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5. Stylistic Inversion
On subjects and complementizers in French

0. Introduction

In previous chapters, we have shown that a diverse set of subject-object asymmetries can uniformly be analyzed in terms of economy. Contrary to object or adjunct operators, subject operators can be licensed in, or extracted from SpecIP. Consequently, the presence of CP is dispreferred for reasons of economy, and extended projections containing a subject operator will often be realized as IP. In this chapter, it will be argued that for similar reasons, the French subject, which normally appears in preverbal position, can appear in postverbal position in specific syntactic contexts.

French is an SVO language. Nevertheless, in Stylistic Inversion, subjects appear in postverbal position. Consider the examples in (1). Sentence (1a) exhibits the standard SVO order. The grammaticality of (1a) contrasts with the ungrammaticality of (1b), in which the subject is in postverbal position. However, the grammaticality of (1c) shows that we should not conclude that subjects are banned from postverbal position altogether. As long as some other constituent precedes the verbal cluster, like the interrogative adverb où in (1c), inversion is acceptable. In other words, the generalization in (2) holds for French.

(1)  
   a. Mon ami est allé à New York pour trouver la paix.  
      my friend is gone to New York for find the peace  
      ‘My friend has gone to New York to have some peace and quiet.’
   c. Où est allé votre ami pour trouver la paix?  (Kayne, 1972)  
      where is gone your friend for find the peace  
      ‘Where has your friend gone to find some peace and quiet?’

(2)  
   Generalization: the verbal cluster must be preceded by an XP.¹

¹ Note that no preverbal element is present in the following examples, taken from Jonare (1976):
   (i)  
      a. Arrivaient, enlacés, le choeur hystérique des mouettes, le craquement de mâts,  
         arrived entwined the choir hysterical of-the sea-gulls the creaking of masts  
         l’accent des voix méridionales.  
         the-accent of voices southern  
         ‘A hysterical choir of sea-gulls, entwined with the creaking of masts and voices with southern accents, swelled’
      b. Suit un article d’une rare violence contre la guerre au Vietnam qui, en posant  
         follows an article of-a rare violence against the war in Vietnam qui en asking  
         des questions sur les mouvements de troupes et d’avions, dévoile en passant  
         INDEF questions on the movements of troops and of-airplanes uncovers in passing  
         quelques secrets militaires.  
         several secrets military  
         ‘Here follows an extraordinarily hostile article against the Vietnam war which, in passing, uncovers several military secrets because it asks questions about the movements of troops and airplanes.’
The examples in (3)-(5) reinforce this generalization in several respects. First of all, they show that it holds not only in interrogative main clauses, but also in declarative main clauses, exclamative clauses, and a variety of subordinate clauses. Second, XP may be of any category as long as it is not verbal (NP in (1a), (4), (5a); AdvP in (1c), (3b), (5c); PP in (3a), (3c), (and (5b)); AP in (3d)). Third, the syntactic function of XP is not restricted. Not only adjuncts (e.g. (1c), (3a-b), (5c)), but also direct objects (e.g. (4), (5a)), indirect objects (e.g. (3c) and (5b)), small clause predicates (e.g. (3d)), and of course subjects (e.g. (1a)) may be fronted in accordance with (2).

(3)  *Declarative clauses (Jonare, 1976):*
   a. Dans les deux années qui suivent, se développent les tendances in the two years qui follow REFL develop the tendencies sexuelles normales.
   sexual normal
   ‘In the following years, normal sexual tendencies develop.’
   b. Tout récemment sont apparues les éditions comportant le texte all recently are appeared the editions containing the text allemand et la traduction française.
   German and the translation French
   ‘Very recently, the editions containing the German text and the French translation have appeared.’
   c. A la diversité géographique correspond la diversité des crus.
   to the diversity geographic corresponds the diversity of-the wines
   ‘The diversity of wines corresponds to the geographic diversity.’
   d. Tout autre fut la réaction de Laurence.
   all different was the reaction of Laurence
   ‘Laurence’s reaction was totally different.’

(4)  *Exclamative clause (Kayne, 1972):*
   Quels beaux visages ont ces jeunes femmes!
   what pretty faces have these young women
   ‘What pretty faces these young women have!’

These and similar sentences can be used in a very limited number of contexts. The proposition they denote is firmly located in the discourse (which might suggest that the XP should be identified with an empty localizing element; see Pinto, 1997, for an analysis of subject-verb inversion in Italian along these lines), and the subject is often (but not necessarily) considerably heavier than in examples with XP-preposing: it often (but not necessarily) contains a coordination or it is modified by a long relative clause. We will ignore these examples here.
Subordinate clauses:

a. J'aime les villes que traversent les fleuves. (Fuchs, 1997b)
   I love the cities that flow through the rivers.
   'I love cities through which rivers flow.'

b. Avec qui croit-elle qu'a soupe Marie? (Kayne & Pollock, 1978)
   with whom thinks-she that-has dined Marie
   'Who does she think Marie dined with?'

c. Je me demande quand partira ton ami. (Kayne & Pollock, 1978)
   I wonder when your friend will leave.

The main claim in this chapter will be that Stylistic Inversion should be analyzed as IP in all clause types. This allows us to account for the general properties of this construction, as well as for the properties that are specific for the clause type it appears in. The chapter consists of the parts. The first part, a revision of Dekkers (1997), is devoted to interrogative and declarative main clauses. Differences between Stylistic Inversion in these two clause types will be reduced to distinct motivations for the movement operations that have applied. In the second part of the chapter, we will examine Stylistic Inversion in subordinate clauses.

Examples like (5a-b) seem to be incompatible with an IP analysis because they contain the complementizer que. However, this incompatibility is only apparent if the clitic status of que in these examples is taken into consideration.

1. Stylistic Inversion in interrogative and declarative main clauses

In this part of the chapter, we will focus on declarative and interrogative main clauses. It will be shown in section 1.1 that French interrogatives can be formed in several ways, and that this optionality partially disappears when the wh-element is a sentential adverb. The three types of interrogative clauses we will be focusing on (Stylistic Inversion, Complex Inversion, and a construction containing est-ce que) each have a declarative counterpart. However, these three constructions turn out not to have the same distribution in the two sentence types. An analysis of French interrogatives will be presented in section 1.2. Finally, in section 1.3, it will be argued that inversion is only licit in declarative clauses if the subject is focused. In interrogative clauses, on the other hand, no such requirement has to be met.

1.1. Optionality

The French interrogative clause is characterized by a high degree of optionality. Next to Stylistic Inversion, it is possible, in standard French, to parse the subject in preverbal position, provided that either a subject clitic or the interrogative complementizer est-ce que is inserted. This is shown in (6):

More generally, the interrogative clause has many variants, some of which can be attributed to sociolinguistic variation. Here, we will make a distinction between standard and colloquial French. For all practical purposes, this distinction suffices, although matters are undoubtedly more subtle than this. Stylistic Inversion and Complex Inversion clearly belong to standard French. Hulk (1996) points out that the est-ce que construction is found in standard and, in particular, in
(6) a. **Stylistic Inversion:**

Où est allé votre ami pour trouver la paix?

'Where has your friend gone to find some peace and quiet?'

b. **Est-ce que construction:**

Où est-ce que votre ami est allé pour trouver la paix?

'Where has your friend gone to find some peace and quiet?'

c. **Complex Inversion:**

Où votre ami est-il allé pour trouver la paix?

'Where has your friend gone to find some peace and quiet?'

One problem we run into is the fact that the optionality in (6) partially disappears when the sentential *why*-adverb *pourquoi* introduces the clause, as in (7). *Pourquoi* does not license Stylistic Inversion.

(7) a. *Pourquoi est venu Jean?*

'Why did Jean come?'

b. *Pourquoi Jean est-il venu?*

c. *Pourquoi est-ce que Jean est venu?*

A similar observation can be made for declaratives. Just like *pourquoi*, sentential adverbs like *peut-être* and *sans doute* are successfully used in Complex Inversion and the construction containing an overt complementizer (which is *que* in declaratives), but not in Stylistic Inversion. This is shown in (8).

(8) a. *Peut-être/sans doute sont comme cela toutes les femmes.*

'Maybe/probably all women are like that.'

b. *Peut-être/sans doute que toutes les femmes sont comme cela.*

'Maybe/probably all women are like that.'

c. *Peut-être/sans doute toutes les femmes sont-elles comme cela.*

'Maybe/probably all women are like that.'

However, when we substitute a VP adverb (e.g. an adverb of time or place) for *peut-être*, as in (9), only Stylistic Inversion is licit.

---

(i) a. Il est allé où?

'Where has he gone?'

b. Où il est allé?

'Where has he gone?'
(9) a. Tout récemment sont apparues les éditions comportant le texte allemand et la traduction française. 'Very recently, the editions containing the German text and the French translation have appeared.'

b. *Tout récemment que ces éditions sont apparues. 'Very recently, these editions have appeared.'

c. *Tout récemment ces éditions sont-elles apparues. 'Very recently, these editions have appeared.'

In sum, clause-initial adverbs allow either Complex Inversion and que-insertion (sentential adverbs) or Stylistic Inversion (VP adverbs) in declaratives. In this light, the adverb *ainsi* is exceptional, since it licenses both Stylistic Inversion and Complex Inversion. However, as Blinkenberg (1928) remarks, *ainsi* followed by Complex Inversion is interpreted as a sentential adverb, while it gets a manner interpretation when it licenses Stylistic Inversion. This difference is in accordance with what we have observed so far.

(10) Blinkenberg (1928):

a. *Sentential:*
  Ainsi, le malentendu s'explique-t-il. consequently the misunderstanding REFL-explains-t-CL(3SG-MASC) 'Consequently, the misunderstanding can be explained.'

b. *Manner:*
  Ainsi s'explique le malentendu. this-way REFL-explains the misunderstanding 'The misunderstanding can be explained this way.'

