Notes on Deictic Inversion and Quotative Inversion in English*

Masatoshi HONDA

Abstract

The peculiar syntactic and semantic properties of locative inversion (LI) have been a central research topic in the generative framework. It is argued that LI has a semantic/cognitive function of expressing a directly perceived situation that is about to happen, is happening, or has happened before the speaker's eyes (Fukuchi (1985) and Hasegawa (2010)). Unifying LI and Japanese thetic judgment sentences into the presentational clause type, Hasegawa (2010) proposes a cartographic analysis to account for their syntactic and semantic/cognitive properties. According to Hasegawa's analysis of LI, the preposed locative PP occupies [Spec, ForceP], thereby encoding the clause type as presentational. The aim of this paper is to develop Hasegawa's analysis of LI by elaborating on the information-structural status of the locative PP. More specifically, I propose that the locative PP may target either [Spec, ModP] or [Spec, FocP]: In the former, the postverbal NP carries focus; in the latter, the preposed locative PP carries focus. Extending the proposed analysis to quotative inversion (QI), I further argue that the derivation of QI may involve focus fronting, concluding that LI (/Deictic Inversion) involving focus fronting is theoretically treated on par with QI. This study thus makes a theoretical contribution to the unified approach to LI and QI that has been motivated on different grounds in previous studies (e.g., Collins (1997) and Wu (2008)).

1. Introduction

Since the early days of generative grammar (e.g., Emonds (1976)), inversion sentences in English have long been a topic of debate. Locative Inversion (LI) has been studied as a representative case of so-called inversion sentences due to its unique syntactic and semantic properties. One of the crucial semantic/cognitive properties of LI is the presentational function, which has been defined differently in the literature on linguistics. One general definition is that LI is a grammatical means to introduce a new entity in the discourse (e.g., Bresnan (1994) and Lambrecht (1994)); for example, a speaker can use a sentence like "Into the room came *a cat*." in order to draw her/his hearer's attention to the fact that a hitherto absent entity (*a cat*) has appeared in the place denoted by the locative PP (*into the room*). Hasegawa (2010) defines the presentational function as a semantic/cognitive function that expresses a directly perceived actual situation that is about to happen, is happening, or has happened before the speaker's eyes (see also Fukuchi (1985)). Hasegawa's definition of the presentational function is

intended to cover Japanese thetic judgment (*ga*-marked) sentences (Kuroda (1965, 1972)) and English presentational sentences including LI, which are illustrated below:[1]

(1) a. Neko-ga heya-de nemut-tei-ru. [Thetic Judgment]
neko-NOM room-at sleep-PROG-PRES
'A cat is sleeping in the room.'
b. In the room slept a cat. [Locative Inversion]

Identifying crucial syntactic-semantic similarities between thetic judgment sentences and LI, Hasegawa (2010) unifies them into the presentational clause type. Hasegawa's approach is based on Cheng's (1991:29) clause-typing hypothesis, according to which "[e]very clause needs to be typed[;] in the case of typing a *wh*-question, either a *wh*-particle in C^0 is used or else fronting a *wh*-word to the Spec of C^0 is used, thereby typing a clause C^0 by Spec-head agreement." According to Hasegawa's analysis, the syntactic structures of Japanese thetic judgment sentences and LI are responsible for their presentational function and the relevant syntactic-semantic properties, contra Kuroda, who argues that the distinction between thetic judgment sentences and the other *ga*-marked sentences exists at the semantic level.

The primary aim of this study is to elaborate Hasegawa's (2010) approach to the presentational clause type in terms of the information-structural status of the fronted locative PP in LI. Adopting the cartography of syntactic structures as a theoretical framework (e.g., Rizzi (1997)), Hasegawa proposes that the locative PP targets [Spec, ForceP], thereby encoding the clause type as presentational (i.e., [+P]). Modifying Hasegawa's analysis, I propose that the locative PP may target either [Spec, ModP] or [Spec, FocP]: In the former, the postverbal NP carries (presentational) focus; in the latter, the preposed locative PP represents focus. In both cases, the Force head is assumed to type the clause as [+P] by searching and agreeing with the preposed locative PP. It is then shown that the proposed analysis is supported by deictic inversion (e.g., *Here is your lunch box!*), a subtype of LI that can be used in the spoken context. Extending the proposed analysis to quotative inversion (QI), I argue for the analytical possibility that certain instances of LI and QI can be derived by focus fronting. Therefore, this study constitutes an attempt to provide a further theoretical contribution to the unified approach to LI and QI that has been motivated on different empirical and theoretical grounds in previous studies (Collins (1997) and Wu (2008)).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the cartographic framework and proposes an alternative analysis of presentational sentences on the basis of Hasegawa's (2010) analysis. Focusing on deictic inversion, Section 3 provides empirical evidence for the proposed analysis. Section 4 extends the proposed analysis to QI. Section 5 presents the conclusions of this study.

2. Theoretical Background

This section first introduces some core theoretical assumptions proposed in the cartographic framework (Rizzi (1997, 2004)); then, after reviewing Hasegawa's (2010) analysis of the presentational clause type, I propose an alternative analysis that reflects the information-structural status of the fronted locative PP.

2. 1. The CP Domain and Discourse-Related Functional Projections

The cartography of syntactic structures has been proposed as a theoretical program that aims at drawing precise and complete maps of syntactic configurations (e.g., Rizzi (1997, 2004) and Rizzi and Cinque (2016)). Such syntactic maps play significant roles in providing crucial information for the interfaces with meaning and sound. For example, the traditional CP domain assumed in GB theory divides into multiple discourse-related functional projections such as *Force*, *Topic*, *Focus*, and *Finite*, as illustrated below:[2]

(2) a. CP … IP … VP …
b. Force … Topic … Focus … Finite IP …

The CP domain is delimited by the two functional heads labelled *Force*, which expresses illocutionary force and clausal type, and *Finiteness* (Fin), which agrees in finiteness with the adjacent clause IP. *Topic* and *Focus* are sandwiched between *Force* and *Fin*: The former triggers topicalization and the latter focus fronting (see also Gundel (1974) and Culicover (1992)).

