

ATLANTIS

Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies

43.1 (June 2021): 221-242

e-ISSN 1989-6840

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.28914/Atlantis-2021-43.1.12>

© The Author(s)

Content is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial ShareAlike 4.0 International Licence

Speaker's Involvement in Press Reportage: The Case of Nonlexicalised and Lexicalised Locative Inversion

CARLOS PRADO-ALONSO

Universidad de Oviedo

pradocarlos@uniovi.es

This article offers a corpus-based analysis of locative inversion in journalistic writing. The study focuses on the analysis of the construction in press reportage dealing with cultural, sports, financial, political and spot news in Present-Day English. On the basis of data retrieved from six different corpora, it is argued that the distribution of locative inversion in these texts is related to the degree of the writer's involvement in each text style. Results show that the more involved a text is, the more locative inversions may be expected. The study further demonstrates that the construction itself serves as a discourse marker through which the presence of the writer is encoded in these texts.

Keywords: corpus; locative inversion; textual variation; press reportage; interpersonal metafunction

...

La participación del emisor en los textos periodísticos: el caso de la inversión locativa no lexicalizada y lexicalizada

Esta investigación ofrece un análisis, basado en el estudio de corpus, de la inversión locativa en el lenguaje periodístico. El estudio se centra en el análisis de esta construcción en artículos de prensa que incluyen noticias culturales, deportivas, financieras, políticas y de última hora del inglés contemporáneo. Tomando como base datos obtenidos de seis corpus lingüísticos, se demuestra que la distribución de la inversión locativa en los textos analizados está relacionada con el grado de implicación del escritor en cada tipo de texto. Los resultados indican que cuanto mayor implicación del autor haya en el texto, más inversiones locativas cabe esperar. La investigación también demuestra que la inversión locativa puede ser considerada un marcador del discurso mediante el cual se indica la presencia del emisor en los textos.

Palabras clave: corpus; inversión locativa; variación textual; artículos de prensa; metafunción interpersonal

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, locative inversions—constructions involving the fronting of a locative constituent that triggers the inversion of the subject and the lexical verb in the clause, as can be seen in examples (1) to (4)—have been the subject of extensive research, the focus of each study varying according to the nature and goals of the specific theoretical framework adopted (Webelhuth 2011; de Wit 2016; Prado-Alonso 2016; Teixeira 2016; Duffley 2018; Ojea 2019, among others). This article offers a functional corpus-based analysis of locative inversion and seeks to cast some light on its distribution and pragmatic function in several press reportage categories.

- (1) At the top of 14 uncarpeted stairs in a Notting Hill mews lives Christopher Logue, poet. (A19, cultural reportage)
- (2) On the river banks at Leningrad were people now told that in 20 years they will have free food, housing, light, heat, transport and medical treatment. (A06, political reportage)
- (3) Then came the revolting images of death in Sarajevo's marketplace, and the U.S., Britain and France pressed the U.N. Security Council to impose full, mandatory sanctions. (A33, sports reportage)
- (4) Here are two old men mad at each other. (A37, spot reportage)

The data are taken from six computerised corpora of British and American Present-Day English (PDE), and the press reportage texts under analysis deal with sports, financial, cultural, political and spot news. The present study will address the following research questions:

- RQ1 What is the discourse function served by the construction in these types of text?
- RQ2 What is the distribution and frequency of locative inversion in the above-mentioned press reportage categories?
- RQ3 Is there a relationship between the distribution and the discourse function served by the construction in these types of journalistic writing?

In order to answer these questions, the distribution and frequency of the locative inversions in the corpus texts will be compared to Douglas Biber's well-known multidimensional textual analysis (1988). On the basis of statistical analysis, it will be shown that, in press reports, the use of a locative inversion may signal the presence of the writer in the text in order to change the reader's focus of attention. It will also be shown that the more involved a text, the larger the number of locative inversions that

may be expected. Finally, it will be argued that the construction itself may be considered a discourse marker in press reportage through which involvement is encoded.¹

After this introduction, section 2 provides a review of the literature on locative inversion and shows that, from a corpus-based perspective, the study of this construction remains relatively underexplored in press reportage PDE texts. Section 3 offers information on the press reportage texts analysed in the study. Section 4 sets out the results for the types and distribution of locative inversion in the corpus-based analysis of press reportage texts. This provides the basis for section 5, which seeks to shed light on the linguistic and textual factors that determine the distribution and pragmatic use of locative inversion constructions in the different press reportage categories. Finally, section 6 offers some concluding remarks.

2. PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON LOCATIVE INVERSION

The study of inversion following locative constituents, which subsumes “spatial locations, path and directions, and their extension to some temporal and abstract locative domains” (Bresnan 1994, 75), has been carried out within the framework of two of the most widely accepted language theories in modern times: the generative and the functional approaches.

There are numerous generative analyses of locative inversion that pay attention to the structural and syntactic criteria of the construction without devoting attention to usage (Nakajima 2001; Kim 2003; Holler and Hartman 2012; Ojea 2019). There are also functional studies based on corpus data, that is, on a collection of actual samples of the language under investigation (Birner 1996; Dorgeloh 1997; Chen 2003, 2013; Kreyer 2006; Webelhuth 2011; Duffley 2018). Betty Birner, for instance, analyses 1,778 instances of English locative and nonlocative inversions in a self-compiled corpus of written and spoken texts. She asserts that locative inversion serves an information-packaging function by linking relatively unfamiliar information—represented by the postposed subject—to the prior context via the clause-initial placement of information—represented by the preposed preverbal constituent—which is relatively familiar in the discourse in question. According to Birner, therefore, the felicity of locative inversion depends on “the relative familiarity of the postposed subject and preposed constituent” (1996, 72). In other words, the postposed subject must always represent newer information to the addressee than the information provided in the preposed constituent.