Notice that we wrongly predict that sentential *ainsi* can also appear in the que-construction. *Ainsi* as such may be followed by *que*, but whenever it is, the complex *ainsi que* functions as a conjunction. The fact that *ainsi* differs from an adverb like *peut-être* in this respect might be attributed to a blocking effect, resulting in an avoidance strategy whenever the sequence adverb-*que* is independently listed as a complex conjunction in the lexicon.

---

3 In general, the normal SVO-order is also available:

(i) a. Peut-être/sans doute, toutes les femmes sont comme cela. 'Maybe without doubt all the women are like that.'

b. Tout récemment, ces éditions sont apparues. 'Very recently, these editions have appeared.'

The objective of the present study is to discover in which contexts Stylistic Inversion, que-insertion or Complex Inversion are not available. Hence, we will disregard the examples in (i), although these should be explained in an overall analysis of adverb placement in French.
Petit Robert:
Ainsi qu'on vient de le dire,...
in that-we come of it say
'As we have just said, ...'

This hypothesis is corroborated by the behavior of the sentential adverb encore, which is also interpreted as a complex conjunction when combined with que. Again, an avoidance strategy seems to be used, with the result that only the option of Complex Inversion is available:

> a. Et encore les plus avertis doivent-ils penser (...).
> 'And still the most knowledgeable must think (...).'
> b. Encore que la révolution puisse fausser le caractère.
> 'Although revolutions may deform one's character.'

### 1.2. Stylistic Inversion in interrogative clauses

In this section, we will examine Stylistic Inversion in interrogative clauses in more detail, and propose that these clauses should be analyzed as IPs.

#### 1.2.1. Stylistic Inversion as IP

Stylistic Inversion is traditionally analyzed as involving *wh*-movement to SpecCP (or Comp), as in (13). Depending on the actual analysis, this movement licenses rightward movement of the subject (Kayne, 1972; Kayne & Pollock, 1978), the presence of an expletive pro in SpecIP (Deprez, 1990; Friedemann, 1997; Valois & Dupuis, 1992), or the absence of SpecIP altogether (De Wind, 1995):

> a. \( [\text{s} \subseteq [\text{ou}_j \text{L_s t_j est allé votre ami_j t_j pour trouver la paix}]] \)
> b. \( [\text{CP} [\text{ou}_j] [\text{IP pro_j est allé votre ami_j t_j pour trouver la paix}]] \)
> c. \( [\text{CP} [\text{ou}_j] [\text{IP C est allé votre ami_j t_j pour trouver la paix}]] \)

All these analyses are based on the idea that the absence of a preverbal subject is *indirectly* licensed by the presence of some other constituent in preverbal position:

> Hypothesis 1:
> The subject does not appear in SpecIP (the canonical subject position) because some other constituent has moved to SpecCP (Comp).

However, it seems more natural to relate the possibility of Stylistic Inversion to XP-preposing in a more direct way. Therefore, we will adopt the alternative hypothesis given in (15).
Hypothesis II:
The subject does not appear in SpecIP because some other constituent has moved to SpecIP.

According to (15), either the subject (e.g. mon ami in (1a)) or some other maximal projection (e.g. où in (1c)) must appear in SpecIP. This yields the structures in (16). Let us assume, following most work written after the introduction of the VP-internal subject hypothesis (Sportiche, 1988), that the postverbal subject in Stylistic Inversion is stranded in its base position inside the VP.4

(16) a. \[\text{IP [votre ami] est allé à New York pour trouver la paix}\]  
b. \[\text{IP [où] est allé votre ami pour trouver la paix}\]

It has often been proposed that non-subjects can appear in SpecIP (see, among others, Diesing, 1990; Holmberg, 1997; Hulk, 1993; Hulk & Van Kemenade 1993, 1995; Kroch, 1997; Santorini, 1991, 1995). An often-heard argument against such proposals is that SpecIP is a Case position, and is, therefore, not able to host operators. This argument does not hold in D&E. Operator features are in I. Therefore, operators can be licensed in SpecIP. We have shown in previous chapters that there are good reasons to assume that subjects can check their operator features in SpecIP. There are no principled reasons to assume that non-subjects could not also check their operator features in SpecIP. If a non-subject operator moves to SpecIP, the subject is forced to stay in its base position, and its formal features will move in isolation and adjoin to I. This is illustrated in the structures in (17), which correspond to those in (16). See chapter 2 for details on feature movement.

(17) a. \[\text{IP votre ami [i est] allé à New York pour trouver la paix]}\]  
b. \[\text{IP où [i FF(votre ami), i est] allé votre ami pour trouver la paix]}\]

As a first piece of evidence in favor of the IP status of Stylistic Inversion, let us consider the distribution of additional syntactic material such as adverbs and fronted complements in the preverbal domain in Stylistic Inversion clauses. The example in (18a) shows that (non-interrogative) complements can be fronted in interrogative clauses as long as these complements precede the subject in SpecIP. When the fronted complement follows the subject, as in (18b), the sentence is marginal. In other words, the fronted complement may not intervene between SpecIP (underlined) and the verb in I.

---

4 Although the assumption that the postverbal subject is parsed in its base-position inside VP is rather uncontroversial, the exact position of the subject within VP remains unclear. Some scholars (Deprez, 1990; Valois & Dupuis, 1992; De Wind, 1995, 1998) argue that subjects are in a left-branching SpecVP in Stylistic Inversion, whereas others (Friedemann, 1997; Roberts, 1993) hypothesize that this specifier branches to the right. Since both positions have their merits, and this issue is not immediately relevant here, we will leave it aside. Eventually, the choice between right-branching and left-branching specifier should follow from the prominence of alignment constraints (see McCarthy & Prince, 1993) requiring that SpecXP be aligned with the left or right edge of XP.
(18) a. Je me demande quel parti, de cette situation, Luc [i pourra] bien tirer.
   'I myself ask which party of this situation Luc can-FUT well pull'
   I wonder how Luc will be able to exploit this situation.'
   b. ??Je me demande quel parti Luc, de cette situation, [i pourra] bien tirer.

If fronted complements are not allowed to intervene between SpecIP and I in interrogative clauses, we predict that they should not be able to follow the \textit{wh}-phrase in Stylistic Inversion if hypothesis II is correct. According to this hypothesis, the \textit{wh}-phrase in Stylistic Inversion, like the subject in the SVO clauses in (18), occupies SpecIP. Hence, we predict that (19) is degraded on a par with (18b) because, again, the fronted complement intervenes between SpecIP and I. This prediction is borne out.

(19) ??Je me demande quel parti, de cette situation, [j pourra] bien tirer Luc.\textsuperscript{5}

Preverbal adverbs, on the other hand, have a more liberal syntactic behavior. The examples in (20) show that they may both precede SpecIP, and appear between SpecIP and I.

(20) a. l'endroit où, de temps en temps, mes amis [se sont] rencontrés
   'the place where my friends met from time to time'
   b. l'endroit où mes amis, de temps en temps, [se sont] rencontrés

All things being equal, this leads to the prediction that (21) should be grammatical on a par with (20b), since où in (21), like mes amis in (20b), occupies SpecIP according to hypothesis II. Also this prediction is borne out.\textsuperscript{6}

(21) l'endroit où, de temps en temps, [se sont] rencontrés mes amis

\textsuperscript{5} Note that if \textit{de cette situation} is not fronted, as in (i), the sentence is slightly marginal. This is due to (sometimes very subtle) restrictions on the postverbal domain in Stylistic Inversion.

(i) ??Je me demande quel parti pourra bien tirer Luc \textit{de cette situation}.
   The examples in (ii) show that judgments generally improve when the offensive postverbal material moves to the preverbal domain. If this carries over to (i) and (19), this would mean that topic fronting as such should improve judgments.

(ii) \textit{De Wind} (1995):
   a. *Quand a mangé la pomme Paul?
      when has eaten the apple Paul
      'When did Paul eat the apple?'
   a'. *Quand a mangé Paul la pomme?
   b. Qu'a mangé Paul?
      what has eaten Paul
      'What did Paul eat?'
   c. ??Quand les lira votre fils?
      when them read-FUT your son
      'When will your son read them?'

Although the pattern in (ii) itself is a central issue in any complete study of Stylistic Inversion, we will ignore it because our focus of investigation is on the preverbal domain. For possible analyses, see Deprez (1990), Friedemann (1997), Valois & Dupuis (1992), De Wind (1995, 1998), among others.

\textsuperscript{6} Note that this contradicts the observation by Deprez (1990) that nothing may intervene between the \textit{wh}-phrase and the verb in Stylistic Inversion.
In sum, the distribution of fronted complements and adverbs in (18)-(21) follows directly from hypothesis II, according to which preverbal subjects and preverbal constituents that trigger Stylistic Inversion both occupy SpecIP. If one adopts hypothesis I, on the other hand, the contrast between (18a) and (19) should receive an independent explanation. We will return to intervention effects in the preverbal domain in section 2.2 below.

1.2.2. Evaluating interrogative clauses

If the structures in (16) are correct, there should exist a constraint that requires that SpecIP be filled, either by a subject or by some other maximal projection. This constraint, EPP (Extended Projection Principle), is given in (22). In the eighties, this principle required that all clauses have a subject. However, in recent years, it has been proposed by several scholars (see Holmberg, 1997; Kroch, 1997) that EPP should receive a more general definition, along the lines of the one proposed here. Notice that (22) states that SpecIP must be filled with a category, rather than with phonological features. Hence, EPP can also be satisfied by empty elements, such as traces and deleted material. Evidence for this will be presented at several points in this chapter.

(22) EPP: SpecIP must contain a category.