(3) a. Your book, you should give *t* to Paul (not to Bill)
b. YOUR BOOK you should give *t* to Paul (not mine)
(Rizzi (1997:285))

The topicalization sentence in (3a) involves the topic-comment articulation: The topic is a fronted element that expresses old information on the semantic side, and it is set off from the rest of the clause by comma intonation on the phonological side; the comment forms an open proposition predicated of the topic, introducing new information. The focus-presupposition articulation in (3b) is formally similar, but interpretively and phonologically different. The fronted focus element introduces contrastive new information and bears focal stress; the presupposition expresses given information, or knowledge that the speaker assumes to be shared with the hearer. By virtue of its contrastive nature, indicated by the presence of the negative tag, contrastive focus fronting cannot be used as the neutral answer to a *wh*-question. The Topic-Focus sequence assumed in (2b) is motivated by the following fact that a fronted topic must precede a fronted focus in English:

(4) a. This book to ROBIN I gave. (Culicover (1992:36))
b. * To ROBIN this book I gave. (Haegeman (2012:20))

The following example illustrates a more complex case where topicalization and negative inversion co-occur in the embedded context:

(5) a. He prayed THAT *atrocities like those,* **never again** would he witness.
(Radford 2004: 329, with modifications)
b. FORCE (Subordination), *Topicalization*, **Focus** (**Negation**, *wh*-Q), Fin

Here, the Force layer and the Fin layer are assumed to be responsible for the dual role played by the CP system: clause typing and tense specification. The complementizer *that* lexicalizes the Force head and encodes the clause type as Declarative (i.e., [+Decl]). The Fin head occupied by the inverted auxiliary functions to specify the finiteness of the clause as finite; the Fin layer may involve a null head that specifies the clause as finite if only topicalization occurs in the embedded context. On the basis of the split CP hypothesis, Hasegawa (2010) proposes the following derivations for *wh*-questions in English and Japanese:

(6) a. What did you buy?

b. $[_{ForceP[+Q]} \ldots [_{FocP[+wh]}\ what_{[+wh]j} [_{FinP}\ did_i\ [_{IP}\ you\ [_{I'}\ t_i [_{VP}\ buy\ t_j\ ]]]]]]$

(7) a. Anata-wa nani-o kaimasi-ta ka?
you-TOP what-ACC buy.POL-PAST Q?

b. $[_{ForceP[+Q]} \ldots [_{FocP[+wh]}\ [_{FinP}\ [_{IP}\ anata(-wa)\ [_{I'}\ [_{VP}\ nani(-o)_{[+wh]}\ [_{V'}\ t_i\ ]]\ t_i\ ]]\ kaimasi\text{-}ta_i]]\ ka_{[+Q]}]$

Under her system, it is assumed that clause types are marked at the Force layer with the corresponding abstract features (e.g., [+Decl(arative)], [+Q(uestion)], [+P(resentational)], etc.). In the case of English *wh*-questions, the [+Q] feature on the Force head triggers movement of a *wh*-word to [Spec, FocP], and the auxiliary fronts to the Fin head. In the case of Japanese *wh*-questions, on the other hand, the [+Q] feature on the Force head (lexicalized by the Q-marker *ka*) induces head movement of a verbal element to the Fin head, and the Foc head agrees with a *wh*-word in the sentential (IP) domain.

Having introduced the basic theoretical assumptions, the next subsection reviews Hasegawa's (2010) unified approach to thetic judgment sentences and LI.

2. 2. Hasegawa (2010): Presentationals as a Clause Type

Kuroda (1965, 1972) claims that the differences in judgment styles are linguistically marked in Japanese by the topic marker *wa* and the nominative case marker *ga*. Kuroda observes that the English sentence in (8) can be translated into two sentences in Japanese, a *ga* sentence and a *wa* sentence.

(8) The cat is sleeping there.

(9) a. Neko-ga asoko-de nemut-tei-ru.
Neko-NOM there-at sleep-PROG-PRES

b. Neko-wa asoko-de nemut-tei-ru
Neko-TOP there-at sleep-PROG-PRES

The two sentences in (9) express the same situation but are different in their judgment styles. The nominative marker *ga* in (9a) expresses a thetic judgment, whereas the topic marker *wa* in (9b) expresses a categorical judgment. In the former, the thetic judgment expressed by (9a) reflects a speaker's direct response to the perceptual cognition of an actual situation; that is, there is an actual situation in which a cat is sleeping there. *Categorical judgment*, on the other hand, consists of two acts: "the act of recognition of that which is to be made the subject, and the other, the act of affirming or denying what

is expressed by the predicate about the subject" (Kuroda 1972:154). Thus, the categorical judgment expressed by (9b) implies that the speaker recognizes the presence of a cat in advance and apprehends it in the perceived situation as an entity that is playing a particular role in the given situation. Therefore, *thetic judgment* is a single act, whereas *categorical judgment* a double act. Kuroda argues that thetic judgment sentences are not syntactically differentiated from other sentences such as *ga*-marked embedded sentences.