Another corpus-based study is Heidrum Dorgeloh’s, which analyses fewer than seventy locative inversions in press reportage texts from the *Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus of British English* (LOB) and the *Brown University Standard Corpus of Present-day American English* (Brown) and tries to discern the ultimate meaning—which might be nonpropositional—

¹ *Involvement* is understood here as the addressor’s presence in a text and their direct or indirect interaction with the addressee (Biber 1988, 105).

of an inverted construction. According to Dorgeloh, in the case of locative inversion, this involves the expression of a point of view. She argues that, since locative inversion is a marked structure in English, it must have an “extra meaning” (1997, 63). Her argument is based on a principle similar to H. P. Grice’s maxim of quantity (1975): if an addressor chooses to use a marked word-order pattern, the addressee will infer that something that goes beyond the meaning of the unmarked or canonical order is intended. In locative inversion, Dorgeloh states, this “extra meaning” is *deictic-presentative*: the fronted locative constituent guides the addressee’s attention to a spatial or temporal location after which the new information, represented by the postposed subject, is introduced (1997, 67).

Drawing on Dorgeloh’s claim, Rong Chen analyses, from a cognitive functional perspective, 1,132 locative and nonlocative inversion instances in an uncontrolled personal corpus of fictional texts, and argues that locative inversion is an instantiation of the so-called *Ground-before-Figure* cognitive model (2003). The figure/ground distinction derives from Gestalt psychology (Koffka 1935; Zusne 1970; Rock 1975; Miller and Johnson-Laired 1976). It is appropriately explained by Leonard Talmy, who notes that all spatial relations in language are expressed by specifying the position of one entity—the *figure*—relative to another—the *ground* (2000). The figure is defined as that part of a differentiated visual field that “stands out distinctively” from other parts in the field in question, that is, the ground (Krech et al. 1974, 264). For instance, if someone looks out of a window, their attention is generally focused on a particular entity such as a tree, a cloud, a passer-by or a car. The entity the observer is looking at is considered the figure, whereas the setting around it is regarded as the ground. The characteristics that make an entity a likely candidate as a figure are listed by Tanya Reinhart and include, among others, a continuation in shape contour and a small size (1984, 803). A figure tends to be “thing-like, solid, discrete, well-defined, stable, and tightly organised” (Wallace 1982, 214). By contrast, the ground tends to be unformed, shapeless, less definite, loosely organised, large, unstable and irregular. It is, in sum, larger, more stationary, structurally more complex, more known to the viewer and more backgrounded than the figure (Talmy 2000, 315-16). Since, according to Ronald W. Langacker, the figure is normally coded by the subject whereas the ground is coded by more peripheral clause constituents (1991, 312), it is generally assumed that English follows a *Figure-before-Ground* order because it is a subject-verb-object (SVO) language, as illustrated in (5a) below. The Ground-before-Figure model, on the other hand, asserts that when the addressor and the addressee do not share the same information about the context, it is cognitively more efficient to present the ground before the figure, which can be done through locative inversion as shown in (5b). This view is further elaborated by Chen, who extends the model to other inversion types (2013), and it is also shared by Gert Webelhuth, who provides a construction grammar analysis of locative inversion and claims that “utterances of locative inversions are associated with a particular plan on the speaker’s part that motivates the grammatical and usage properties of the construction where

are systematic patterns of variation within the major genre categories of a corpus” (1988, 191). A more comprehensive account of locative inversion that examines all these systematic variations is therefore needed, as only then can a conclusive picture of the distribution and functions of the construction in press reportage texts be achieved. The present study is a first step in that direction.

3. THE CORPORA

In this study, six computerised corpora of British and American English have been used to analyse the pragmatic behaviour and distribution of locative inversion in PDE press reportage. These are: 1) the *Brown University Standard Corpus of Present-day American English* (Brown; texts from 1961, released in 1964); 2) the *Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus of British English* (LOB; texts from 1961, released in 1976); 3) the *Freiburg-Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus of British English* (FLOB; texts from 1991, released in 1999); 4) the *Freiburg-Brown Corpus of American English* (FROWN; texts from 1992, released in 1999); 5) the *British English 2006 Corpus* (BrE06; texts from 2004-2008, released in 2008); and 6) the *American English 2006 Corpus* (AmE06; texts from 2004-2008, released in 2008).²

These corpora are not parsed and do not allow the automated analysis of the electronic database using software tools in order to retrieve locative inverted constructions. Even though the use of Brown, LOB, FROWN, FLOB, BrE06 and AmE06 meant that a manual (reading) corpus-based search was necessary, the six corpora were selected for two main reasons. Firstly, the internal structure of each of them is the same and therefore, as will be shown presently, allows the compilation of a substantial number and types of press reportage texts. Secondly, Brown and LOB are analysed in Biber's multidimensional analysis of linguistic variation (1988), which will be used here for comparative purposes as it is considered a validated criterion of linguistic variation.

The Brown, LOB, FLOB, FROWN, BrE06 and AmE06 corpora each comprise a million words, distributed across fifteen textual categories, one of which is press reportage. The press reportage texts analysed consist of 246 samples of approximately 2,000 words each, totalling 492,000 running words organised into five well-defined subcategories—sports, financial, cultural, political and spot news.³

² For more details, see Knut Hofland et al. (1999) and Paul Baker (2009).

³ In the six corpora analysed here, the press reportage textual category also contains a subcategory related to society news. However, this subcategory was excluded from the analysis because it has a limited number of texts containing fewer than 30,000 words in total.