The subject is one of many potential fillers of SpecIP. It is, however, a privileged one because when it moves to this position, it will be united with its Case features, and satisfy the constraint PARSE-Case given in (23a) (see chapter 2). Other relevant constraints are given in (23b-c). PARSE-\textit{w/z} forces interrogative phrases to move to their scope position, and the by now familiar STAY prohibits traces (see chapters 1-4).

(23) a. PARSE-Case: Pronounce constituents in the same position as their Case feature.
   b. PARSE-\textit{w/z}: Pronounce constituents in the same position as their \ [+wh] \ feature.
   c. STAY: Traces are prohibited.

Let us return now to the three-way optionality in (6), and let us assume that the corresponding structures are as given in (24). Two matters are important here. First, Stylistic Inversion is analyzed as IP, in accordance with hypothesis II given in (15). Second, clauses containing \textit{est-ce que} or a postverbal clitic are CPs. The fact that both the subject and the \textit{wh}-phrase are preverbal suggests that two specifiers are present, i.e. SpecIP and SpecCP. Let us make the provisory assumption that \textit{est-ce que} in (24b) occupies C, while the clitic in (24c) is adjoined to I (see De Wind, 1995). It must be underlined that any alternative view on Complex Inversion or the \textit{est-ce que} construction is compatible with the conclusions drawn in this chapter as long as it acknowledges that in these two constructions, the \textit{wh}-phrase occupies a higher specifier position than in Stylistic Inversion. We will briefly return to this issue below.
The structures in (24) suggest that there are two forces in play. On the one hand, French prefers not to leave the subject in postverbal position when an operator is moved to clause-initial position, while on the other, it does not want to deviate from its basic SVO order. This can be expressed in terms of the interaction of the constraints in (22)-(23). On the one hand, STAY prefers Stylistic Inversion, since EPP is satisfied by the wh-element which moves to clause-initial position for independent reasons, i.e., to satisfy PARSE-wh. On the other hand, PARSE-Case prefers Complex Inversion and the est-ce que construction, which both lead to an SVO order. The optionality of subject movement to SpecIP indicates that PARSE-Case and STAY are in a tie (see Drijkoningen, 1994, and De Wind, 1995, who draw similar conclusions in terms of feature strength), whereas the obligatoriness of wh-fronting (in standard French) and the impossibility of leaving SpecIP empty suggests that both PARSE-wh and EPP outrank STAY. This gives the ranking in (25).

(25) \{EPP, PARSE-wh\} » STAY \(\ll\) PARSE-Case

The evaluation of French interrogatives is given in tableau (26). It is correctly predicted that est-ce que is incompatible with inversion: structure (26g), containing an empty SpecIP, is ruled out by EPP, whereas the tie between PARSE-Case and STAY eliminates (26f), in which a constituent other than the subject or the wh-phrase occupies SpecIP, and (26h), in which SpecIP is filled by a wh-trace. Moreover, candidate (26a) is ruled out by EPP, and (26c-d) violate the high-ranked PARSE-wh. This leaves us with candidates (26b) (Stylistic Inversion), (26e) (est-ce que construction), and (26i) (Complex Inversion). All three of these candidates are optimal. Hence, they are correctly predicted to be optimal.

In tableau (26), EPP outranks PARSE-wh, for which there is only circumstantial evidence. Unlike standard French, which we are describing here, colloquial French allows wh-in-situ (see section 1.2.3 below as well as footnote 2). This means that in this variety of French, PARSE-wh is in a tie with STAY. At the same time, PARSE-Case outranks STAY, since Stylistic Inversion is not available. In short, colloquial French is characterized by one of the two rankings in (i). Standard French, on the other hand, corresponds to one of the two possible rankings in (ii). The assumption that varieties of one language are characterized by closely related constraint rankings adds some plausibility to the hypothesis that the colloquial French ranking is as given in (ia), and the standard French ranking as given in (iia), since these two rankings differ minimally from each other.

(i) Colloquial French:
   a. EPP » PARSE-Case » PARSE-wh » STAY
   b. PARSE-Case » EPP » PARSE-wh » STAY

(ii) Standard French:
    a. EPP » PARSE-wh » PARSE-Case » STAY
    b. PARSE-wh » EPP » PARSE-Case » STAY

In tableau (26), structures involving I-to-C movement are omitted because these are ruled out by STAY, which outranks OB-HD (see chapters 1, 3, 4). The low rank of OB-HD is confirmed by the fact that in (standard) French relative clauses, doubly filled Comps are banned (see chapter 3). On the assumption that Complex Inversion contains an empty C, OB-HD would prefer (26e) over (26i), despite of its low rank (notice that TEL is irrelevant because est-ce que, being an interrogative complementizer, is a meaningful element). In one way or another, the clitic is responsible for the fact that the wh-phrase is immediately adjacent to the preverbal subject in Complex Inversion. In the literature on Complex Inversion (see De Wind, 1995, for a particularly
What Complex Inversion and the *est-ce que* construction have in common is that they can both be traced back to Germanic-type inversion structures of older varieties of the language. *Est-ce que* stems from *c'est que*, which introduces cleft constructions. In *est-ce que*, the pronoun *ce* and the copula *est* are inverted. It has been proposed (see De Bakker, 1997, among others) that in the 14th/15th century, Complex Inversion arose from Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) structures in which the clitic and the inflected verb were inverted. A Modern French example of CLLD without inversion is given in (27).

(27) Mon ami, il est allé à New York pour trouver la paix.

In this light, it is not surprising that, like inverted structures in English, Complex Inversion and *est-ce que* do not appear in embedded interrogative clauses. Instead, SVO without clitic or *est-ce que* insertion is available next to Stylistic Inversion:

(28) a. Je me demande où est allé votre ami pour trouver la paix.
   I myself ask where is gone your friend for find the peace
   ‘I wonder where your friend has gone to have some peace and quiet.’

b. Je me demande où votre ami est allé pour trouver la paix.

c. *Je me demande où est-ce que votre ami est allé pour trouver la paix.\(^9\)

d. *Je me demande où votre ami est-il allé pour trouver la paix.

---

\(^9\) *Est-ce que* is not excluded from complement clauses in colloquial French. This can be considered the final stage in the reinterpretation of *est-ce que* as an interrogative complementizer. See Lefebvre (1982) for a study of this phenomenon in Quebec French.
The fact that Stylistic Inversion is found in both main and subordinate clauses means that if an IP analysis of this construction is on the right track, STAY and PARSE-Case must outrank PURE-EP. We have seen in chapters 3 and 4 that this constraint prohibits verb movement to the highest head of the subordinate clause. On the assumption that the embedded clause in (28a) is an IP, the verb has moved to the head of the clause, resulting in a violation of PURE-EP. This does not mean that violations of PURE-EP are allowed at any cost in French. It is not unlikely that the contrast between (28a-b) and (28c-d) is caused by I-to-C in older varieties of the language, which also leads to a violation of PURE-EP. If I-to-C movement is triggered by the need to realize heads (to satisfy OB-HD, see chapter 1), and V-to-I movement is motivated by the need to unite the verb with its tense features in I (to satisfy PARSE-T, see again chapter 1), the aforementioned contrast follows if PARSE-T outranks PURE-EP, and PURE-EP outranks OB-HD. The ungrammaticality of (28c-d) can thus be related to properties of older varieties of French (see also footnote 8).

1.2.3. Pourquoi

We observed in section 1.1 that the generalization in (2) is silent about the ungrammaticality of examples like (7a) and (8a), which illustrate that preverbal sentential adverbs do not license interrogative and declarative Stylistic Inversion. Given the analysis of Stylistic Inversion in interrogatives presented in the previous section, it seems that sentential adverbs are not allowed to appear in SpecIP. Rizzi (1990) argues that these adverbs are base-generated in a position from which they c-command the clause they modify (see also chapter 4). Let us identify the clause with IP, the smallest maximal projection containing both V and I, which are the two heads in the verbal extended projection that are endowed with features. In order to c-command IP, pourquoi must be inserted in SpecCP (or any higher specifier position in the functional domain of V). If so, it will not satisfy EPP, and Stylistic Inversion is illicit.

There are at least two other properties of pourquoi which follow from the assumption that it is base-generated in SpecCP. First, Rizzi (1990) observes that pourquoi is allowed to appear in weak island contexts, contrary to an w/z-adverb like comment. This is illustrated by the examples in (29). It is, in general, very difficult to have wh-adverbs in negative contexts (see chapter 4). Pourquoi, however, is not sensitive at all to the negation in (29), contrary to the aforementioned comment.

(29) a. Pourquoi n’a-t-il pas ouvert la porte?
why NEG-has-t-he NEG opened the door
‘Why didn’t he open the door?’
b. *Comment n’a-t-il pas ouvert la porte?
how NEG-has-t-he NEG opened the door
‘How didn’t he open the door?’

If pourquoi, contrary to comment, is base-generated in clause-initial position, the pattern in (29) follows, since comment moves across the negative island, whereas pourquoi does not. The example in (30) shows that comment licenses Stylistic Inversion. This follows immediately from the negative correlation we have
just established between the behavior of wh-elements in Stylistic Inversion on the one hand, and in weak island contexts on the other.

(30) Comment sont partis les étudiants?
how are left the students
"How did the students leave?"

Second, Rizzi (1990) remarks that pourquoi is not allowed to follow the verbal cluster in colloquial French. This is telling, since in this variety of French, wh-elements are generally allowed to be stranded in their base-position (see footnotes 2 and 7). Examples are given in (31). If pourquoi is base-generated in clause-initial position, it is simply misplaced in the postverbal position it occupies in (31b).

(31) a. Tu es allé où?
you are gone where
"Where did you go?"
b. *Tu es venu pourquoi?
you are come why
"Why did you come?"
c. Marie l'a tué comment?
Marie him-has killed how?
"How did Marie kill him?"