Hasegawa (2010), unlike Kuroda (1965, 1972), argues for a syntactic analysis of Japanese thetic judgment sentences and presentational sentences in English. Hasegawa's approach is of empirical and theoretical importance in implementing the idea that LI and Japanese thetic judgment sentences constitute an independent clause type structurally distinguished from other sentence structures. Hasegawa's analyses of LI and thetic judgements are schematically illustrated below:

(10) a. Into the room came a cat.
b. $[_{\text{ForceP[+P]/[-1st, -2nd]}}$ into my room$_j$ … $[_{\text{FinP[Thetic]}}$ came$_i$ $[_{\text{IP}}$ t$_j$ $[_{\text{I'}}$ $[_{\text{VP}}$ t$_i$ a cat$_{\text{[-1st, -2nd]}}$ t$_j$]]]]]
(11) a. Neko-ga heya-de nemut-tei-ru.
b. $[_{\text{ForceP[+P]/[-1st, -2nd]}}$ … $[_{\text{FinP[Thetic]}}$ $[_{\text{Fin'}}$ $[_{\text{IP}}$ neko-ga$_j$ $[_{\text{I'}}$ $[_{\text{VP}}$ t$_j$ heya-de $[_{\text{V'}}$ t$_i$]] t$_i$]] nemut-te-i-ru$_j$]]]

Hasegawa's analysis of LI in (10) is proposed on the basis of the following four assumptions. First, the Force head with the abstract feature [+P] induces fronting of a locative PP to [Spec, ForceP]; as a result, the sentence is typed as a presentational clause. Second, the Force head also bears the [−1st, −2nd] person features and establishes an agreement relationship with the postverbal NP with the same features (cf. (12b)). Third, the Force head with [+P] communicates with the Fin head, thereby specifying the Fin head as [Thetic]; the [Thetic] feature here is assumed to account for the tense specification and the restriction of the types of predicates (cf. (12a, c)) and triggers movement of an inflectional element (with a predicate) to the Fin head. Fourth, the EPP requirement is satisfied by a PP. Basically, a similar analysis is proposed for Japanese thetic judgment sentences, except that the sentence type is morphologically marked at the Fin head occupied by a conjugated verb (i.e., a complex verbal head), as shown in (11b). Hasegawa's analyses of LI and thetic judgment sentences involve clause typing at the Force layer level; hence, it follows that they are theoretically treated as main-clause phenomena (see Emonds (1976) for the treatment of LI as an instance of root transformation; see Hasegawa (2010) for the empirical characterization of thetic judgment sentences as an example of main-clause phenomena).

Putting details aside, Hasegawa's (2010) unified analysis provides a systematic account of the following empirical characterizations of thetic judgment sentences and LI:

(12) Empirical Characterization of LI in English
a. <u>*Typical predicate types*</u>: Unaccusative verbs, or verbs of existence or emergence. (e.g., On the corner was { standing / * drinking } a woman. (Bresnan (1994:78))
b. <u>*Person restriction on the subject*</u>: Neither the 1st person nor the 2nd person. (e.g., * Into the building ran {I / ME / WE /US}. (Takami (1995:200) / * On the top of the mountain stood YOU. (Takami (1995:200))

c. *Tense interpretation*: The present and the simple past, excluding auxiliaries of inference (except *will*) and the perfective.
(e.g., Down the street rolled the baby carriage! (Emonds 1976:29) *vs.* * Down the hill may roll the baby carriage! (Coopmans (1989:729) / * Down the stairs has fallen the baby. (Coopmans (1989:729))

(13) Empirical Characterization of Thetic Judgment Sentences in Japanese (Hasegawa (2010:11))
a. *Typical predicate types*: (i) of temporal-existence and emergence, such as *i-ru*, *a-ru* 'be, exist', *ku-ru* 'come', *tuk-u* 'arrive'; (ii) of sudden/obvious change of state or temporal state, such as *koware-ru* 'break-intr[ansitive].', *oti-ru* 'drop', *byooki-da* 'be sick'; (iii) activity/process predicates with *te-iru* 'be-stative.' (= (14))
b. *Person restriction on the subject*: Neither the 1st person nor the 2nd person. (= (15))
c. *Tense interpretation*: the 'non-perfect' *-(r)u* form of activity/change predicates → the immediate perfect or the on-going aspect; the 'perfect' *-ta* form of activity/change predicates → the immediate perfect, not the simple past. (= (14))

(14) a. Oya, asoko-ni John-ga i-ru.
Oh there-at John-NOM exist-PRES
'Oh, John is there.' (Hasegawa 2010:8)

b. Tegami-ga ki-ta.
letter-NOM come-PAST
'Mail has come.' (Hasegawa 2010:8)

c. A! Kabin-ga oti-ru.
oh vase-NOM drop-PRES
'Oh, the vase is going to drop!' (Hasegawa 2010:10)

d. Neko-ga asoko-de nemut-te-i-ru.
cat-NOM there-in sleep-PROG-PRES
'A cat is sleeping there.'

(15) {* Watasi / * Anata / Kodomo }-ga hasit-te-i-ru.
I / you / child-NOM run-PROG-PRES
'{ * I / * You / A child } is running.' (Nitta 1991:127)

Hasegawa's (2010) analysis constitutes an innovative attempt to provide a theoretical basis for investigating presentational sentences from a syntactic perspective (see Honda (2021) for the further application of Hasegawa's approach to participle preposing in English). On the basis of Hasegawa's analysis, the next subsection proposes an alternative analysis by focusing on the information-structural status of the preposed locative PP.

2. 3. Alternative Analysis: The Information-Structural Status of the Preposed Locative PP in LI

According to Hasegawa's (2010) proposal, the locative PP in LI fronts to [Spec, ForceP], wherein the clause type is encoded as [+P]. In this proposal, the locative PP syntactically functions to encode the clause type as [+P], but this analysis does not perfectly reflect the information-structural status of the

preposed locative PP. Some previous studies, on the other hand, argue that the preposed locative PP also plays a crucial role in determining the information structure of LI (Birner (1994) and Kuno and Takami (2013)).

