraschek for this information.

[24] A situation which can arise when an adverbial or a direct/indirect object is placed between subject and verb.

[25] This sub-section is essentially composed from information kindly provided by Joseph van den Reysen, Ahmed Moutaouakil and Albert Abi Aad, and derived from Moutaouakil (1984), (1989).

[26] An aspectual operator or even 'past time adverbial', according to Abi Aad (p.c.): see the examples (7a´´´´-d´´´´) and (7f´´´´´-g´´´´´) below.

[27] The fact that *zaydun* is a focused subject in (12b) accounts for the tension caused by its being placed in P0, according to Moutaouakil; this would also be the case if the subject term were topic.

[28] My thanks are due to Joseph van den Reysen and Albert Abi Aad for having translated these examples.

[29] The authors define this as "any set defined by a transitive partial ordering relation R such that R is either reflexive and antisymmetric, or irreflexive and asymmetric" (1998: 17).

[30] In fact, in the case of the choice of a level 2 locative or temporal satellite, it would seem that there are two possible positions for such a form type to occupy: either P1 (as for level 1 satellites), in which case the verb will follow without interruption (see example (4a) in §2.1), or P2, in which case it will have a "Theme"-type value (in the standard FG sense) and not a "(Sub-)Topic" one (see example (4b)). In such a situation, the verb will not need to follow the satellite immediately, and the subject term can then occupy P1 - not as Topic, but as Focus.

[31] An identical situation obtains with preposed unaccusative verbs in the Bergamasco dialect of northern Italy, according to M-N. Carminati (p.c.), as already noted.

[32] Examples (7b´´´´), (7e´´´´´) and (7h´´´´´), the first two containing an unaccusative verb, and the last, an unergative one.

[33] The co-indices here indicate the identity of the intended referents, and the crosshatch, the pragmatically defective character of the example as a potential utterance.

[34] Connolly (1991:68), and p.c., regards sentences such as (25a) as containing two syntactic subjects: an 'anticipatory subject' (*there*) and a 'subject-proper' (*a charming cottage*) which represents the underlying subject in the FG sense. This would appear to correspond exactly to the traditional distinction between "apparent subject" and "real subject". However, an immediate objection which may be raised against this analysis is this: how can a given verb be said to have two subjects? A solution to this question would appear to be available within the FG framework, however, as follows: given the essential distinction drawn within this framework between "function" and "position" (part of the "formal" properties of a term bearing a given function), we might then say that the "subject" function is, under certain circumstances - namely, where a "dummy" expletive occurs in the clause, within impersonal constructions of the kind examined here -, able to be "shared" between distinct constituents. Where, for example, a lexically-filled term is called upon to perform a pragmatic function other than the one it carries by default (here that of Presentational Focus for subject terms), then part of the properties associated with this function may be borne by a dummy expletive (position associated with subject function; case marking and, according to the language, determination of an agreement marking on the verb), and part by the lexically-specified term occurring in P0 or P4 position. This would then explain the absence of certain typical subject properties in the postposed "subject" term, as discussed in this section. In terms of the extended template given under (14) in the text, English *there* and French *il* would occupy the S position to the left of V.

[35] In fact, internal argument, since it is made a "chômeur" by the unexpressed expletive which fulfils the subject function in this case.

[36] Position to the right and not the left of the verb, possible absence of agreement in number expressed by the verb, impossibility of controlling the reference of the unexpressed subject of a non-finite subordinate clause, etc.

References

Birner, Betty J.
   1994   Information status and word order: an analysis of English inversion. *Language* 70(2): 233-259.
Birner, Betty J. & Gregory Ward
   1998   *Information Status and Noncanonical Word Order in English*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Blinkenberg, Andreas
   1928   *L'ordre des mots en français contemporain*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
Borillo, Andrée
   1990   À propos de la localisation spatiale. *Langue Française* 86: 75-84.
   2000   Le complément locatif et le genre descriptif. In *Studia linguistica in honorem Lilianae Tasmowski*, Martine Coene, Walter de Mulder, Patrick Dendale & Yves d'Hulst (eds.), 85-95. Padua: Unipress.
Bresnan, Joan & J. M. Kanerva
   1989   Locative inversion in Chichewa: a case study of factorization in grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20 (1): 1-50.
Carminati, Maria Nella
   2001   The processing of Italian subject pronouns. Ph. D. diss., Department of Linguistics, University of Massachusetts.
Connolly, John H.
   1991   *Constituent Order in Functional Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Corbett, Greville G.
   2001   Principles of the SMG agreement data-base draft of 30 November 2001. University of Surrey, UK (MS: 1-24).
Cornish, Francis
   2001   L'inversion "locative" en français, italien et anglais: propriétés syntaxiques, sémantiques et discursives. *Cahiers de Grammaire* 26: 101-123.
   2002   "Downstream" effects on the predicate in Functional Grammar clause derivations. *Journal of Linguistics* 38(2): 247-278.
   fc   "Focus of attention" in discourse: a comparison between the Four FG Topic functions and the systems of Focus and Deixis in the Columbia School of Linguistics. In Mackenzie & Gómez-González (eds.), 117-150.
Costa, João
   2001a   Postverbal subjects and agreement in unaccusative contexts in European Portuguese. *The Linguistic Review* 18: 1-17.
   2001b   Marked and unmarked inversion and Optimality Theory. In *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*, A.C.J. Hulk & Jean-Yves Pollock (eds.), 91-106. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Dahlgren, S-O.
   1988   Word order in Arabic. *Acta Universitatis Gothenburgensis*, Götheburg.
Dik, Simon C.
   1997   *The Theory of Functional Grammar 1: the structure of the clause*, 2nd, revised edition, edited by Kees Hengeveld. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Erteschik-Shir, Nomi
   1997   *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fournier, Nathalie
   1997   La place du sujet nominal dans les phrases à complément prépositionnel initial. In *La place du sujet en français contemporain*, Catherine Fuchs (ed.), 97-132. Louvain-la-neuve: Duculot.
   2001   Expression et place des constituants dans l'énoncé en français classique: la relation sujet-verbe et la relation verbe-objet. *Langue Française* 130: 89-107.
Fournier, Nathalie & Catherine Fuchs