TABLE 1. Source and distribution of the press reportage texts selected from the corpora

Press reportage text-type	Number of samples	Number of words
Cultural news	42	84,000
Spot news	60	120,000
Sports news	60	120,000
Political news	60	120,000
Financial news	24	48,000
Total	246	492,000

4. LOCATIVE INVERSION IN PRESS REPORTAGE

4.1. Locative Inversion: Nonlexicalised and Lexicalised Uses

Two main types of inversions are analysed in the present study: nonlexicalised and lexicalised locative inversions.⁴ In nonlexicalised uses of the construction (6a), the canonical SVX word order is also available to the addressor, as illustrated in (6b). In lexicalised uses of locative inversion, the choice between the locative inverted structure and its SVX canonical counterpart is not available to the addressor, either because the noninverted version is grammatically impossible, as in (7), or because it would convey a different meaning, as in (8). These lexicalised inversions represent formulaic uses of the construction (Brinton and Traugott 2005; Traugott and Trousdale 2013) and, on the basis of the data retrieved from the corpora, they are triggered by spatial or temporal deictic adverbs such as *here*, *there*, *now* or *then* (7), or enumerative listing conjuncts such as *first*, *second*, *third*, etc. and adverbs such as *finally* or *lastly*, as shown in (8).

- (6) a. In the centre of the chapel was a great stone-built tomb. (A34, spot reportage)
 b. A great stone-built tomb was in the centre of the chapel.
- (7) a. Here comes Cheung Chi Doy, the first full Chinese to play in the Football League. (A32, sports reportage)
 b. ? Cheung Chi Doy, the first full Chinese to play in the Football League, comes here.
- (8) a. First, in 1986, came the departure of ACT founder William Ball, who left under what may be charitably called a cloud. Then came the 1989 earthquake. (A38, financial reportage)

⁴ Locative inversion, as understood here, needs to be distinguished from other constructions that bear some superficial similarities to it. This is particularly true for subject-auxiliary inversion triggered by a locative or temporal *wh*-constituent—e.g. *Where did Peter go?*—which contrasts sharply with locative inversion in many grammatical respects and constitutes a different construction.

- b. ? The departure of ACT founder William Ball, who left under what may be charitably called a cloud, came first, in 1986. The 1989 earthquake came then.

In (7b), for instance, the canonical word order, though possible, conveys a different meaning. In (7a), deictic *here* is used as a presentative device to introduce new information in discourse and defines the entities referred to by the postposed subject as being close to the addressor's location. The unmarked version in (7b) cannot be felicitously used in this way. Similarly, the canonical variant of (8b) differs in meaning from its XVS counterpart and cannot be used in the same linguistic context. In (8a) preverbal *first* and *then* are adverbial pointers that help to indicate the progression of events and mark the successive stages in discourse. In other words, they order the level of discourse metalinguistically. This is not the case in (8b), which is why the SVX clause is grammatically acceptable but infelicitous. Here the clause-final *then* simply conveys a temporal meaning and denotes that the action takes place at the moment indicated by the addressor, but does not perform a sequential cohesive function.

The formulaic nature of these lexicalised locative inversions may also be attested in that both the verb and the postposed subject are syntactically and semantically restricted. Lexicalised locative inversions only allow intransitive verbs. In these constructions, the most common verb is copular *be*, which is the most general lexical item that expresses a predicate of location, as shown in (9), repeated below for convenience. Some basic-level verbs of location—namely, *lie*, *stand* and *sit*—and verbs of motion—such as *go* and *come*—may also occur. The restriction to the use of these types of verb is not surprising since, as will be shown in section 5, the function of lexicalised locative inversion is to present new information in discourse by moving the attention of the addressee towards the location specified by the preverbal constituent. Similarly, the postposed subject is also constrained in that it can only be represented by a noun phrase. Examples where the subject function is represented by a pronoun cannot be inverted in English (Quirk et al. 1985, 881). The fact that the preverbal constituent, the verb and the postposed subject are restricted in lexicalised locative inversions clearly suggests that the construction as a whole is, indeed, a formula.

- (9) Here are two old men mad at each other. (A37, spot reportage)

4.2. Distribution of the Construction

The analysis of Brown, LOB, FLOB, FROWN, BrE06 and AmE06 provided a total of 205 instances of locative inversions—168 nonlexicalised and 37 lexicalised constructions—distributed throughout the press reportage categories. This relatively small number of instances was to be expected for two main reasons. Firstly, locative

inversion is a very specific type of inversion. Secondly, the vast majority of English declarative clauses do not contain postverbal subjects (Biber et al. 1999; Huddleston and Pullum 2002). That is, in an SVO language such as English, departures from the canonical order are uncommon and, for this reason, the frequency of locative inversion and other marked constructions can be expected to be limited.

On the basis of the corpus-based findings, the different instances of nonlexicalised locative inversion in the press reportage texts analysed here can be grouped into three main types:

- Inversions triggered by a fronted spatial or temporal locative constituent followed by the verb *to be*:

(10) Behind Bonn's slogan of German self-determination is the intention to impose on East Germany the regime existing in West Germany. (A06, political reportage)

- Inversions triggered by a fronted spatial or temporal locative constituent followed by a non-*be* verb:

(11) On a nearby wall hangs a framed affidavit from Ringo Starr. (A44, cultural reportage)

- Inversions triggered by a present or a past participle form of the verb followed by a spatial or temporal locative constituent and the verb *to be*:

(12) Sitting on an equally big pork barrel was another Judge Smith ally, Georgia's Vinson, chairman of the Armed Services Committee. (A37, sports reportage)

Locative inversion with the verb *to be* is the most frequent type of nonlexicalised locative inversion in press reportage—128 instances—as shown in table 2. The preponderance of locative inversion + *be* is well attested in the literature (Birner 1996; Dorgeloh 1997; Chen 2003, among others). Chen, for instance, views locative inversion with *be* as the prototypical form of inversion (2003, 60), that is, as Langacker puts it, “the unit in the schematic network which is naturally most salient, most often thought of or most likely to be chosen as representative of the category” (1987, 492). The remaining types of nonlexicalised locative inversion—i.e., locative + non-*be* inversion and participial + locative + *be* inversion—are far less frequently attested in the corpus, with 20 instances each.