Based on a corpus-based survey, Birner (1994) argues that LI takes the following three information-structural patterns (see also Kuno and Takami (2013) for a detailed review):

(16) a. On **the hall table** is **a crystal vase full of roses**.
anaphoric non-anaphoric
b. In **a little white house** lived **seven dwarfs**.
non-anaphoric non-anaphoric
c. Under **the doormat** lay **the key to the front door**.
anaphoric anaphoric

(Kuno and Takami (2013:174), translations mine)

Through a corpus survey, Birner collected 1778 tokens of LI and investigated their information structures. The three main findings are: First, there was no token with a preposed discourse-new element and a postverbal discourse old element (i.e., the non-anaphoric [new] & anaphoric [old] pattern); second, in postposed position, constituents representing discourse-new information outnumbered those representing discourse-old information by more than 20 to 1 (674 tokens [96%] vs. 29 tokens [4%]); third, preposed constituents representing discourse-old information outnumbered those representing discourse-new information 4 to 1 (562 tokens [80%] vs. 141 tokens [20%]). These findings suggest the following tendency: The preposed element in LI, in general, is not newer in the discourse than the postverbal element. Takami and Kuno (2013:178), on the other hand, claim that the non-anaphoric [new] & anaphoric [old] information structural pattern is actually possible in LI. They conducted informant surveys, presenting the following examples as acceptable cases where the preposed-locative phrase is new while the post-verbal element is old:

(17) a. Into **a dark cave** walked **the beautiful sleeping princess.**
b. Into **a dark room** walked **the woman with the emerald necklace.**
c. In **a dark cave on a mountainside** lived **the evil witches of Songsee.**
d. Into **a dark cave** walked **the spellbound princess**.
e. Out of **a hidden doorway** walked **the girl with the golden hair**.
f. We had finished our work and were just about to leave, when out of **a closet** walked **John**.

(Takami and Kuno (2013:178))

Thus, in terms of the occurrence of an anaphoric/non-anaphoric lexical element in the locative PP and/or the postverbal NP, LI basically allows the four information-structural patterns: (i) the new-new pattern, (ii) the new-old pattern, (iii) the old-new pattern, and (iv) the old-old pattern. These four information-structural patterns exist at the lexical level, but on the basis of the functional-syntactic similarity between the *there*-sentence and LI, Takami and Kuno then argue that the post-verbal NP of

the *there*-sentence and LI represents new information regardless of whether it contains an anaphoric lexical element or not; the preposed PP functions to set a scene in which the new entity denoted by the postverbal NP is introduced. Their argument basically implies that the preposed locative PP in LI can vary from old to new (see Takami (1995) for the observation that certain instances of LI such as (16b) can be used to start a story and therefore are compatible with the all-new statement context).

Within the generative framework, it is often argued that the locative PP in LI serves as topic (e.g., Bresnan (1994)), but a recent study by Rizzi and Shlonsky (2007) points out that the preposed PP may behave as either topic or focus (e.g., a *wh*-word or a contrastive focus element). The following examples correspond to the examples in (11) and (12a, b) in Rizzi and Shlonsky's paper, respectively:

(18) In what room is sitting my old brother?
(19) a. IN THE LIVING ROOM is sitting my old brother (, not in the bedroom).
b. IN THE LIVING ROOM, but not in the bedroom, were hanging portraits of GWB.

Their observation implies that the fronted locative PP in LI plays different discourse-related roles.

To sum up, given Hasegawa's (2010) analysis of LI, it will be concluded that the information-structural status of the preposed locative PP can vary from old to new as long as it is compatible with the presentational function. In order to account for the information-structural status of the preposed locative PP, I first adopt Rizzi's (2004) revised version of the split CP hypothesis shown below:

(20) Force … Top(ic) … Foc(us) … Mod(ifier) … Fin … IP …

On the basis of the Italian data in (21), Rizzi (ibid.:239) assumes the functional head Mod(ifier) as a landing site for a preposed adverbial element that "does not share with the topic the necessary connection to the background, whence its compatibility with 'what happened' contexts."

(21) A: Che cosa è successo?
'What happened?'
B: Improvvisamente, la polizia stradale ha fermato l'autobus per Roma.
'Suddenly, the road police stopped the bus to Rome.'

(Rizzi (2004:238))

Second, I assume that the locative PP may target either [Spec, FocP] or [Spec, ModP], depending on its information-structural status (see Cruschina (2011, 2021) for focus fronting phenomena in Sicilian and other Romance languages that are compatible with the all-new statement (or "what happened?") context and the question-answer context.). Third, the Force head with the [+P] feature searches and agrees with the locative PP with the same feature occupying either [Spec, FocP] or [Spec, ModP], thereby encoding the clause type as presentational. These assumptions allow us to propose the following derivations for LI:

(22) a. $[_{\text{ForceP[+P]/[-1st, -2nd]}} \dots [_{\text{FocP}}$ in a little white house$[_{\text{+P]}j} \dots [_{\text{FinP[Thetic]}}$ lived$_i$ $[_{\text{IP}}$ t_j $[_{\text{I'}}$ $[_{\text{VP}}$ t_i two rabbits$_{\text{[-1st, -2nd]}}$ t_j]]]]]]

b. $[_{\text{ForceP[+P]/[-1st, -2nd]}} \dots [_{\text{ModP}}$ into my room$_{\text{[+P]}j} \dots [_{\text{FinP[Thetic]}}$ came$_i$ $[_{\text{IP}}$ t_j $[_{\text{I'}}$ $[_{\text{VP}}$ t_i a cat$_{\text{[-1st, -2nd]}}$ t_j]]]]]

The proposed analysis theoretically predicts that there are two types of LI: one with a preposed locative PP representing (discourse-related) new information and the other with a preposed locative PP that simply functions to set a scene. Some examples of the former are instantiated from LI with *wh*-movement and contrastive(/corrective) focus fronting (cf. (18), (19)). The latter differs from the former in that the postverbal NP introduces a new entity (i.e., focus) in the speech setting that, in turn, behaves as a topic in the subsequent discourse.

If we allow the analytical possibility that certain instances of LI are derived by focus fronting, it will be further predicted that certain examples of LI can be used as answers to *wh*-questions. However, it should be noted here that LI is restricted to the written context (cf. Birner and Ward (1998)), and hence it is not so easy to investigate and identify the information-structural status of the preposed locative PP in terms of question-answer pairs.

(23) a. Hey, Sam – Did you hear the weird report on the evening news? # In the basement of a department store are living a bunch of alligators.

b. Hey, Sam – Did you hear the weird report on the evening news? A bunch of alligators are living in the basement of a department store.