This analysis can be extended to yes-no questions. In chapter 1, we presented an analysis of English main clause interrogatives based on the idea that subject-auxiliary inversion only takes place in the presence of a wh-element in SpecCP. Thus, (32a) has the structure in (32b).

(32) a. Which books will he read?
b. \[CP which\books_{i} [_{C} will_{i}] [_{IP} he [i_{t} [_{VP} read \t_{i}]]]\n
Example (33a) shows that subject-auxiliary inversion also takes place in yes-no questions. If indeed inversion only occurs in the presence of some element in SpecCP, (33a) must be analyzed as in (33b). In this structure, a null operator occupies SpecCP.

(33) a. Will he read those books?
b. \[CP Op \[_{C} will_{i}] [IP he [i_{t} [_{VP} read \_those\books]]\]

It is not unlikely that this null operator must c-command IP because it questions the whole clause, just like pourquoi modifies the whole clause. If so, it will not be able to satisfy EPP. Hence, we predict that Stylistic Inversion is not found in yes-no questions. Example (34a) shows that this is borne out. Notice that est-ce que and Complex Inversion do appear in yes-no questions.

---

10 The judgments in (31) are based on reason pourquoi and instrumental comment. There is no consensus among informants on the examples involving purposive pourquoi and manner comment.
In sum, preverbal elements which question or modify the entire clause do not allow Stylistic Inversion. This follows if these elements are base-generated in a position from which they c-command IP, which leads to a violation of EPP if the subject does not move to SpecIP instead.

1.3. Stylistic Inversion in declarative clauses

We have observed in section 1.1 that preverbal adverbs in declarative clauses license either Complex Inversion and the que-construction or Stylistic Inversion. The relevant examples are repeated in (35)-(36).

(35) a. *Peut-être/sans doute sont comme cela toutes les femmes.
   b. Peut-être/sans doute que toutes les femmes sont comme cela.
   c. Peut-être/sans doute toutes les femmes sont-elles comme cela.

(36) a. Tout récemment sont apparues les éditions comportant le texte allemand et la traduction française.
   b. *Tout récemment que ces éditions sont apparues.
   c. *Tout récemment ces éditions sont-elles apparues.

The ungrammaticality of (35a) follows if peut-être and sans doute are base-generated in SpecCP, on a par with pourquoi and the yes-no operator. However, the ungrammaticality of (36b-c) is more mysterious, since the corresponding interrogative constructions are grammatical: whereas a wh-adverb like où may appear in all three constructions, tout récemment licenses only Stylistic Inversion. This raises the question of why there are no adverbs which are, like où, allowed to appear in all three declarative constructions like où does. In order to answer this question, we should wonder why tout récemment in (36) occupies its preverbal position in the first place.

1.3.1. A genuinely stylistic phenomenon

In interrogatives, the wh-element moves to clause-initial position to be united with its operator features, i.e., to satisfy PARSE-wh. The same might hold in declaratives. It could be that tout récemment has moved in (36a) to check a [+top] feature on I, leading to the satisfaction of PARSE-top. However, this would lead to the prediction that preverbal tout récemment either licenses all three constructions (if PARSE-top, on a par with PARSE-wh, outranks STAY, as in tableau (37)) or does
not raise at all (if STAY outranks PARSE-top, as in tableau (38)). Clearly, this is false. This means that declarative Stylistic Inversion is licensed in another way.

(37)

French

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>P-top</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>P-Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(38)

French

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>P-Case</th>
<th>P-top</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
<td>![]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the more traditional literature, it has often been observed that postverbal subjects in declaratives are focused and preferably heavy. Le Bidois (1952) identifies the postverbal subject with the psychological predicate of the clause. Fournier

The remarks made in footnote 8 with respect to tableau (26) also hold for the evaluations in tableaux (37), (38), (40), the only difference being that unlike est-ce que, que is not a meaningful element. As a result, pronunciation of que violates TEL (TEL prohibits pronunciation of syntactic units without semantic content, see chapter 3). If so, (37e) is also suboptimal. Maybe, examples like (35b) should be analyzed as in (ib), rather than as in (ia). In (ib), que toutes les femmes sont comme cela is contained in a subordinate clause, while peut-être belongs to a largely elided main clause, which can be paraphrased as in (ib'). This would mean that que cannot be deleted because deletion would lead to an unnecessary violation of LE(VP).

(i) a. [cp peut-être [que] [ip toutes les femmes sont comme cela]]
   b. [xp ... peut-être ... [cp [que] [ip toutes les femmes sont comme cela]]]
   b'. "It is possible that all women are like that."

Notice that a re-analysis along these lines does not affect the main conclusion drawn in this section (VP adverbs appear in Stylistic Inversion, but not in Complex Inversion or the que-construction because they only move to satisfy EPP).
(1997) notes that the postverbal is associated with the rheme of the clause. Baillard (1981) makes the more precise observation that the subject is the source of the unexpectedness brought about by the inversion. Let us, therefore, assume that declarative Stylistic Inversion is caused by properties of the postverbal subject rather than the preverbal element.

In chapter 2, we followed Grimshaw and Samek-Lodovici (1995), who argue that focused constituents are preferably parsed at the right edge of the clause. Whenever they are not, ALIGN-foc, repeated in (39), is violated (see also Broekhuis, 1998; Costa, 1996, 1997, 1998; Samek-Lodovici, 1996).

(39) ALIGN-foc: Align focused constituents with the right edge of the verbal extended projection.

ALIGN-foc outranks STAY (and PARSE-Case) because whenever a focused subject is stranded, some other constituent is fronted. EPP, on the other hand, outranks ALIGN-foc, with the result that empty specifiers of IP are avoided in any context (cf. footnote 1).

The evaluation of sentences containing a focused subject is given in tableau (40). This tableau expresses that in sentences like (36a), XP preposing takes place in order to satisfy EPP, so that the focused subject may remain in situ and satisfy the high-ranked ALIGN-foc. This entails that preposing never occurs in Complex Inversion (candidate (40g) = (36c)) or in the que-construction (candidate (40d) = (36b)), since in these constructions the subject has moved to SpecIP, with the result that XP-preposing has lost its purpose. The tableau further shows that que is incompatible with inversion because candidates (40e-f) are harmonically bound by candidate (40b). Candidates (40a) and (40c) are eliminated by EPP and ALIGN-foc, respectively. As a result, (40b) (= (36a)) is optimal, and therefore correctly predicted to be grammatical.

In sum, wh-movement prevents violations of both PARSE-wh and EPP, while the preverbal constituent that licenses Stylistic Inversion in declarative clauses only raises to clause-initial position to satisfy EPP. As a result, the postverbal subject must be focused in declarative clauses. If it is not, inversion leads to an unnecessary violation of PARSE-Case. This is shown in tableau (41), in which the subject is not focused. In this tableau, like in tableau (40), candidates (a) and (e)
incur a fatal violation of EPP. Unlike in tableau (40), however, all candidates vacuously satisfy ALIGN-foc. As a result, the tie between STAY and PARSE-Case plays a decisive role in the evaluation. Candidate (41c) (the SVO option without que or a clitic) is optimal because it is the only candidate that satisfies PARSE-Case and violates STAY once.

(41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>ALIGN-foc</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>PARSE-Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>![a]</td>
<td>![a]</td>
<td>![a]</td>
<td>![a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>![b]</td>
<td>![b]</td>
<td>![b]</td>
<td>![b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>![c]</td>
<td>![c]</td>
<td>![c]</td>
<td>![c]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>![d]</td>
<td>![d]</td>
<td>![d]</td>
<td>![d]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td>![e]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In interrogative clauses, on the other hand, subjects need not be focused to appear in postverbal position. In tableau (26), like in tableau (41), the subject is not marked with [+foc]. Unlike in tableau (41), however, candidate (b) (Stylistic Inversion) is optimal. This can be considered the source of the differences between inversion in interrogative and declarative clauses observed here.

1.3.2. Definite versus indefinite subjects

If ALIGN-foc is responsible for Stylistic Inversion in declaratives, we expect that in this sentence type, the postverbal subject may not be followed by any syntactic material. Declaratives should differ from interrogatives on this point, since ALIGN-foc does not play a role in interrogative Stylistic Inversion. The examples in (42) show that this prediction is borne out (see also (1c)).

(42)  a. Quand a dit Marie que Paul était malade? (Valois and Dupuis, 1992)  
      'When did Marie say that Paul was ill?'  
      b. *Cet après-midi a dit Marie que Paul était malade.  
         'This afternoon, Marie said that Paul was ill.'

The declarative pattern is also found in subjunctive contexts. In the French subjunctive clause, subjects may appear in postverbal position without there having to be an XP in preverbal position. This suggests that subjunctive inflection may license an empty (expletive) element that is visible to EPP, or that subjunctive inflection itself satisfies this constraint, a problem which we leave for further research. In this construction, postverbal subjects are also focused, as Kampers-Manhe (1998) reports, which means that they should never be followed by any
syntactic material, just like in (42b). This is exactly what Kampers-Manhe observes:

(43) Je veux que parte Paul (*aux Etats-Unis).
'I want that leave Paul to the United-States'

She further notes that this restriction only holds for definite subjects. The counterpart of (43) involving an indefinite postverbal subject is acceptable, as shown in (44).

(44) J'exige que soient distribués des/*ces prospectus par les enfants.
'I demand that be distributed INDEF/DEM prospectuses by the children'

The examples in (45) show that the same holds for Stylistic Inversion in declaratives:

(45) a. Dans ce musée figuraient de/*les précieux manuscrits
'avant la guerre.
'(The) precious manuscripts figured in this museum before the war.'

b. Durant l'hiver se sont présentés des/*les enfants affamés
'à nos portes.
'During the winter, (the) starving children showed up at our doors.'