TABLE 2. Raw and normalised distribution of nonlexicalised locative inversion in the press reportage texts (raw frequencies in brackets)

	Cultural news	Sports news	Spot news	Political news	Financial news	Total raw
Locative + verb <i>to be</i>	29.8 (25)	26.6 (32)	25.8 (31)	24.1 (29)	22.9 (11)	(128)
Locative + non <i>be</i> verb	5.9 (5)	4.1 (5)	5 (6)	2.5 (3)	2 (1)	(20)
Participial + locative + <i>be</i>	4.7 (4)	4.1 (5)	3.3 (4)	4.1 (5)	4 (2)	(20)
Total	40.4 (34)	34.8 (42)	34.1 (41)	30.7 (37)	28.9 (14)	(168)

As can clearly be seen in table 2, nonlexicalised locative inversion takes place more frequently in press reportage articles related to culture—normalised frequency (n.f.) 40.4—sports—n.f. 34.8—and spot texts—n.f. 34.1. Press reportage dealing with politics—n.f. 30.7—and finance—n.f. 28.9—make less frequent use of the construction, the reasons for which are explained in section 5.⁵ This higher frequency of nonlexicalised locative inversion is also notable in the individual analyses of the different types of this construction in the textual categories of the corpora. With the exception of nonlexicalised locative inversion triggered by a fronted participial form and a locative constituent, the frequency of the other types of nonlexicalised locative inversion is also higher in culture, sports and spot press reportage.

As regards lexicalised locative inversion, on the basis of the findings from the analysis of the corpora the different instances found in the press reportage texts analysed here can be grouped into two main types:

- Inversions triggered by a fronted spatial or temporal deictic:
 - (13) Now is the appropriate time to make significant changes! (A44, cultural reportage)
 - (14) Here is the deal for thousands of wannabe millionaires. (A41, sports reportage)
- Inversions triggered by a fronted enumerative listing conjunct:
 - (15) First are physical assaults committed against old people. These assaults go mostly unreported. Second is harassment related to gay adolescents. (A41, political reportage)

⁵ In the present study, following Biber's proposal for a "normalised frequency of a feature" (1988, 14), normalised frequencies per 100,000 words are given.

As illustrated in table 3, the data show that lexicalised locative inversion also takes place more frequently in press reports related to culture—n.f. 11.8—sports—n.f. 7.4—and spot news—n.f. 8.3. The construction is less frequently attested in the remaining categories, i.e., politics—n.f. 2.4—and finance—n.f. 4.4. Frequency of occurrence for each type of lexicalised locative inversion is also consistently higher in culture, sports and spot press reportage.

TABLE 3. Raw and normalised distribution of lexicalised locative inversion in the press reportage texts (raw frequencies in brackets)

	Cultural news	Sports news	Spot news	Political news	Financial news	Total raw
Deictic trigger	5.9 (5)	4.1 (5)	5.8 (7)	0.8 (1)	2.4 (3)	(21)
Listing conjunct	5.9 (5)	3.3 (4)	2.5 (3)	1.6 (2)	2 (2)	(16)
Total	11.8 (10)	7.4 (9)	8.3 (10)	2.4 (3)	4.4 (5)	(37)

The data, therefore, indicate that there is an affinity for both lexicalised and nonlexicalised locative inversion with culture, sports and spots news press reports. In order to examine the exact reasons for this affinity, a more fine-grained textual analysis is required. This is provided in what follows on the basis of established criteria of linguistic variation (Biber 1988).

4.3. A Statistical Textual Analysis of Lexicalised and Nonlexicalised Locative Inversion in Press Reportage

In *Variation across Speech and Writing* (1988), Biber analyses linguistic variation in Brown and LOB, which match the structure of the other corpora analysed here (see section 3). The textual categories comprised in the Brown and LOB corpora are analysed by Biber in terms of six parameters or dimensions of linguistic variation. Dimension 1, which he labels “Involved versus Informational Production,” distinguishes between discourse with interactional, affective or involved purposes, associated with strict real-time production and comprehension constraints, and discourse with highly informational purposes. Biber shows that the category of press reportage exhibits a low score on the involved pole of Dimension 1 (128).

In general, press reportage is informational in nature and does not show much concern for interpersonal or affective content. However, Biber shows that there is internal variation in the press reportage texts analysed and that some press reportage categories are more informational than others: the categories of political and financial

press reportage exhibit more informational linguistic features than the categories of culture, sports and spot press reportage, which show a higher incidence of interactional or interpersonal features (1988, 182-83). Among these features, Biber notices that, compared to text in political and financial press reportage, the texts in culture, sports and spot press reportage make more frequent use of private verbs—e.g., *think*, *feel*—present tenses, first- and second-person pronouns, *that* deletions, causative subordination and *wh*-questions, used to express private attitudes, thoughts and emotions and to represent the speaker's interventions in discourse (1988, 129).