(Birner and Ward (1998:175))

For this reason, the next subsection attempts to provide empirical evidence for the proposed analysis with reference to deictic inversion (e.g., *Here is your lunch box!*), which can be used in the spoken context (e.g., Lambrecht (1994)).

3. Evidence from Deictic Inversion in English

The previous section proposed two derivational possibilities of LI in English: The first is that the locative PP targets [Spec, ModP]; the second is that the locative PP moves to [Spec, FocP]. In the former case, the preposed locative PP simply functions to set a scene in which a new entity is introduced; in the latter case, the preposed PP is predicted to receive a discourse-related focus interpretation (other than corrective focus) in the question-answer context. The present study also assumes that both types of LI, in principle, are compatible with the presentational function by means of the following syntactic operations (Hasegawa (2010)): The [−1st, −2nd] person features on the Force head agree with the same features on the post-verbal NP; the [Thetic] feature on the Fin head triggers fronting of a tensed predicate that is compatible with the presentational function. Because the use of LI is restricted to the written context, deictic inversion, which can be naturally used in the spoken context, is selected in order to confirm the two predictions stated above.

3. 1. Formal Properties

This subsection first provides two pieces of evidence for the claim that deictic inversion (DI) shows the presentational function. The first evidence comes from Lambrecht's (1994) observation that DI does not allow anaphoric pronouns in post-copular position. Lambrecht (1994:36-37) attempts to describe the presentational function of DI within a model of the universe of discourse, which consists of the following two parts:

(24) a. the TEXT-EXTERNAL WORLD, which comprises (i) SPEECH PARTICIPANTS, i.e. a speaker and one or several addressees, and (ii) a SPEECH SETTING, i.e. the place, time and circumstances in which a speech event takes place;
b. the TEXT-INTERNAL WORLD, which comprises LINGUISTIC EXPRESSIONS (words, phrases, sentences) and their MEANINGS.

Having the two notions in (24) in mind, let us consider the following examples:

(25) a. Here comes the CAT. (Lambrecht (1994:39))
b. And here the cat COMES! (Lambrecht (1994:39))
c. Here he COMES. (Lambrecht (1994:40))

The logical subject *the cat* in the DI sentence in (25a) occupies the postverbal position and receives prosodic prominence; in this case, the logical subject has the focus relation to the proposition, implying that a hitherto absent entity is arriving at the speech setting (or the text-external world). If at the time of the utterance the entity introduced into the discourse happens to be already established as a topic in the text-internal world, the speaker grammatically expresses this fact by putting the same lexical subject or its pronominal counterpart in the preverbal subject position, as shown in the initial-*here* sentences in (25b, c). Although the subject in (25b) is lexical, it lacks prosodic prominence and the predicate instead receives prosodic prominence; the relevant sentence can be uttered by someone with an allergy to cats who is sitting in the house of a cat owner and is hoping the animal will not appear. A further difference between DI sentences and initial-*here* sentences appears when the first and second pronouns occur in the postverbal/preverbal subject position. Let us first consider the following initial-*here* sentences:

(26) Here I AM. (Lambrecht (1994:41))
(27) a. Here you ARE.
b. HERE you are.
(Lambrecht (1994:41))

According to Lambrecht, a speaker may use (26) to announce her/his presence to a hearer; it is also possible for her/him to acknowledge the arrival/presence of a previously absent hearer at the speech setting by uttering either (27a) or (27b). Since the speaker and the hearer are necessary participants in the speech setting (or the text-external world), the pronouns *I* and *you* appear before the verb. The

situations described by (26) and (27a, b) are not expressed by DI sentences such as "*Here's ME*." or "*Here's YOU*."; furthermore, according to Lambrecht, sentence structures such as "*Here am I*." and "*Here are YOU*." are ungrammatical. Under the present approach on the basis of Hasegawa (2010), Lambrecht's observations can be analyzed as a reflex of the feature-agreement operation in which the Force head with the [−1st, −2nd] person feature searches and agrees with the post-verbal NP with the same feature (cf. (10b)).

The second piece of evidence is obtained from Webelhuth's (2011:section 3.1) observation that DI cannot tolerate the occurrence of auxiliaries (see also Lakoff (1987)).[3] Webelhuth further points out that "[d]eictic inversion typically found in spoken language and consequently also has a strong affinity to the present tense[,]" as shown by the following example:[4]

(28) There is/ ? was Harry. (Webelhuth (2011:90))

Under the present approach, Webelhuth's observations are also naturally accounted for as a consequence of the feature-agreement operation in which the [Thetic] feature on the Force head searches for and agrees with the same feature of the Fin head occupied by the copula.

Although the empirical evidence and arguments presented in this section must be strengthened by independent supportive evidence, they lend support to the present proposal that DI syntactically realizes the presentational function. The next step is to examine the semantic/contextual effects of the preposed deictic adverb in DI, which we turn to in the next subsection.

3. 2. Semantic/Contextual Effects of the Preposed Deictic Adverb

The present study proposes that the preposed deictic adverb in DI may occupy one of the two functional projections in the CP domain, namely [Spec, ModP] or [Spec, FocP]. In the former, it is predicted that the postverbal NP carries the main focus of the sentence, which in turn serves as a topic for the following discourse; in the latter, it is predicted that the preposed deictic adverb carries new information. This subsection presents some attested examples in order to lend support to the proposed analysis.

