

INVERSION IN FRENCH: A CARTOGRAPHIC APPROACH

KAREN LAHOUSSE (KULEUVEN)

0. Intro. In this talk we will provide a new cartographic approach for postverbal subjects (Ss) in French stylistic inversion (SI) (1a). We will first argue against Kayne and Pollock's (2001) (K&P) analysis, in which the postverbal S is in a high left-peripheral position, and IP is moved past it through remnant movement. We will then propose a new analysis in line with Belletti (2004).

1. The postverbal S is not in Rizzi's (1997) left periphery. 1.1. From the fact that indefinites as *quelqu'un* 'somebody' appear neither in a left-dislocated (2a) nor in the postverbal subject position (2b), K&P conclude that postverbal Ss in SI are in the same left-peripheral position as left-dislocated constituents. We will however show that the ungrammaticality of (2b) does not reduce to that of (2a), but is due to an independent constraint on postverbal Ss in interrogatives. This is corroborated by the fact that such indefinites are attested in postverbal position in other contexts for SI, e.g. relatives (3). **1.2.** Since standard cases of SI (1a) do not have the contrastive/corrective intonation and interpretation typically associated with the left-peripheral focus position (a.o. Rizzi 1997, Belletti 2004), there is no reason to assume that SI involves a left-peripheral Focus position. **2. The verb phrase does not undergo remnant movement. 2.1.** K&P's claim that the whole IP moves in SI, is mainly based on the distribution of quantitative *en*, which, they argue, must be extracted to a position c-commanding its original position. From the unacceptability of (4), they conclude that *en* does not c-command the postverbal S and has been moved as part of a larger constituent. We will however argue that extraction of *en* out of postverbal Ss in SI is not banned for structural reasons, because in this case attested examples such as (5) would be unexpected. **2.2.** The fact that the postverbal S in SI can be followed by other complements (6), is a further indication that no remnant movement of TP took place (see Belletti 2004 for similar arguments for Italian). **2.3.** If IP undergoes remnant movement, it is predicted that all elements that appear between the auxiliary and the past participle in SV word order, also do in SI. This is not borne out: floating quantifier *tous*, which occurs between the auxiliary and the past participle in SV word order (7a), cannot occur there in SI (7b) (Sportiche 1988, Déprez 1988/1990, Valois & Dupuis 1992, de Wind 1995). **3. Our proposal.** We will argue that the postverbal S in SI is low in the clause structure: it is not in its original VP-internal position, which would be incompatible with a cartographic approach, but in an IP-internal Focus or Topic position independently argued for by Belletti (2004). **Arguments: 3.1.** Just as in Italian (Belletti 2001/2004, Cardinaletti 2001), the postverbal S in SI follows low adverbs (Cinque 1999) (8), which is an indication of its IP-internal position. **3.2.** With respect to floating quantifiers, we will argue in favor of Doetjes' (1992) analysis, according to which these elements are in an adverbial position and bind a trace in argument position. Given this, and assuming standard Relativized Minimality, the ungrammaticality of (7b) is predicted under our hypothesis: in the structure (7c), the binding relation between *tous* in AdvP and the trace in SpecVP is blocked by the intervening *les linguistes*, which is in a low IP-internal Foc-position. **3.3. The interpretation of the postverbal subject. 3.3.1.** It is well-known that inversion in French, except in cases of 'elaborative VS' (Marandin 2001) or 'focus VS' (Lahousse 2006), must be licensed by the presence of some type of preverbal element. In line with Lahousse (2003/2010/2011), we will first show that this element

- (i) must have topic-like properties or be a (temporal or event-)operator, as in locative inversion, relative clauses (1a), or in embedded clauses derived through operator-movement (Haegeman 2007, Haegeman & Ürögdi 2011), or
- (ii) have focal properties, as in interrogatives (6b) or instances of focus-preposing (9a), which have not often been mentioned in analyses of SI.