The comparison of Biber's mean scores on Dimension 1 of press reportage texts with the distribution of lexicalised and nonlexicalised locative inversion in the press reportage categories analysed in the present study shows that there is a tendency for those categories with a higher degree of speaker involvement—namely, culture, sports and spot press reportage—to favour the use of the construction (see tables 4 and 5). This is more clearly seen if we measure the correlation between Biber's mean scores on Dimension 1 and the normalised frequencies of the distribution of nonlexicalised locative inversion in the textual categories under investigation here by calculating a Pearson Correlation Coefficient test and a Simple Linear Regression test.⁶ As illustrated in table 4, the Pearson Correlation Coefficient for the distribution of nonlexicalised locative inversion in the press reportage categories analysed here and Biber's mean scores on Dimension 1 in those categories is 0.9196, indicating there is a strong positive correlation between them. The statistical significance of the correlation can be further demonstrated by calculating its *p*-value, 0.027034, which is significant at the *p* < 0.05 level. Similarly, by calculating a Simple Linear Regression test, the Coefficient of Determination R^2 is 0.8457, which means that the distribution of the textual categories in terms of involvement explains roughly 89% of the nonlexicalised locative inversion instances across all categories.

TABLE 4. Pearson correlation coefficient for the distribution of nonlexicalised locative inversion and Biber's mean scores on Dimension 1 in the textual categories of press reportage (1988, 181-83)

	Mean scores of the categories on Biber's Dimension 1 (1988)	Normalised frequencies for the distribution of inversion in the categories
Cultural press reportage	-11.7	40.4
Spot press reportage	-13.9	34.8
Sports press reportage	-14.7	34.1
Political press reportage	-17.1	30.7
Financial press reportage	-17.6	28.9

⁶ All statistical analyses were conducted using R (version 3.6.0). See R Development Core Team (2019).

	Mean scores of the categories on Biber's Dimension 1 (1988)	Normalised frequencies for the distribution of inversion in the categories
Correlation coefficient		0.9196
<i>p</i> -value (significant at $p < 0.05$)		0.027034
Simple linear regression (R^2)		0.8457

Similarly, as shown in table 5, the result of the Pearson Correlation Coefficient for the distribution of lexicalised locative inversion in the press reportage categories analysed here and Biber's mean scores on Dimension 1 in those categories is 0.9430. This is again a strong positive correlation, which indicates that a high frequency of lexicalised locative inversion in press reportage correlates with a high degree of speaker involvement in the text where the inversion occurs. The statistical significance of the correlation is further supported by its *p*-value, 0.016196. As for the Coefficient of Determination in the Simple Linear Regression test, the result of R^2 is 0.8892, which means that the distribution of the textual categories in terms of involvement explains roughly 89% of the lexicalised locative inversion instances across all categories.

TABLE 5. Pearson correlation coefficient for the distribution of lexicalised locative inversion and Biber's mean scores on Dimension 1 in the textual categories of press reportage (1988, 181-83)

	Mean scores of the categories on Biber's Dimension 1 (1988)	Normalised frequencies for the distribution of inversion in the categories
Cultural press reportage	-11.7	11.8
Spot press reportage	-13.9	7.4
Sports press reportage	-14.7	8.3
Political press reportage	-17.1	2.4
Financial press reportage	-17.6	4.4
Correlation coefficient		0.9430
<i>p</i> -value (significant at $p < 0.05$)		0.016196
Simple linear regression (R^2)		0.8892

The statistical analysis thus shows that the more frequent use of nonlexicalised and lexicalised locative inversion in culture, sport and spot press reportage is best explained by the speaker's increased degree of involvement in these categories. The different types of locative inversions analysed here are well suited to these interpersonal features, as is shown in section 5.

5. SPEAKER'S INVOLVEMENT IN PRESS REPORTAGE: THE CASE OF NONLEXICALISED AND LEXICALISED LOCATIVE INVERSION

Reportage frequently includes news reporting and is often considered the most information-based section in a newspaper. However, as shown by Biber, press reportage texts may also exhibit interpersonal features (1988, 129). In addition, reportage has also been described as exhibiting narrative and descriptive features. In this regard, Kay Wikberg points out that the reportage types in the corpora analysed here differ from fictional texts mainly in that they deal with the description of actual rather than fictional events (1992, 248). Fictional texts, which tend to contain substantial reference to past time and places, show a strong preference for the use of adverbial and prepositional phrases conveying a locative spatial or temporal meaning (Herman 2001). Spatial and temporal reference is, then, not an optional or peripheral feature of narration but a core property that helps constitute narrative domains. Locative inversion is frequently attested in fictional texts since they are characterised by the regular introduction of new scenes with their internal topography (Kreyer 2006; Prado-Alonso and Acuña-Fariña 2010). To a more limited extent this is also the case in reportage, where the use of locative inversion is justified because of the presence of narrative stretches including spatial or temporal descriptions alongside a great proportion of nonnarrative text. As is shown in what follows, it is within these descriptions that nonlexicalised and lexicalised locative inversions serve an interpersonal function and are used to achieve the involvement of the addressor in the text.