This difference in syntactic behavior between definite and indefinite subjects follows if indefinites, unlike definites, can be assigned Case inside VP.\(^{12}\)

---

\(^{12}\) See Belletti (1988) and De Hoop (1992), among many others. Belletti argues that ergative verbs assign partitive Case to their complement if this complement is indefinite. In this context, we should note that although Stylistic Inversion in declaratives is usually attested in ergative contexts, it sometimes appears in unergative constructions. This is shown in (ia). The same holds for the impersonal construction in (ib), although such examples are not accepted by all speakers of French.

(i) a. Au coin de la cheminée dormait un petit chat blanc.
'on the corner of the mantlepiece slept a little cat white

'b. %Il dormait un petit chat blanc au coin de la cheminée.
EXPL slept a little cat white on the corner of the mantlepiece

Apparently, external arguments can also (marginally) be assigned Case within VP. See Hulk (1989) for an analysis of (ib) in terms of accusative Case assignment, which can be carried over to (ia). In many respects, declarative Stylistic Inversion containing an indefinite subject behaves like the impersonal construction (see Pollock, 1986). An exception is the possibility of extracting quantitative en from the postverbal NP, which is only possible in the expletive construction:

(ii) a. *Dans cette prison en ont été exécutés deux.
'in this prison of them have been executed two

'b. Il en a été exécuté deux.
EXPL of them has been executed two

'Two of them have been executed.'
result, as we will see in tableau (46) below, indefinite subjects need not be focused to appear in postverbal position. This means that ALIGN-foc is irrelevant, so that constituents should be allowed to follow the postverbal indefinite subject. The evaluation of sentences in which the subject is assigned Case inside VP is given in tableau (46). Candidates (46b-c) are optimal because they are the only representations which violate STAY only once and do not violate EPP. Hence, indefinite subjects may appear in postverbal position without being focused.\(^{13}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>P-Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. [[\text{IP} \otimes [V \ [\text{VP subj-def}] XP_i]]]</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. [[\text{IP} XP_i [V \ [\text{VP subj-def}] t_i]]]</td>
<td>(\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. [[\text{CP} XP_i [que] [\text{IP subj-def}] [V \ [\text{VP t_i} XP_i]]]</td>
<td>(\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. [[\text{CP} XP_i [que] [\text{IP} \otimes [V \ [\text{VP subj-def}] t_i]]]</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. [[\text{CP} XP_i [que] [\text{IP subj-def}] [V \ [\text{VP t_i} t_i]]]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>(\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. [[\text{CP} XP_i [que] [\text{IP} \otimes [V-cl \ [\text{VPVI}]] ]</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. [[\text{CP} XP_i [que] \ [\text{IP subj-def}] [V-cl \ [\text{VP t_i} t_i]]]</td>
<td>(\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that there is a link between the possibility of en-extraction and agreement. Whenever the postverbal NP agrees with the verb, its \(\varepsilon\)-features have moved to I for checking purposes. The absence of agreement in the impersonal construction indicates that such movement has not taken place. In this light, the impossibility of en-extraction in (ia) seems due to a freezing effect, since en is extracted from an element whose formal features undergo movement to the checking domain of I (see Kampers-Manhe, 1998, who argues that the impossibility of en-extraction in similar contexts can be reduced to a violation of Principle B of the Binding Theory).

Interrogative Stylistic Inversion does not depend on the rank of ALIGN-foc. Hence, the distribution of indefinite postverbal subject is not predicted to be more liberal than that of definite postverbal subjects in this clause type. Even the opposite is true. De Cornulier (1974) observes that postverbal indefinite subjects are only marginally available in interrogative Stylistic Inversion.

(i) a. Qui a mangé Pierre?
   what has eaten Pierre
   'What did Pierre eat?'
b. ?Qui a mangé quelqu’un?
   what has eaten someone
   'What did someone eat?'

Example (iib) illustrates that more in general, indefinites are marginal in interrogative Stylistic Inversion.

(ii) a. Qu’a dit Pierre à Jean-Jacques?
   what has said Pierre to Jean-Jacques
   'What did Pierre say to Jean-Jacques?'
b. ?Qu’a dit Pierre à quelqu’un?
   what has said Pierre to someone
   'What did Pierre say to someone?'

See De Cornulier (1974) for a semantic analysis of these facts which is compatible with our account of Stylistic Inversion. Notice that similar facts are found in, for instance, Dutch and English:

(iii) a. Wat heeft Piet gegeten?
   a’. What did Pete eat?
b. ?Wat heeft iemand gegeten?
   b’. What did someone eat?

(iv) a. Wat heeft Piet tegen Jan-Jaap gezegd?
   a’. What did Pete say to Jack?
b. ?Wat heeft Piet tegen iemand gezegd?
   b’. What did Pete say to someone?
In sum, the distribution of indefinite subjects is syntactically less constrained than that of definite subjects, which follows if indefinite subjects can get Case within VP, while their definite counterparts cannot.

2. Stylistic Inversion and complementizer pronunciation

In the previous section, we have argued that Stylistic Inversion clauses should be analyzed as IPs. This might lead us to expect that Stylistic Inversion is incompatible with the presence of a complementizer. This prediction is not borne out. In section 2.1, we will see that our analysis forces us to analyze complementizers in the context of Stylistic Inversion as clitics adjoined to I. It will be shown in section 2.2 that this accounts for several remarkable properties of Stylistic Inversion.

2.1. An economic construction

Consider the embedded interrogative clauses in (47). In accordance with the analysis presented above, the wh-phrase in (47a) cannot be in SpecCP because this would lead to a structure in which SpecIP is either empty or filled with an intermediate wh-trace.

(47)  a. (Je sais très bien) à quelle heure partira ce garçon. (Kayne, 1972)
       I know very well at which hour leave-FUT that boy
       'I know very well at what time that boy will leave.'

b. (Je sais très bien) à quelle heure ce garçon partira.

Tableau (48) shows that these CP structures (candidates (b)-(c)) are harmonically bound by the winning IP option (candidate (a)). The third CP option, candidate (48d), is grammatical, on the other hand because the subject has been moved to SpecIP, preventing a violation of EPP and PARSE-Case. This goes at the expense of an additional violation of STAY. However, this violation is innocent, since STAY is in a tie with PARSE-Case, which is not violated by candidate (48d).

(48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>P-Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. [IP wh, [l V] [VP subj ... t; ...]]</td>
<td>eEPP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>&lt;*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. [CP wh, [IP t; [l V] [VP subj ... t; ...]]]</td>
<td><em>-</em></td>
<td>**&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. [CP wh, [IP wh, [l V] [VP subj ... t; ...]]]</td>
<td><em>!</em></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. [CP wh, [IP subj, [l V] [VP t; ...]]]</td>
<td>eEPP</td>
<td>**&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words, if Stylistic Inversion is possible next to the basic SVO order, the two statements in (49) must be true.
Stylistic Inversion leads to fewer violations of STAY than the SVO-alternative.

Some constituent fills SpecIP.

Also in relative clauses, Stylistic Inversion is attested next to the SVO order, as the examples in (50) show.

Friedemann (1997):
Il a visité l'endroit où se sont rencontrés ses parents,
he has visited the-place where his parents met 'He has visited the place where his parents met.'

Il a visité l'endroit où ses parents se sont rencontrés.

These examples are evaluated in tableau (51). Candidates (51b-c), in which inversion takes place in a CP, are harmonically bound by the IP candidate (51a). The remaining two candidates, viz. (51a) and (51d), are both optimal because the former violates PARSE-Case, whereas the latter incurs an additional violation of STAY. Again, Stylistic Inversion is available because it leads to fewer violations of STAY.

The analysis of the relative clauses in (52), on the other hand, is less straightforward. The presence of the complementizer que might suggest that CP has projected.

However, if this were indeed the case, then Stylistic Inversion could not possibly meet both requirements in (49). Tableau (53) shows that if the clause given in italics in (52a) is a CP, it either incurs as much violations of STAY as the SVO-option (compare candidate (a) with candidate (c)) or it violates EPP (candidate (b)).

Recall that we established in chapter 3 that French uses the unmarked qui as a relative pronoun. Because this pronoun is unmarked, it can be deleted as long as it heads an A'-chain. Since both in SpecIP in (54a) and in SpecCP in (54b), only operator features are checked, these two positions qualify as A'-positions. Consequently, qui can be deleted.
In order to save our analysis, we are forced to assume that the relative pronoun is in SpecIP. If so, CP is absent, which means that que cannot head this projection. On the assumption that que is a head, the only alternative consistent with the observed word order is to adjoin que to the verb in I. Hence, Stylistic Inversion corresponds to structure (54a), and the SVO-option to (54b).

(54) a. \([CP \text{ qui, que } [IP \text{ t, i, V}] [VP \text{ ta fille ... t, i ...}]])\]
    b. \([CP \text{ qui, que } [IP \emptyset \text{ i, V}] [VP \text{ ta fille ... t, i ...}]])\]

In (54), que is ambiguous between a projecting and a non-projecting head. This is exactly what we would expect in a syntactic framework such as D&E, which is based on extended X-bar theory. Ideally, projectional or selectional properties of lexical items do not determine the presence or absence of functional structure. Rather, functional structure is present if and only if this is required by the constraint ranking of the language. Hence, the question of whether a head such as que should be realized as a projecting or an adjoined element is answered during the evaluation.

In the French relative clause, two syntactic domains we have been addressing in this book come together. On the one hand, the constraints LE(VEP) and NOSTRUC (see chapters 3 and 4) play a role in determining the position of the complementizer, while on the other, EPP, PARSE-Case and STAY are relevant for word order (see section 1). The rankings we have so far established for French are given in (55).