The first prediction that the deictic adverb may target [Spec, ModP] in DI is confirmed with the following attested examples from the *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA):

(29) You remember, General Kelly's son was killed in action in Afghanistan. And in an interview yesterday, President Trump said, quote, you could ask General Kelly, did he get a call from Obama. By the way, he did not. As we talked about last night on this program, General Kelly has always been very private about any public discussion of his son's death. Here is what Sarah Sanders said about it today. (BEGIN VIDEO CLIP) REPORTER# Sarah, did the president speak to his chief of staff, General John Kelly, before invoking his son's death and what has become a political argument? SANDERS# [I know he's spoken to General Kelly multiple times yesterday and today. …] (*Spoken, ANDERSON COOPER 360 DEGREES, 2017*)

(30) Mr-PARGH: Now another thing, if you look at wanting not to get cut, or trying to avoid cuts, you know, when you open a can with a standard can opener, this is typically what happens. Well, here is a can opener. [This] is probably one of my favorite products of all times. [This] is from Krups, [it]'s called the Openmaster.
(*Spoken, NBC_TodayLater, 1999*)

The underlined DI sentence in (29) is used to draw the hearer's attention to what Sarah Sanders said about the topic of the talk (i.e., General Kelly's son's death); then, a video clip starts which recorded an interview between the reporter and Sarah Sanders. In this case, Sarah's utterance enclosed in square brackets serves to provide the detailed information that supplements what she actually said. The underlined DI sentence in (30) is used to introduce a can opener as a new piece of information in the given context. As is clear from the use of the pronominal elements enclosed in square brackets, the can opener behaves as a topic in the subsequent discourse. These facts suggest that DI play a semantic role in introducing a new entity (focus) in the speech setting; the newly introduced entity in turn becomes a topic in the following discourse.

Having provided the evidence for the proposal that the deictic adverb may target [Spec, ModP], let us turn to the second prediction, that the deictic adverb moves to [Spec, FocP] and carries new information. This prediction is confirmed with the underlined DI sentences below, cited from a language teaching material titled *Activities for Responsive Caregiving: Infants, Toddlers, and Twos*:

(31) **Questions and Things to Say**
"Where are your toes? Oh! Here are your toes!" (Touch each toe one by one.) "Where are your hands? Oh! Here are your hands!" (Clap the baby's hands together while saying "hands.") "Where is your nose? Can you wiggle your nose like this?" (Wiggle your nose.)

In the example above, the first *wh-que*stion in (31), "*Where are your toes?*," is (self-)answered by the DI sentence, "*Here are your toes*." In this case, the preposed deictic adverb *here* can be interpreted as providing an answer (focus) because the post-verbal NP was already mentioned in the *wh*-question and therefore is more or less given information.[5] Basically, the same holds true for the second question-answer pair, "*Where are your hands? Oh! Here are your hands!*" Here, caregivers are intended to use the question-answer pairs in order to teach the names of body parts to infants or toddlers while touching their body parts and naming them. The relevant context implies that the postverbal NPs *toes* and *hands* are not introduced as purely new information, nor do they behave as topics in the subsequent utterances. More precisely, the two question-answer pairs here function to establish the connections between the body parts referred to by the deictic adverb *here* and their names *toes* and *hands*; the established connections are assumed to be newly added to the knowledge on the part of the hearer(s) (i.e., the infant(s)/ the toddler(s)). Although the attested examples presented in this subsection come from the education-oriented spoken context, the semantic/contextual effects of the DI sentences are naturally accounted for as empirical consequences of the present approach. While the exact focal status of the DI sentences in (31) needs to be explored and identified in future research, the relevant context will not

be regarded as being oriented to information correction (cf. (3b)). This possibility is indicated by the presence of the pragmatic marker *oh* interpolated between the *wh*-question and the (self-)answer. The pragmatic marker *oh* is argued to reflect a mental attitude that something happened unexpectedly or came to the speaker's mind which s/he had not predicted in a given discourse (Uchida (1985, 2011); see also Murahata (2018)). The compatibility between the pragmatic marker *oh* and the DI sentences in (31) implies that they can be seen as realizing a focus type different from corrective focus.

I would like to conclude this subsection with a brief comment on the use of DI as the answer to a *wh*-question. The relevant use of DI is also stably observable in the written context, such as storybooks. The following passage is cited from the picture book titled *Where is the green sheep*? by Mem Fox:

(32) Here is the blue sheep. And here is the red sheep. Here is the bath sheep. And here is the bed sheep. But where is the green sheep? Here is the thin sheep, and here is the wide sheep. Here is the swing sheep. And here is the slide sheep. But where is the green sheep? Here is the up sheep, and here is the down sheep. Here is the band sheep. And here is the clown sheep. But where is the green sheep? Here is the sun sheep. And here is the rain sheep. Here is the car sheep, and here is the train sheep. But where is the green sheep? Here is the wind sheep. And here is the wave sheep. Here is the scared sheep, and here is the brave sheep. But where is the green sheep? Here is the near sheep. And here is the far sheep. Here is the moon sheep. And here is the star sheep. But where is the green sheep? Where IS that green sheep? Turn the page quietly—let's take a peep .… Here's our green sheep, fast asleep.

A wide variety of sheep appear one after another in the picture book, and each of them is contrasted with the green sheep; therefore, their modifier part (e.g., *blue*, *red*, *bath*) receives contrastive focus. In the last scene, the *wh*-question with the focused copula indicates that the relevant *wh*-question is still not answered (cf. Creswell (2000)), and it is finally answered by the underlined DI sentence. Thus, the use of DI in the question-answer context supports the analytical possibility that certain instances of DI are derived by the type of focus-fronting that is compatible with the question-answer context.

4. Further Application to Quotative Inversion: Some Preliminary Observations

The previous section provided evidence for the following two-fold proposal: First, DI syntactically realizes the presentational function; second, the preposed deictic adverb may target either [Spec, ModP] or [Spec, FocP]. On the basis of the present analysis of LI, this section considers whether or not it is possible to extend the present approach to quotative inversion (QI). According to Quirk et al. (1985) and Biber et al. (1999), QI, illustrated below, is frequently used in the journalism context (e.g., news articles):

(33) a. "I don't believe in ghosts," Tracy said (in a loud voice).
b. "I don't believe in ghosts," said Tracy (in a loud voice).

(Matsubara (2019:176))

The sentence in (33b) is an instance of QI, and its word order (especially, the V-S order part) looks similar to that of LI. This configurational and other syntactic similarities lead some scholars to propose a unified analysis of LI and QI (Collins (1997) and Wu (2008)). In the literature on QI, it is also observed that QI may take the following three surface forms (e.g., Collins and Branigan (1997) and Matsubara (2019)):

(34) a. Said John, "I wonder whether I can borrow your bicycle."
b. "I wonder," said John, "whether I can borrow your bicycle."
c. "I wonder whether I can borrow your bicycle," said John.