In ordinary life, viewers perceive the most important entities first and only afterwards do they focus on particular entities or particular parts of the most important entities (Langacker 1987, 1991, 1993). However, this takes place in a spatial and temporal context that is essential to the interpretation of the information, normally shared by the addressor and the addressee. In the text descriptions attested in the press reportage texts analysed here, shared knowledge about the spatial and temporal context does not always exist between the addressor and the addressee, and locative inversion can be used by the writer as a device to provide the reader with important information about context. This can be seen in (16), where every time the narrator introduces new features of the place being described, a spatial or temporal theme is selected. The succession of the fronted spatial or temporal themes followed by the inversion of the subject and the verb is indeed a strategy chosen by the writer to guide the reader through the text by providing them with an adequate spatial and/or temporal context, required to anchor the new information provided in the postverbal subjects. The nonlexicalised locative inversions in (16) reflect the structure of the perception of a particular setting as someone would when experiencing the event in real life. The use of the inversions thus allows the writer to be present in the text, guiding the reader through it by making them focus on the spatial or temporal context first. Once this context is determined, what is being communicated is made transparent for the reader and a better understanding of the new information is achieved.

- (16) Within an easy walk from Capitol Hill, where Pennsylvania Avenue comes together with Constitution Avenue, begins a series of great federal buildings, some a block long and all about seven-stories high. Great chapters of history have been recorded along the avenue, now about 169 years old. Along this avenue, which saw marching soldiers from the War Between the States returning in 1865, is the National Archives building where hundreds of thousands of this country's most valuable records are kept. Many spectators will be occupying seats and vantage points bordering Lafayette Square, opposite the White House. In this historic square are several statues, but the one that stands out over the others is that of Gen and Andrew Jackson, hero of the Battle of New Orleans. Moving past the presidential viewing stand and Lafayette Square will be at least 40 marching units. About 16,000 military members of all branches of the armed forces will take part in the parade. Division one of the parade will be the service academies. Division two will include the representations of Massachusetts and Texas, the respective states of the President and of Vice-President L& B& Johnson. Then will come nine other states in the order of their admission to the union. (A08, sports reportage)

Another example of the writer guiding the reader through the use of nonlexicalised locative inversions is attested in (17). Here, the writer describes the arrangement of three objects on a mantelpiece, a clock, a set of candlesticks and a mirror. However, the description is not random but, rather, the objects are introduced in clearly marked steps. The writer introduces the spatial context first—the mantelpiece—and only afterwards are the entities introduced one after another, beginning from the front of the mantelpiece—the clock and the candlesticks—and finishing at the back—the mirror. The different nonlexicalised locative inversions are, therefore, context-promoting structures that the writer uses to anchor the events in the spatial descriptive process. They may be considered discourse markers that serve a focus-management function—that is, they are used by the writer to make the reader focus their attention on the spatial or temporal context first. The inversions encode the addressor's involvement in the text, because they allow the writer to be present in the text by guiding the reader through the descriptive process.

- (17) A thoroughly normal living room is utterly changed by the invasion of a train, miniature in scale, but real. What makes the incongruous juxtaposition surreally logical is that the opening of the fireplace resembles the mouth of a railroad tunnel. All the elements of the pared-down picture contribute to its theme. On the mantel is a clock with its time stopped at 12:43—has the train arrived on time? On either side of it are two candlesticks empty of candles, traditional symbol in still lives of the irredeemable passage of time. Magritte is saying he doesn't need to fall back on such hackneyed symbols to make his point. Behind the clock is a mirror that reflects the clock's back and one of the candlesticks, but which otherwise reflects only the gray

nothingness of the room, the existential void that is always the real subject of Magritte's paintings. (A39, cultural reportage)

The interpersonal function of locative inversion, which allows the speaker's presence in the text, can also be noticed in the locative inversions retrieved from the corpora that have been lexicalised in PDE (Brinton and Traugott 2005; Traugott and Trousdale 2013). Lexicalised locative inversions triggered by deictic *here*, *there*, *now* and *then* carry the implication that the subject, which represents new information, is presented for the first time and is linked to the previous discourse by the preverbal placement of the spatial or temporal deictic. Dwight Bolinger regards these constructions as "presenting something on the immediate stage" in that they bring something literally before the addressee (1977, 93). This claim is further elaborated by Hans Bernhard Dubrig, who claims that these types of inversion encompass a pragmatic presentative function that consists in "directing the addressee's conscious attention to an object in his environment by making him focus on a region in his perceptual field" (1988, 91). Lexicalised locative inversion triggered by a fronted deictic is unique in that it designates the spatial or temporal location of the addressor while at the same time designating the location of the postposed subject as being close to the addressor. The preverbal deictic points to a spatial or temporal location and, once the addressee's attention is directed towards it, they can focus "more easily" on the postposed subject, which introduces the new information and receives prominence in discourse, as illustrated in the following examples:

- (18) I made a cup of cocoa and took it to the attic... and there was this girl, wearing a green blazer and a dress. (A12, spot reportage)
- (19) Lincoln looked round the corner and: "And HERE comes TORIN DOUGLAS!" (A32, sports reportage; phonological emphasis shown in capitals)

In (19), for instance, the addressor is not only asserting that Torin Douglas is arriving but is also directing the attention of the addressee to the location specified by *here*, which is close to the addressor. This would be even more apparent if the inversion was used in speech, where the preverbal deictic would bear a marked stress. However, stress of the deictic would not only be the result of its highly marked preverbal placement but also of the function performed by the lexicalised locative inversion. In other words, the deictic is stressed since the addressor's intention is first to draw the addressee's attention towards a location in order to allow them to better interpret the new information, the subject, which is placed in postverbal position and receives a primary stress. This results in a stressed-unstressed-stressed phonological pattern, which can be seen as a mirror of the pragmatic function of the lexicalised locative inverted construction. It allows the author to be involved in the text and instruct the addressee to focus on two units of information—the new information and the context in which this information takes

place—and achieve a link between them. Furthermore, as George Lakoff aptly notes, in speech in these lexicalised locative inversions the stress of the deictic is accompanied by a pause in prosody (1987, 468ff), as shown by the slash in (20) and (21). Such a pause indicates a boundary in discourse and the process can be represented as follows: first the deictic—the location of the addressor—is emphasised; then time is given to the addressee to realise it (pause); and only afterwards is the new information presented in discourse and anchored to the location specified by the deictic. Prosodically, both the stress and the pause are required in the locative inverted construction (21a) but not in the SVX version, which differs in meaning and where the deictic remains in an unmarked position (21b).