(55) a. EPP >> STAY —PARSE-Case (this chapter)
    b. LE(VEP) >> NOSTRUC (chapters 3 and 4)

Of course, these two sets of constraints are bound to interact with each other. Tableau (57) below will show that NOSTRUC must have a lower rank than STAY and PARSE-Case in order to prevent that only Stylistic Inversion is available in the French relative clause. Furthermore, we will observe in section 2.2 that pronouncing the complementizer at the left edge of the clause takes precedence over the possibility of having Stylistic Inversion next to the basic SVO order, which indicates that LE(VEP) outranks the tie between STAY and PARSE-Case. This leads us to the ranking in (56), in which only the mutual ranking of EPP and LE(VEP) is immaterial.

(56) \{EPP, LE(VEP)\} >> STAY —PARSE-Case >> NOSTRUC

The evaluation of the examples in (52) is given in tableau (57). Candidates (57g-h) and (57m-n) are filtered out by the high-ranked EPP. The remaining
candidates in which *qui* is pronounced and/or *que* is left unpronounced ((57b-d), (57f), (57j-1), (57o-p)) incur a fatal violation of LE(VEP). Among the three remaining candidates, there is only one (candidate (57e)) that does not survive the tie between STAY and PARSE-Case. Due to the irrelevance of NOSTRUC, the two other options ((57a) = (52a) and (57i) (= (52b))) are optimal, and therefore correctly predicted to be grammatical. Notice that if NOSTRUC had a higher rank, only candidate (57a) would have been optimal.

(57)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>French</th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>LE (VEP)</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>P-Case</th>
<th>NO STR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>[[IP qui, qu'-a reçu ta fille ti]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>[[IP qui, qu'-a reçu ta fille ti]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>[[IP qui, a reçu ta fille ti]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>[[IP qui, a reçu ta fille ti]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>[[CP qui, que [IP t, a reçu ta fille ti]]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>[[CP qui, que [IP t, a reçu ta fille ti]]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>[[CP qui, que [IPØ a reçu ta fille ti]]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>[[CP qui, que [IPØ a reçu ta fille ti]]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>[[CP qui, que [IPØ a reçu ta fille ti]]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>[[CP qui, que [[IP t, a reçu ta fille ti]]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>[[CP qui, que [IP t, a reçu ta fille ti]]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>[[CP qui, que [IP t, a reçu ta fille ti]]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>[[CP qui, que [IP t, a reçu ta fille ti]]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>[[CP qui, que [IPØ a reçu ta fille ti]]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td>[[CP qui, que [IP t, a reçu ta fille ti]]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>[[CP qui, que [IP t, a reçu ta fille ti]]]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>⬤*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, if the complementizer *que* is free to appear in any head position in the verbal extended projection, it is predicted on the basis of the interaction of the pertinent constraints that Stylistic Inversion is allowed in relative clauses provided that *que* is adjoined to I. In the SVO alternative, on the other hand, *que* heads its own projection.

2.2. Evidence for the clitic status of *que* in Stylistic Inversion

One would expect that complementizers should, in principle, be able to adjoin to I in any language. In languages such as Dutch and English, they will not actually appear in this position because I is always preceded by other material, with the result that I is not left-most in the clause, and the adjoined complementizer will give rise to a violation of LE(VEP). However, in an VSO-language like Irish (see chapter 2 for a brief discussion of word order in Welsh, a closely related language), the verb-first character of the language allows for adjunction to the verb without violation of LE(VEP). In this light, it is not surprising that the complementizer and the verb
form a "word-like unit" in this language, as Pesetsky (1998) reports. An example is given in (58).

(58) Irish (Pesetsky, 1998):

Duirt Seán go-bhfuil Cathal ag rince.

said Seán that-is Cathal dancing

'Seán said that Cathal is dancing.'

In this section, it will be shown that in Stylistic Inversion clauses, the French complementizer *que* forms a similar word-like unit with the verb.

2.2.1. Relative clauses

Given our hypothesis that *que* is adjoined to *I* in Stylistic Inversion, it is predicted that *que* and the verb behave like a syntactic unit: no constituents should be able to intervene. This prediction is borne out in relative clauses (see also Deprez, 1990). It is not possible to have, for instance, an adverb interrupt the sequence *que*-verb.\(^{15}\)

(59) *l'homme que, de temps en temps, a rencontré Jean

the-man that from time to time has met Jean

'the man who met Jean from time to time'

This is remarkable because in SVO clauses, preverbal adverbs can appear between the complementizer and the verb, as well as between the subject and the verb (see also section 1.2.1):

(60) a. l'homme que, de temps en temps, Jean a rencontré

b. l'homme que Jean, de temps en temps, a rencontré

(61) a. Je crois que, de temps en temps, Marie téléphone aux enfants.

I think that from time to time Marie phones to the children

'  I think that Marie calls up the children from time to time.'

b. Je crois que Marie, de temps en temps, téléphone aux enfants.

\(^{15}\) The same holds for the homophonous interrogative pronoun *que*. No constituent may intervene between interrogative *que* and the inflected verb:

(i) a. Que voit-il?

what sees-he

'What does he see?'

b. Que voit le photographe?

what sees the photographer

'What does the photographer see?'

c. Que le photographe voit-il?

what the photographer sees-cl(3SG-MASC)

'What does the photographer see?'

Obenauer (1976) argues that interrogative *que* should be analyzed as a complementizer, whereas Bellier (1989) analyzes this element as a pronominal clitic adjoined to the verb in *I*. It seems promising to investigate whether D&E could synthesize these two ideas. Given the complexity of the syntactic behavior of *que*, we have to leave this for future research.
If the subject in (60) and (61) is in SpecIP, the verb occupies I, and the complementizer heads CP, then *de temps en temps* can be adjoined to either IP or I'. Given the liberal syntactic behavior of preverbal adverbs, the ungrammaticality of (59) only follows if *que* is merged with the verb in I.

The evaluation of object relative clauses containing a preverbal adverb is given in tableau (62). The only difference between tableaux (62) and (57) is that, due to the presence of the adverb in tableau (62), candidate (62a) (= (59)) violates LE(VEP), whereas candidate (57a) does not. As a result, only candidate (62i) (= (60a)) is optimal. Hence, it is predicted that the presence of preverbal adverbs excludes the possibility of Stylistic Inversion in object relatives. Notice that if LE(VEP) had a lower rank, also (62a) would have been optimal.
### Notice that only cases of IP adjunction are included in this tableau. This is harmless because each candidate in the tableau incurs the same constraint violations as its counterpart in which the adverb is adjoined to I. Hence, among the I adjunction candidates, the structure given in (63b) will be optimal at the expense of the Stylistic Inversion candidates. This structure is identical to (63a) (= the optimal candidate (62i)), except for the fact that the adverb is adjoined to I, rather than IP.
(63)  

a. \([CP \quad \text{qui}_i \quad que \quad [IP \quad \text{de} \quad \text{temps} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{temps} \quad \text{[IP \quad \text{Jean}_j \quad \text{a} \quad \text{rencontré} \quad t_i \quad t_i]]}]\]

b. \([CP \quad \text{qui}_i \quad que \quad [IP \quad \text{Jean}_j \quad \text{de} \quad \text{temps} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{temps} \quad \text{[IP \quad \text{a} \quad \text{rencontré} \quad t_i \quad t_i]]}]\]

In conclusion, example (59) is ungrammatical because it is blocked by the grammatical examples in (60), which correspond to the optimal structures in (63). This explains why only the SVO order is allowed in relative clauses in which syntactic material intervenes between the complementizer and the subject, i.e., why que behaves like a clitic which must appear leftmost in relative clauses in which Stylistic Inversion has applied.

2.2.2. Stylistic Inversion triggered by long movement

Further evidence for the hypothesis that que is adjoined to I in Stylistic Inversion comes from complement clauses in which successive cyclic movement licenses the postverbal subject.

Kayne & Pollock (1978) note that there is a contrast between examples such as the ones given in (64). In (64a), in which the wh-phrase is the subject of the higher clause, Stylistic Inversion in the lower clause is illicit. In (64b), on the other hand, the wh-phrase in the higher clause is interpreted as the object of the lower clause, and Stylistic Inversion is grammatical. The SVO alternatives in (65) are both grammatical.

(64)  
a. \(*\text{Qui} \quad a \quad \text{dit} \quad que \quad \text{pleure} \quad \text{Paul}?\)  
   \(\text{who} \quad \text{has} \quad \text{said} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{cries} \quad \text{Paul}\)  
   \(\text{‘Who has said that Paul is crying?’}\)

b. \(\text{Qui} \quad a-t-\text{elle} \quad \text{dit} \quad que \quad \text{rencontrerait} \quad \text{Paul}\)?  
   \(\text{who} \quad \text{has}-t\text{-she} \quad \text{said} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{meet-FUT-PAST} \quad \text{Paul}\)  
   \(\text{‘Who did she say that Paul would meet?’}\)

(65)  
a. \(\text{Qui} \quad a \quad \text{dit} \quad que \quad \text{Paul} \quad \text{pleure}\)?

b. \(\text{Qui} \quad a-t-\text{elle} \quad \text{dit} \quad que \quad \text{Paul} \quad \text{rencontrerait}\)?

On the assumption that movement applies successive cyclically (see chapters 2 and 4), the embedded clause in (64b) starts with a trace, whereas its counterpart in (64a) does not. Kayne & Pollock argue that this intermediate trace licenses Stylistic Inversion as if it were a wh-phrase itself. In other words, the configuration in (66b) is sufficiently similar to that in (66a), so that in both contexts, Stylistic Inversion is allowed.