(Matsubara (2019:179))

Based on these surface patterns, Collins and Branigan (1997) propose that the C head with the [+Quote] feature triggers fronting of the object null operator OP (which is assumed to be the null counterpart of archaic *so* in (40)) via [Spec, IP]; the verb raises to T(Agro), and the postverbal subject remains in the VP domain (see also Collins (1997) and Wu (2008)). The primary aim of this section is to develop their analysis within the cartographic framework.

Previous studies of QI have not reached a consensus on the issue of how QI is syntactically derived (cf. Collins and Branigan (1997) and Bruening (2016)), and hence independent research is necessary to observe a wide range of empirical facts and propose an appropriate analysis of them. Therefore, the present study confines itself to reviewing some fundamental observations on crucial syntactic and semantic properties of QI and exploring an analytical possibility under the present approach.

4. 1. Formal Properties

This subsection reviews two main syntactic properties of QI in English. First, it is observed that QI cannot tolerate compound tenses and auxiliaries (e.g., Quirk et al. (1985), Collins and Branigan (1997), and Matsubara (2019)).

(35) ?? "What time is it?" had asked Perry of Mona. (Collins and Branigan (1997:13))
(36) a. "That's not my fault!" the student {had murmured / was murmuring}.
b. * "That's not my fault" {had the student murmured / was the student murmuring}.
c. * "That's not my fault" {had murmured the student / was murmuring the student}.

(Matsubara (2019:182))

Although most of the example sentences presented in the previous studies involve verbs of saying with the past tense, the attested data of QI with the present tense verb can be easily searched for in COCA, as shown below:

(37) "We're now in a situation where doctors and nutritionists are asking us to double our seafood consumption," says Michael Rubino, director of aquaculture at NOAA, referring to the recommendation by the US Dietary Guidelines that people increase their seafood

consumption to twice a week. “Where is all that seafood going to come from?” Rubino says.
(*MAG, Mother Jones, 2017*)

To summarize, the tense form of QI is, in principle, specified for either present or past. Taken together with the tense specification of LI (cf. (12c)), we can say that both QI and LI share the same tense specification patterns. However, it should be noted that QI, unlike LI, requires a verb of saying (e.g., *say, write, note, recall*) and that verbs of saying, unlike unaccusative verbs (cf. (12a)), in general do not contribute to the presentational function. Although the verb restriction imposed on QI and that imposed on LI differ, they are similar in that their predicate parts do not receive focal stress.

Second, it has been observed that pronouns do not freely occur in QI (e.g., Jespersen (1954), Collins and Branigan (1997), and Matsubara (2019).[6]

(38) a. ?? “Don’t snore”, pleaded they. (Collins and Branigan (1997:7))
b. ?? “I’ve lost my keys”, said he. (Collins and Branigan (1997:7))

This pattern is reminiscent of the person restriction patterns of LI (cf. (12b)).

The formal properties reviewed in this subsection are quite similar to those of LI. Although further investigation and careful consideration are necessary to compare them in detail, we can tentatively conclude that the present approach to presentationals can be extended to QI.

4. 2. Semantic/Contextual Effects of QI

If the present approach is extended to QI, there will be two analytical possibilities: one with a fronted null OP in [Spec, ModP] and the other with a fronted null OP in [Spec, FocP]. There is some empirical support for the latter possibility in previous studies of QI (cf. Birner (1994) and Matsubara (2019). Presenting the following example, Birner (1994:22-23) argues that the preposed quotation represents new information, whereas the postverbal NP represents relatively familiar information in context:

(39) *Judith Exner, who has led a life of poor choices and worse luck, finally has a decent fellow at her side, reveals April Vanity Fair.* It’s the son she never knew.
Exner, 56, is a drab footnote to the high-handed legacy of John F. Kennedy.
[“Judith Exner’s No. 1 mam: Her ‘lost’ son brightens a life soiled by illness and a long-ago tryst,” *Chicago Tribune*, 3/15/90, sec. 5, p. 2]

According to Birner (ibid.:22), the QI sentence in the example above “begins an article; thus, Judith Exner has not been evoked in the discourse, nor does she or the information preceding *reveals* represent inferable information.” Birner’s observation is naturally accounted for if the quotation part (more precisely, the null operator assumed in Collins and Branigan (1997)) sits in [Spec, FocP]. By conducting finely-grained informant surveys on the syntactic, semantic, and phonological properties of QI, Matsubara (2019) reached the same conclusion that the quotation part represents new(er) information (than the postverbal NP) in QI.

One remaining issue is whether the former analytical possibility (i.e., fronting a null OP to [Spec, ModP]) is supported or not. One may think that fronting a null OP to [Spec, ModP] can be supported by what Collins and Branigan (1997) calls archaic *so*, because when the quotation part carries certain previously-mentioned information, it can be substituted by the anaphoric *so*.

(40) John: Styvie stole the painting.
Mary: I thought she did!
John: And so thought your brother, as well.

(Collins and Branigan (1997:14))

In this case, the preposed anaphoric *so* can be seen as representing old information, and the postverbal NP carries focus, more precisely, additive focus due to the presence of the additive focus marker *as well*. This pattern can be naturally accounted for if it is assumed the previously mentioned quotation part is lexicalized by *so* targets [Spec, ModP]. However, the presence of such an additive focus marker is not obligatory in QI with archaic *so*, and hence a comprehensive corpus-based and/or informant survey is necessary to fully understand its information-structural patterns of QI. To illustrate the relevant point, let us consider the following examples from COCA:

(41) a. "We believe that iPad is the perfect expression of the future of personal computing." So said Tim Cook at the introduction of the new iPad Pro 9.7 last week. It's exactly the kind of phrase you expect from Cook's Apple: spoken humbly, but revealing a huge ambition. It mixes a thing that's familiar (the good ol' iPad) with an idealistic goal. (*MAG, The Verge, 2016*)

b. Academic writing is bad, and academics should feel bad for writing it. So said Steven Pinker in *The Chronicle* a couple of years back, but he's hardly alone. Academics have been kicking — or, if you prefer, virtually dialectically deconstructing — academic writing for more than a decade.