(20) THEN / will come nine other states in the order of their admission to the union. (A08, sports reportage)

(21) a. THERE / lie the reasons for Clinton's confidence. (A15, financial reportage)
 b. ? The reasons for Clinton's confidence lie there.

The addressor's involvement in discourse can be also noticed in lexicalised locative inversions triggered by an enumerative or sequential adverb, as shown in (22). In this example, the new information, encoded by the subject, is linked to the previous discourse by the preverbal placement of the sequential adverb, which points to a temporal location, and only when the addressor guides the addressee's awareness towards this location is the new information introduced into the discourse. As M. A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan note, this type of locative inversion belongs to "the speaker's organisation of his discourse" (1976, 229), and in press reportage it represents the writer's involvement in the temporal sequencing of the text. The lexicalised locative inversions in (22), therefore, allow the enumeration of pieces of information in an order chosen by the addressor and perform a linking function. In other words, they allow the addressor to give a detailed and temporally structured account of the topic. The preverbal constituents *first*, *second* and *finally* function as adverbial pointers that help to indicate the progression of events and mark the successive stages in the discourse. This would not occur in an SVX word order, where *first*, *second* and *finally* would no longer occupy a preverbal position and would simply convey a temporal meaning affecting the verb, without performing a cohesive function. Thus, the lexicalised locative inversions in (22) explicitly signal the links between ideas and the connections between passages in the text. That is to say, they are constructions that allow the signalling of the macrostructural sectioning of a text and create textual cohesion.

(22) As the time for independence approached there were in Congo four principal political parties. First were those Congolese (among them Joseph Kasavubu) who favored splitting the country into small independent states, Balkanizing it. Second were those (Moise Tshombe) who favored near-Balkanization, a loose federalism having a

central government of limited authority (...). Finally were those (notably Patrice Lumumba) who favoured a unified Congo with a very strong central government. (A35, spot reportage)

As I have argued elsewhere, these types of lexicalised locative are frequently attested in academic prose, where they are commonly used in the development of arguments (Prado-Alonso and Acuña-Fariña 2010). They are also attested, though less frequently, in press reportage, where they allow the addressor to be present in the text and to help the addressee to understand better the sequence of events—and the most important statements—by guiding them through each step of the text.

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This piece of research has dealt with the study of lexicalised and nonlexicalised locative inversion in press reportage texts taken from six PDE written corpora. The study differs from other corpus-based analyses of locative inversion focusing on press reportage in that it also examines patterns of internal variation in this register by analysing the construction in sports, finance, culture, politics and spot press reportage texts.

The results are in line with Dorgeloh, who considers that locative inversion serves a deictic-presentative function (1997), and also support Chen's claim that the construction is an instantiation of the Ground-before-Figure cognitive model (2003). However, my analysis has further shown that the lexicalised and nonlexicalised locative inversions retrieved from the corpora, despite their formal differences, have something in common: they are used by the writer as discourse markers to encode involvement in press reports (RQ1). The statistical comparison of my corpus-based results with Biber's multidimensional analysis (1988) shows that there is a tendency for those press reportage text types with a higher occurrence of interpersonal features—culture, sports and spot news—to favour the use of both types of locative inversion. The statistical analysis has, in fact, demonstrated that the more interpersonal in nature a press reportage text is, the more locative inversions can be expected (RQ2).

The corpus-based study has also shown that the stronger affinity of nonlexicalised and lexicalised locative inversion with the culture, sports and spot news texts analysed here is not only explained by the degree of involvement of the writer, but also by the fact that the constructions themselves encode an interpersonal meaning and represent the writer's intervention in the text (RQ3). The locative inversions retrieved from the corpora allow the writer to direct the reader's focus of interest towards a particular constituent—namely, the fronted constituent. The inversions allow the writer to be involved in the text by guiding the reader spatially or temporally, which in turn facilitates the accommodation of the new information provided by the subject in the addressee's knowledge base.

Even though the present research has some limitations in terms of the size of the corpora and the number and types of press reports analysed, it represents an important

first step in the analysis of the internal variation of locative inversion in journalistic writing. A more comprehensive account dealing with the analysis of locative inversion in more types of journalistic genres—press reviews, press editorials, etc.—would enable a more detailed description of the construction in this type of writing. This is an interesting avenue for future research.⁷