2002   Les énoncés à complément prépositionnel initial et à sujet nominal postposé. Talk given at the
            LATTICE Seminar *Les expressions introductrices de cadres de discours et leur portée*,
            Université de Paris III, February 1st, 2002.
Givón, Talmy
1988   The pragmatics of word order: Predictability, importance and attention. In *Studies in Syntactic
            Typology*, M. Hammond, Edith A. Moravcsik & Jessica Wirth (eds.), 243-284. Amsterdam:
            John Benjamins.
Hannay, Mike
1991   Pragmatic function assignment and word order variation in a functional grammar of English.
            Journal of Pragmatics 16: 131-155.
Hengeveld, Kees
fc.a   The architecture of a Functional Discourse Grammar. In Mackenzie & Gómez-González (eds).
fc.b   Epilogue. In Mackenzie & Gómez-González (eds).

Herring, Susan C. & J.C. Paolillo
1995   Focus position in SOV languages. In *Word Order in Discourse*, Pamela Downing & Michael
            Noonan (eds.), 163-198. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Hobaek Haff, M.
2000   Regard sur l'inversion du sujet en français moderne. *Revue Romane* 35 (1): 21-32.
Huffman, Alan
2002   Cognitive and semiotic modes of explanation in functional grammar. In *Signal, Meaning and
            Message: perspectives on sign-based linguistics*, Ricardo O. Otheguy, Wallis Reid & Nancy
            Stern (eds.), 311-337. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Korzen, Hanna
1996   L'unité prédicative et la place du sujet dans les constructions inversées. *Langue Française*
            111: 59-82.
Lambrecht, Knud
1994   *Information Structure and Sentence Form: topic, focus, and the mental representations of
            discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lazard, Gilbert
1994   *L'actance*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav
1995   Chap. 6: The problem of locative inversion. In *Unaccusativity: at the syntax-lexical semantics
            interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Mackenzie, J. Lachlan & Gómez-González, Maria Angeles (eds.)
fc.   *A New Architecture for Functional Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Moutaouakil, Ahmed
1984   Le focus en arabe: vers une analyse fonctionnelle. *Lingua* 64: 115-176.
1989   *Pragmatic Functions in a Functional Grammar of Arabic*. Dordrecht & Providence: Foris.
Nølke, Henning
1995   Utterance focus: elements of a modular theory. *Copenhagen Studies in Linguistics* 18:74-108.
Ono, Noriko
2001   On the interaction between lexical and constructional meanings. In *Proceedings of the First
            International Workshop on Generative Approaches to the Lexicon*, Pierrette Bouillon & K.
            Kanzaki (eds.). École de Traduction et d'Interprétation, Université de Genève, 26-28 April
            2001.
Perlmutter, David M.
1983   Personal vs. impersonal constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1: 141-200.
Pinto, Manuela
1997   Licensing and interpretation of inverted subjects in Italian. Ph. D. diss., University of Utrecht,
            LED.
Pustejovsky, James
1995   *The Generative Lexicon*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Siewierska, Anna
1998   Polish main clause constituent order and FG pragmatic functions. In *Functional Grammar and
            Verbal Interaction*, Mike Hannay & A. Machtelt Bolkestein (eds.), 243-266. Amsterdam: John
            Benjamins.

Stanchev, S.B.
   1997   Pragmatic functions and special sentence position in Bulgarian. In *Discourse and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar*, John H. Connolly, Roel M. Vismans, Christopher S. Butler & Richard A. Gatward (eds.), 121-135. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.