The relevance of the distinction between these two sets of contexts is independently confirmed by the fact that, in the contexts in (ii) but not in those in (i), inversion is obligatory. VS word order indeed alternates with SV word order in the contexts in (i), as in relatives (1b), but *not* in the contexts in (ii), e.g. in instances of focus-preposing (9b) and interrogatives (10). **3.3.2.** On the basis of question-answer tests, we will show that the postverbal S in the contexts in (i) above has a

(non-contrastive) focus interpretation (11), whereas the postverbal S in the contexts in (ii) above is not interpreted as the focus of the sentence (12b) but as part of the background of the initial focus (12a). **3.3.3.** We will conclude from this that postverbal subjects in the (i)-contexts are in Belletti's (2004) IP-internal Focus position, whereas those in the (ii)-contexts are in Belletti's (2004) IP-internal Topic position. **4. Postverbal subjects in French vs. Italian.** The consequence of our proposal is that postverbal Ss are in the same IP-internal positions in both French and Italian. In order to account for the different distribution of postverbal subjects in both languages, we will argue, in line with traditional accounts and Belletti (2004), that this is due to the fact that in pro-drop languages like Italian, expletive pro can fill the preverbal subject position. In French, expletive pro is not available, and the Subject Criterion (Rizzi 2003) has to be satisfied in another way. In line with Rizzi & Shlonsky's (2006) analysis of locative inversion in English, we will argue that the left-peripheral elements in the contexts in (i) and (ii) satisfy the Subject Criterion *indirectly*, by rendering Fin nominal. According to Rizzi & Shlonsky (2006), nominal Fin can be directly merged on top of the Subj layer and satisfy the Subject Criterion when no preverbal subject is present. The locative element moves to Spec,Fin to value the Loc feature, and, since Fin is no criterial position, must move further to a Top, Q or Foc position in the left periphery.

- (1) a. *l'homme à qui a téléphoné ton ami*
lit. The man to who have telephoned your friend (K&P 2001: 107)
b. *l'homme à qui ton ami a téléphoné*
- (2) a. **Quelqu'un, il mangera ce gâteau.* lit. Someone, he will eat that cake.
b. **Quel gâteau a mangé quelqu'un?* lit. Which cake has eaten someone?
- (3) *L'air que fredonnait quelqu'un m'a soudain rappelé mon enfance.* (Kampers-Manhe et al. 2004)
lit. The tune that was humming a passer-by reminded me of my youth.
- (4) **le jour où en ont téléphoné trois* lit. The day when EN have telephoned three (K&P 2001)
- (5) *Il priait éperdument. À chaque prière en succédait une autre, plus ardente* (Yourcenar)
lit. He prayed passionately. To each prayer EN followed another one, more passionate.
- (6) a. *le livre que veut conseiller mon professeur aux étudiants* (Marandin 2001)
lit. the book that wants to recommend my professor to the students
b. *Que dira Pierre à Micheline?* lit. What will say Peter to Micheline? (Korzen 1983)
- (7) a. *L'homme à qui les linguistes ont tous parlé, c'est Jean.*
lit. The man to whom the linguists have all spoken, it is John.
b. **L'homme à qui ont tous parlé les linguistes, c'est Jean* (Hulk & Pollock 2001: 8)
lit. the man to whom have all spoken the linguists, it is John
c. * $[_{CP} \text{ à qui } [_I \text{ ont } [_{AdvP} \text{ tous } [_{parlé} [_{SpecFocP} \text{ les linguistes } [_{SpecVP} t]]]]]]$
- (8) *la tâche qu'ont bien fait les étudiants *bien*
the task that have well done the students well [ex. to be read with neutral interpretation]
- (9) a. *Il [Alexandre] écrivait avec une sorte de distraction concentrée, comme on crayonne sur le bloc du téléphone: on écoute de moins en moins et c'est le dessin qui s'impose. AINSI écrivait Alexandre (...)* (Pennac)
b. [same context as (9a)] ... **AINSI Alexandre écrivait.*
- (10) a. *Quand sont venus Pierre et Paul?* lit. When came Peter and Paul ?
b. **Quand Pierre et Paul sont venus?* lit. When Peter and Paul came ?
- (11) - *Qui a écrit ce livre?* lit. Who wrote this book ?
- *C'est le livre qu'a écrit Proust.* lit. It's the book that wrote Proust.
- (12) [Question to be asked in the context in (9)]
a. - *Comment écrivait Alexandre?* lit. How did Alexander write?
- *AINSI écrivait Alexandre.* lit. SO/IN THIS WAY wrote Alexander.
b. - *Qui écrivait ainsi?* lit. Who wrote in this way?
- # *AINSI écrivait Alexandre.* lit. SO/IN THIS WAY wrote Alexander.

Selected references. Belletti, A. 2004. "Aspects of the low IP area". In L. Rizzi (2004), 16-51. / Haegeman, L. 2007. Operator movement and topicalisation in adverbial clauses, *Folia Linguistica* 41-3/4: 279–325. / Haegeman, L. & Ürögdi, B. 2011. Referential CPs and DPs: An operator movement account. *Theoretical Linguistics*.