(66)  
a. \([CP/S \quad wh \quad que \quad [IP/S \quad t_i \quad t_i..]]\]

b. \([CP/S \quad t_i \quad que \quad [IP/S \quad t_i \quad t_i..]]\]

Formulated along the lines of the present analysis: EPP can be satisfied by an intermediate trace in SpecIP. However, this raises the same problem as in relative clauses. If que necessarily projects, (65b) will be optimal at the expense of (64b). The evaluation of these examples in given in tableau (67). Candidate (67b) is eliminated because it violates the high-ranked EPP, whereas candidate (67a) is predicted to be ungrammatical because it is harmonically bound by candidate (67c).
(67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>P-Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. $[\text{CP} t_i \text{ que } [\text{IP} t_i \text{ renconstrait Paul } t_i]]$</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. $[\text{CP} t_i \text{ que } [\text{IP} \emptyset \text{ renconstrait Paul } t_i]]$</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. $[\text{CP} t_i \text{ que } [\text{IP} \text{ Paul } t_i \text{ renconstrait } t_i t_i]]$</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If, on the other hand, $que$ is free to appear in any head-position, Stylistic Inversion will not be blocked. In tableau (68), the high-ranked EPP filters out candidates (d) and (g). Candidates (68b), (68f), and (68h), which lack a pronounced complementizer, incur fatal violations of LE(VEP). Finally, candidate (68c) is harmonically bound by candidates (68a) and (68e). This means that candidates (68a) and (68e) are optimal because they both survive the tie between STAY and PARSE-Case, and NOSTRUC is irrelevant.

(68)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>LE (VEP)</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>P-Case</th>
<th>NO STR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. $[\text{IP} t_i \text{ que-renconstrait Paul } t_i]$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>&lt; *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. $[\text{IP} t_i \text{ renconstrait Paul } t_i]$</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. $[\text{CP} t_i \text{ que } [\text{IP} t_i \text{ renconstrait Paul } t_i]]$</td>
<td>***&gt;</td>
<td>&lt; *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. $[\text{CP} t_i \text{ que } [\text{IP} \emptyset \text{ renconstrait Paul } t_i]]$</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. $[\text{CP} t_i \text{ que } [\text{IP} \text{ Paul } t_i \text{ renconstrait } t_i t_i]]$</td>
<td>***&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. $[\text{CP} t_i \text{ que } [\text{IP} t_i \text{ renconstrait Paul } t_i]]$</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. $[\text{CP} t_i \text{ que } [\text{IP} \emptyset \text{ renconstrait Paul } t_i]]$</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. $[\text{CP} t_i \text{ que } [\text{IP} \text{ Paul } t_i \text{ renconstrait } t_i t_i]]$</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, the embedded clauses in (64b) and (65b) should be analyzed as in (69).

(69)

| a. $[\text{IP} t_i \text{ que-renconstrait Paul } t_i]$ | |
| b. $[\text{CP} t_i \text{ que } [\text{IP} \text{ Paul } t_i \text{ renconstrait } t_i t_i]]$ | |

Like for relative clauses, we predict that the sequence $que$-verb in (69a) cannot be interrupted by syntactic material. Again, this is borne out:

(70)

| a. *Qui a-t-elle dit que, de temps en temps, rencontrait Paul? |
| b. Qui a-t-elle dit que, de temps en temps, Paul rencontrait? |
Recall that we argued in chapter 4 that IPs are not allowed to appear as complements of factive verbs for reasons of s-selection. On the assumption that IPs are interpreted as propositions, a (type-changing) complementizer is needed to ensure that the complement clause receives a factive interpretation. In this light, the contrast between (71) and (72), taken from Adams (1985), is interesting. Adams observes that long wh-movement does not license Stylistic Inversion in complements of factive verbs. If Stylistic Inversion is analyzed as IP, the ungrammaticality of (72a) follows from our assumption that factive verbs select CPs.16

(71)  a. le livre que Jean croit qu’aime Marie
    the book that Jean thinks that loves Marie
    ‘the book that Jean thinks that Marie loves’
    b. le livre que Jean croit que Marie aime

(72)  a. *le livre que Jean regrette qu’aime Marie
    the book that Jean regrets that loves Marie
    ‘the book that Jean regrets that Marie loves’
    b. le livre que Jean regrette que Marie aime

If que, on a par with English that, can be both a type-changing and a type-preserving complementizer, the ungrammaticality of (72a) suggests that type-changing que necessarily projects. This could mean that only one complementizer is listed in the lexicon, and that the structures it appears in is responsible for it being type-changing or not. Let us suppose that the embedded clauses in (73) correspond to the structure in (75a), in which the complementizer is adjoined to the head of XP, the highest node in the clause.17 If so, the complementizer is type-preserving. If the embedded clauses in (74), on the other hand, have the structure in (75b), in which the complementizer does project, que and that are type-changing.

(73)  a. Je crois que Marie a tué Jean.
    I think that Marie has killed Jean
    ‘I think Marie killed Jean.’
    b. I think (that) Mary killed John.

(74)  a. Je regrette que Marie ait tué Jean.
    I regret that Marie have-SUBJ killed Jean
    ‘I regret that Marie killed Jean.’
    b. I regret that Mary killed John.

(75)  a. [XP [x [c que/that] [x C]] [IP ...]] \rightarrow type-preserving
    b. [CP [c que/that] [IP ...]] \rightarrow type-changing

---

16 There is disagreement among speakers of French with respect to the ungrammaticality of (72a), for which we have no explanation.
17 XP is an empty functional projection. Empty functional projections are freely available in D&E (see chapters 1 and 2).
2.2.3. Stylistic inversion in subjunctive clauses

In subjunctive clauses, postverbal subjects need not be licensed by a preverbal constituent, as we have seen in section 1.3.2. Examples are given in (76). The corresponding SVO-clauses are given in (77).

(76)

\[
\begin{align*}
  a. \quad & J'exige \ que \ soient \ faits \ ces \ travaux. \\
       & I\text{-demand that be-SUBJ done these duties} \\
       & 'I demand that these duties be carried out.'
  \\
  b. \quad & Je souhaite \ que \ disparaisse \ ce \ dossier. \\
       & I\text{ wish that disappear-SUBJ this file} \\
       & 'I wish this file disappeared.'
\end{align*}
\]

(77)

\[
\begin{align*}
  a. \quad & J'exige \ que \ ces \ travaux \ soient \ faits. \\
  b. \quad & Je souhaite \ que \ ce \ dossier \ disparaisse.
\end{align*}
\]

Yet again, whenever the subject is in postverbal position, the complementizer behaves like a clitic. The examples in (78) show that adverbs are not allowed to intervene between the complementizer and the verb. In SVO-clauses, on the other hand, such preverbal material can freely appear in preverbal position.

(78)

\[
\begin{align*}
  a. \quad & *J'exige \ que, \ demain, \ soient \ faits \ ces \ travaux. \\
       & I\text{-demand that tomorrow be-SUBJ done these duties} \\
       & 'I demand that tomorrow, these duties be carried out.'
  \\
  b. \quad & *Je souhaite \ que, \ demain, \ disparaisse \ ce \ dossier. \\
       & I\text{ wish that tomorrow disappear-SUBJ this file} \\
       & 'I wish that tomorrow, this file disappeared.'
\end{align*}
\]

(79)

\[
\begin{align*}
  a. \quad & J'exige \ que, \ demain, \ ces \ travaux \ soient \ faits. \\
  b. \quad & Je souhaite \ que, \ demain, \ ce \ dossier \ disparaisse.
\end{align*}
\]

If que in subjunctive Stylistic Inversion is indeed a clitic, the embedded clauses in (76) are IPs, which leads to the prediction that they cannot be used as complements of factive verbs. This prediction is borne out. Kampers-Manhe (1998) observes that although a factive verb such as regretter selects a subjunctive complement, inversion is illicit.

(80)

\[
\begin{align*}
  a. \quad & Je \ regrette \ que \ Paul \ vienne. \\
       & I\text{ regret that Paul come-SUBJ} \\
       & 'I regret that Paul is coming.'
  \\
  b. \quad & *Je \ regrette \ que \ vienne \ Paul.
\end{align*}
\]

For a more detailed analysis of (the restrictions on) inversion in subjunctive complements, see Kampers-Manhe (1998).

In sum, our analysis forces us to assume that even in the presence of a complementizer, Stylistic Inversion clauses are IPs. This leads to the prediction that complementizers behave like clitics in Stylistic Inversion in relative clauses,
subjunctive clauses and long movement contexts, and that Stylistic Inversion is banned from factive complements. Both predictions are borne out.

3. Conclusion

We have argued in this chapter that Stylistic Inversion structures in French should be analyzed as IPs. This establishes a direct relation between constituent preposing and the possibility of parsing the subject in postverbal position. If the subject does not appear in preverbal position, some other constituent must do so in order to prevent a violation of the constraint EPP, which requires that some constituent occupy SpecIP.

In most cases, constituent preposing takes place for independent reasons. In interrogatives, for instance, wh-elements move to clause-initial position to satisfy the constraint PARSE-wh. Sometimes, however, preposing only occurs to ensure that the subject can stay in its postverbal base position without violating EPP. In Stylistic Inversion in declarative clauses, for instance, constituents are preposed merely to prevent a violation of EPP so that focused subjects can be parsed at the right edge of the clause. This explains some remarkable differences in syntactic behavior between interrogative and declarative Stylistic Inversion, such as the fact that the postverbal subject in the declarative clause, contrary to its counterpart in the interrogative clause, may not be followed by syntactic material. This restriction only holds for definite postverbal subjects, suggesting that these cannot be assigned Case in their base position, while their indefinite counterparts can.

When Stylistic Inversion is analyzed as IP, it follows, given the conclusions drawn in chapter 4, that it does not appear in complements of factive verbs, which is correct. Furthermore, our IP analysis correctly predicts that there are restrictions on the occurrence of preverbal material which are specific for Stylistic Inversion. We have also seen that the interaction between constraints responsible for subject placement and those regulating complementizer pronunciation explains why que behaves like a clitic in Stylistic Inversion, whereas it acts like a projecting head in other contexts.