WORKS CITED

- BAKER, Paul. 2009. *Contemporary Corpus Linguistics*. London: Continuum.
- BIBER, Douglas. 1988. *Variation across Speech and Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- BIBER, Douglas et al. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- BIRNER, Betty. 1996. *The Discourse Function of Inversion in English*. New York: Garland.
- BOLINGER, Dwight. 1977. *Meaning and Form*. London: Longman.
- BRESNAN, Joan. 1994. "Locative Inversion and the Architecture of Universal Grammar." *Language* 70 (1): 72-131.
- BRINTON, Laurel and Elisabeth Traugott. 2005. *Lexicalization and Language Change: Research Surveys in Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- BRITISH NATIONAL CORPUS, version 3 (BNC XML Edition). 2007. U. of Oxford. [Accessed May 30, 2019].
- CHEN, Rong. 2003. *English Inversion: A Ground-Before-Figure Construction*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- . 2013. "Subject-Auxiliary Inversion and Linguistic Generalization: Evidence for Functional/cognitive Motivation in Language." *Cognitive Linguistics* 24 (1): 1-32.
- COLE, Peter and Jerry Morgan, eds. *Speech Acts*. Vol 3, *Syntax and Semantics*. New York: Academic Press.
- DE WIT, Astrid. 2015. "The Relation between Aspect and Inversion in English." *English Language and Linguistics* 20 (1): 107-28.
- DORGELOH, Heidrum. 1997. *Inversion in Modern English: Form and Function*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- DUBRIG, Hans Bernhard. 1988. "On the Discourse Function of Subject-Verb Inversion." In Klegraf and Nehls 1988, 83-95.
- DUFFLEY, Patrick. 2018. "The Cognitive Structure of Full-Verb Inversion and Existential Structures in English." *Cognitive Semantics* 4 (2): 184-229.
- GREEN, Georgia. 1980. "Some Wherefores of English Inversions." *Language* 56 (3): 582-601.
- GRICE, H. P. 1975. "Logic and Conversation." In Cole and Morgan 1975, 41-58.

⁷ The research reported on in this article has been funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness through research project "Constructionalization in contemporary and earlier English: Cognitive, variationist and discourse-pragmatic perspectives" (FFI2017-86884-P). Thanks are also due to two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

- HALLIDAY, M. A. K. and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- HERMAN, David. 2001. "Spatial Reference in Narrative Domains." *Text* 21 (4): 515-41.
- HOFLAND, Knut et al. 1999. *ICAME Collection of English Language Corpora*. Bergen: The HIT Centre.
- HOLLER, Sara and Jutta M. Hartmann. 2012. "Locative Inversion in English: Implications of a Rating Study." In Stolterfoht and Featherston 2012, 241-65.
- HOPPER, Paul J., ed. 1982. *Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- HUDDLESTON, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- KIM, Jong-Bok. 2003. "Locative Inversion: A Constraint-Based Perspective." *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 28 (2): 1-24.
- KLEGRAF, Joseph and Dietrich Nehls, eds. 1988. *Essays on the English Language and Applied Linguistics on the Occasion of Gerhard Nickel's 60th Birthday*. Heidelberg: Julius Gross.
- KOFFKA, Kurt. 1935. *Principles of Gestalt Perception*. New York: Harcourt and Brace.
- KRECH, David et al. 1974. *Elements of Psychology*. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- KREYER, Rolf. 2006. *Inversion in Modern Written English: Syntactic Complexity, Information Status and the Creative Writer*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- LAKOFF, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- LANGACKER, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP.
- . 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, vol. 2: Descriptive Applications*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP.
- . 1993. "Reference-Point Constructions." *Cognitive Linguistics* 4 (1): 1-38.
- LEINTER, Gerhard, ed. 1992. *New Directions in English Language Corpora: Methodology, Results, Software Development*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- MILLER, George A. and Philip N. Johnson-Laird. 1976. *Language and Perception*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- NAKAJIMA, Heizo. 2000. "Verb Second, Locative Inversion and Topicalization." *Linguistic Analysis* 30 (1-2): 7-24.
- OJEA, Ana. 2019. "EPP Satisfaction on Discourse Grounds: The Case of Locative Inversion." *Syntax* 22 (2): 248-73.
- PRADO-ALONSO, Carlos. 2016. "A Constructional Analysis of Obligatory XVS Structures." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 51 (1): 51-82.
- PRADO-ALONSO, Carlos and Juan Carlos Acuña-Fariña. 2010. "A Comprehensive Account of Full-Verb Inversion in English." *Folia Linguistica* 44 (2): 509-53.
- QUIRK, Randolph et al. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- R DEVELOPMENT CORE TEAM, 2019. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. [Accessed June 7, 2019].

- REINHART, Tanya. 1984. "Principles of Gestalt Perception in the Temporal Organization of Narrative Texts." *Linguistics* 22 (6): 779-809.
- ROCK, Irvin. 1975. *An Introduction to Perception*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- STOLTERFOHT, Britta and Sam Featherston, eds. 2012. *Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Theory*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- TALMY, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- TEIXEIRA, Joana. 2016. "Locative Inversion and Stage Topics: A Cross-Linguistic Study." *Discours: Revue de Linguistique, Psycholinguistique et Informatique* 19: 1-28.
- THE BRITISH NATIONAL CORPUS. 2007. Distributed by Bodleian Libraries. University of Oxford.
- TRAUGOTT, Elisabeth and Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and Constructional Changes*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- WALLACE, Stephen. 1982. "Figure and Ground: The Interrelationships of Linguistic Categories." In Hopper 1982, 201-23.
- WEBELHUTH, Gert. 2011. "Motivating Non-Canonicity in Construction Grammar: The Case of Locative Inversion." *Cognitive Linguistics* 22 (1): 81-105.
- WIKBERG, Kay. 1992. "Discourse Category and Text Type Classification: Procedural Discourse in the Brown and LOB Corpora." In Leinter 1992, 247-62.
- ZUSNE, Leonard. 1970. *Visual Perception of Form*. New York: Academic Press.

Received 20 November 2019

Revised version accepted 30 July 2020

Carlos Prado-Alonso is Senior Lecturer in English language and linguistics at the University of Oviedo. His research interests include English contemporary syntax and pragmatics. He has published widely in international peer-reviewed journals such as *Folia Linguistica*, *Studia Neophilologica* or *English Studies*. His monograph *Full Inversion in Written and Spoken English* (2011) was awarded the European Society for the Study of English (ESSE) award in English Language and Linguistics.