We have learned that the analysis of the syntactic behavior of complementizers and subjects developed in previous chapters allows us to get a better understanding of the left-periphery of Stylistic Inversion clauses. Whereas most literature written within the generative paradigm focuses on Stylistic Inversion in interrogative clauses, we have studied several clause types. It turned out that our analysis predicts Stylistic Inversion to have clause-specific properties that escaped notice in earlier work. At the same time, we have largely ignored aspects of Stylistic Inversion that relate to the postverbal domain of the clause, such as the exact hierarchical position of the postverbal subject and the non-finite verb, and the intricate conditions on the distribution of other postverbal constituents. Future research should examine whether the analysis presented here can be extended to these in general thoroughly examined properties of Stylistic Inversion.
Appendix: The Comp-trace phenomenon revisited

In chapter 4, we observed that in French, the complementizer que is replaced by the element qui in the context of long subject movement. The relevant examples are repeated in (81).

(81) a. *Qui crois-tu que lira la lettre?
   who think-you that read-FUT the letter
   ‘Who do you think will read the letter?’

   a'. Qui crois-tu qui lira la lettre?
   who think-you qui read-FUT the letter

   b. Que crois-tu que Jean fera?
   what think-you that Jean do-FUT
   ‘What do you think that Jean will do?’

In the light of what we have seen in this chapter, the ungrammaticality of (81a) might seem mysterious. If the complementizer que can be adjoined to I, one could argue that (81a) has the structure in (82). Recall, however, that we argued in chapter 3 that Case-marked traces count as pronounced material. If so, alignment constraints are likely to be sensitive to this type of traces. Consequently, (82) violates LE(VEP).

(82) Violation of LE(VEP):
    Qui crois-tu [IP t₁ que-lira la lettre]

Nevertheless, the generalization that subject extraction leads to IP-complementation in CTP languages is confirmed by the unacceptability of (83a). Zubizarreta (1982) reports that subjects cannot be extracted from complements of factive verbs in French. If the embedded clause in (83a) is an IP, it cannot be interpreted as a fact. As a result, (83a) is ruled out in the semantic component.

(83) a. *Qui regrettes-tu qui châtie les enfants?
   who regret-you qui punishes the children
   ‘Who do you regret that punishes the children?’

   b. ?Qui regrettes-tu que Marie châtie?
   who regret-you that Marie punishes
   ‘Who do you regret that Marie punishes?’

Let us therefore assume that because que cannot cliticize onto the verb without violating LE(VEP) in the context of a subject extraction, que cliticizes onto a minimal pronunciation of the subject trace in SpecIP. More precisely, let us assume that the element qui behaves as if it were composed of the complementizer que and the (resumptive) pronoun il(l) (see Rooryck, 1997, for a similar proposal). This hypothesis is not implausible from a diachronic point of view.

In 16th century French, both qui and qu'il(iz) could be used in the context of long subject movement. Gougenheim (1974) illustrates this with the following examples:
(84) a. un des gentilz hommes de la Beausse, que l'on dit qu'ilz
one of-the noble men de la Beausse that l-one says that-the
sont deux à un cheval quand ilz vont par païz
are two on a horse when they go through country
‘one of the gentlemen de la Beausse about whom people say that they
ride with two people on a horse when they go across the country’

b. Peult estre celle que vous pensez qui en
can be the-one that you think qui of-them had-to be the most
debovit estre la plus
most marry auroit bien de quoy se
had to be the most of what REFL indemnify s'il luy plaisoit.
something compensatory if he pleased her.

‘Maybe the one you think had to be the saddest one would have
something compensatory if he pleased her.’

Gougenheim further notes that in relatives, qui is sometimes confused with qu’il. An example is given in (84). It seems that in this example, the otherwise masculine (and singular) il is not marked for q-features, since it has a feminine antecedent (mort) which licenses the feminine agreement suffix -e on aissée.

(85) Vous ne luy sçauriez donner mort qu'il ne luy fust plus aissée
you not him could give death qu'il ne him was more easy-FEM-SG
to bear
‘You could not give him any death that would be easier to bear.’

If, from a historical perspective, qui is indeed composed of the complementizer que and the unmarked resumptive pronoun i(l), the complex is likely to qualify as both a complementizer and a nominative trace. This leads to the evaluation in tableau (86), in which candidate (a) is optimal because it is the only candidate that does not violate EPP and LE(VEP) and incurs only two violations of STAY. Note that the second-best option (86c) (= (81a)) is eliminated because it contains one more trace than (86a) (= (81a')).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>LE (VEP)</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>P-Case</th>
<th>NO STR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. [IP qu-i lira [VP tl la lettre]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. [IP tl lira [VP tl la lettre]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. [CP tl que [IP tl lira [VP tl la lettre]]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. [CP tl que [IP  lira [VP tl la lettre]]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. [CP tl que [IP tl lira [VP tl la lettre]]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. [CP tl que [IP  lira [VP tl la lettre]]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of preposed complements provides us with additional evidence for the IP status of the embedded clause in (81a'). In the context of wh-movement, aux enfants can only appear in between the complementizer and the
subject (see section also 1.2.1 above). Whenever it follows the subject, as in (87b), marginality is the result. SpecIP is underlined.

(87) a. Quelles histoires crois-tu qu’aux enfants, Marie [t racontait] which stories think-you that-to-the children Marie told often

‘Which stories do you think that Marie often told to the children?’

b. *Quelles histoires crois-tu que Marie, aux enfants, [t racontait] souvent?

If qui in (81a’), like the subject in (87b), occupies SpecIP we also predict that in this construction, aux enfants can only marginally appear between qui and the verb. Example (88a) illustrates that this is correct (SpecIP is again underlined).

(88) Qui crois-tu qui, aux enfants, [t racontait] souvent de vieilles who think-you qui to-the children told often INDEF old histoires?

‘Who do you think told the children often old stories?’

In Modern French, the element qui which appears in the context of long subject movement behaves much like its homonym found in the relative clause. The relative clause in (89) is degraded on a par with (88):

(89) L’homme qui, aux enfants, [t racontait] souvent de vieilles the-man qui to-the children told often INDEF old histoires?

‘the man who told the children often old stories’

Recall that we established in section 1.2.1 that adverbs may intervene between SpecIP and 1. This leads to the prediction that if we substitute an adverb such as hier (‘yesterday’) for aux enfants in (88), the result should be grammatical. This prediction is borne out:

(90) Qui crois-tu qui, hier, [t racontait] de vieilles histoires?

‘Who do you think told the children old stories yesterday?’

Again, long subject movement qui behaves on a par with relative qui. This is shown in (91):

18 In the absence of wh-movement, contrasts are less sharp. We leave this for further research.
(i) a. Je crois qu’aux enfants, Marie racontait souvent de vieilles histoires.
    I think that-to-the children Marie told often INDEF old stories
    'I think that Marie often told old stories to the children.'
    b. *Je crois que Marie, aux enfants, racontait souvent de vieilles histoires.

19 In (87a), aux enfants must be constrastively focused (Christine Tellier, p.c.). This is irrelevant for the point made here.
Notice, finally, that the syntactic behavior of both instances of qui differs from that of subject pronouns:

\[(92) \quad *H, \text{ hier, } [i \text{ racontait}] \text{ de vieilles histoires.} \]

'He told the children old stories yesterday.'

This suggests that long subject movement qui has not inherited the clitic status of the pronoun il it is composed of from a historical point of view. Rather, it behaves like an autonomous pronominal complex of a complementizer and a subject trace.
subject (and therefore also) whose pronoun is held approximately, as in (179),
marginally is reduced. In (181b) when /she/ is subcategorized as an event
subject, which pronoun fills both number and gender
(80), as in Quelles histoires vous avez (spoken context). Marie (b) aucun
n'est incidemment une la narration de la vie à env. (spoken context.
To complete a list of the relevant subjects only.

"Which stories would you tell if you had [toujours devant] there?" (3V)

(59) in "...Quelle histoire surtout qu'elle imagine, enfant, à écrire seulement?"

volonté, comme les rédacteurs qui disent a.

If you in (179), like the subject in (179a), except for spécif, you also predict that
because unlike the be, which always verb, the noun can be changed for the
example in (181b). No explicit, implicit, or implied order is made clear, but the
shows a few traces of the doctrine of the relative clause. The
(59) "...Qui écris-tu qu'il a encore [toujours devant] au visiteur
qui think-yes you re-ex children until other INDEF old
historien?" historic stories

"Who do you think told the children old old stories?"

In modern French, the element qui which appears in the context of long subject
movement behaves much like its homonym found in the relative clause. The
relative clause in (179) is dependent on a par with (179b).

(181b) "...Quelle histoire surtout qu'elle imagine, enfant, à écrire seulement?"

n'est incidemment une la narration de la vie à env. (spoken context.

Recall that we established in section 4.21 that adverbs may intervene
between spécif and /on/. This leads to the prediction that if we substitute an adverb
such as yester /yesterday/ for any evidence in (39), the result should be grammatical.
This prediction is borne out.

(181b) "...Quelle histoire surtout qu'elle imagine, enfant, à écrire seulement?"

n'est incidemment une la narration de la vie à env. (spoken context.

Recall that we established in section 4.21 that adverbs may intervene
between spécif and /on/. This leads to the prediction that if we substitute an adverb
such as yester /yesterday/ for any evidence in (39), the result should be grammatical.
This prediction is borne out.

(181b) "...Quelle histoire surtout qu'elle imagine, enfant, à écrire seulement?"

n'est incidemment une la narration de la vie à env. (spoken context.

Recall that we established in section 4.21 that adverbs may intervene
between spécif and /on/. This leads to the prediction that if we substitute an adverb
such as yester /yesterday/ for any evidence in (39), the result should be grammatical.
This prediction is borne out.