Many "academics (and especially younger ones) tend to confuse incomprehensibility with profundity," Stephen Walt declared in 2013.

(*ACAD*, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *2016*)

The anaphoric element *so* in (41a) refers back to the preceding quotation part that begins an article on iPad. As is clear from the use of the pronoun *it* in the subsequent utterance, the post-verbal NP (*Tim Cook*) does not behave as a main topic for the subsequent discourse; rather, the quotation part referred back to by the anaphoric *so* becomes the main topic, and the postverbal NP is intertwined with it. This pattern cannot be predicted if it is simply assumed that QI with archaic *so* is derived by fronting *so* to [Spec, ModP] and the postverbal NP behaves as focus (and then as topic in the subsequent discourse). In a similar vein, the anaphoric element *so* in (41b) refers to the preceding utterance that starts the article titled *Why Most Academics Will Always Be Bad Writers*. On the face of it, the use of the pronoun *he* seems to suggest that the postverbal NP (*Steven Pinker*) is introduced as focus and serves as topic for the following discourse. However, the subsequent discourse shows that claims similar to Steven Pinker's

have been made by other scholars. These preliminary observations may imply that QI with archaic *so* is also derived by focus fronting; archaic *so* sits in [Spec, FocP] as an overt OP that introduces a quotative part as focus, newer information than the postverbal NP. If this analysis is correct, it will be the case that QI is derived by focus fronting regardless of the presence of the overt/covert operator; this conclusion also implies that the type of LI involving focus fronting is unified with QI.

To sum up, the preliminary observations presented in this subsection will be seen as lending support to a unified analytical possibility that certain instances of LI and QI are derived by focus fronting.

5. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, I have reviewed Hasegawa's (2010) cartographic approach, according to which Japanese thetic judgment sentences and presentational sentences such as LI are unified into the presentational clause type. In Hasegawa's approach, the preposed locative PP moves to [Spec, ForceP], wherein the clause type is encoded as presentational. After identifying the two information-structural patterns of the preposed LI, I have proposed that the locative PP may front to either [Spec, ModP] or [Spec, FocP], according to the information-structural status of the preposed PP (i.e., anaphoric vs. non-anaphoric). The empirical predictions of the proposed analysis are confirmed with attested examples from the COCA corpus and some teaching materials for infants/toddlers. Discussing the analytical possibility that the present proposal can be further applied to QI, I have provided some preliminary observations and arguments for the claim that LI involving focus fronting is theoretically treated on par with QI. Further investigations based on the present approach will offer us a more systematic understanding of the nature of inversion sentences in English.

Footnotes

* This work is supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists, Grant No. 20K13065). I am grateful to Breanna Conner for kindly providing valuable comments on the data used in this paper.

1. The following abbreviations are used in the glosses throughout this paper: ACC = Accusative, NOM = Nominative, POL = Politeness marker, PRES = Present, PROG = Progressive, TOP = Topic marker.
2. For the sake of clarity and simplicity, a simplified version of the split CP hypothesis is adopted here. Interested readers are referred to Rizzi (1997, 2004).
3. Webelhuth (2011) claims that the peculiar syntactic and semantic properties of LI are naturally accounted for within the framework of construction grammar. Since the main purpose of this paper is to explore the theoretical possibility that certain instances of LI can be derived by focus fronting, it does not consider which approach covers a wider range of empirical facts about LI.
4. In Webelhuth's (2011) paper, the term *deictic inversion* is used to cover what Lakoff (1987) calls the central deictic construction that contains a deictic locative adverb (*here/there*). Therefore, the observation provided here is intended to hold true for the DI sentences with *here*.

5. The author asked a native speaker of American English how the DI sentences here are read. According to her judgment, the primary focus can be put on the preposed deictic adverb and the secondary on the post-verbal subject; however, the question-answer pairs here can be associated with rhyming and repetition, and hence the actual intonation patterns will vary so that the postverbal NP may receive focal stress in certain cases. Further phonological investigations are definitely necessary, but her judgment on the phonological intonation can be accounted for in the proposed analysis.
6. One remaining issue here is whether the first and second person pronouns occur in QI. According to the American native speaker of English I consulted, a sentence like "'Don't snore,' pleaded I/you." is judged unacceptable. However, corpus-based surveys will be also necessary to determine whether the first and second person pronouns may occur in the postverbal subject position in QI.

References

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, Longman, London.

Birner, Betty (1994) "Information Status and Word Order: An Analysis of English Inversion," *Language* 70, 233-259.

Birner, Betty and Gregory Ward (1998) *Information Status and Noncanonical Word Order in English*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Bresnan, Joan (1994) "Locative Inversion and the Architecture of Universal Grammar," *Language* 70, 72-131.

Bruening, Benjamin (2016) "Alignment in Syntax: Quotative Inversion in English," *Syntax* 19, 111-155.

Cheng, Lisa (1991) *On the Typology of Wh-Questions*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Collins, Chris (1997) *Local Economy*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Collins, Chris and Phil Branigan (1997) "Quotative Inversion," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15, 1-41.

Coopmans, Peter (1989) "Where Stylistic and Syntactic Processes Meet: Locative Inversion in English," *Language* 65, 728-751.

Creswell, Cassandre (2000) "The Discourse Function of Verum Focus in Wh-Questions," *NELS* 30, 167-179.

Cruschina, Silvio (2011) Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Cruschina, Silvio (2021) "The Greater the Contrast, the Greater the Potential: On the Effects of Focus in Syntax," *Glossa* 6(3), 1-30.

Culicover, Peter (1992) "Topicalisation, Inversion and Complementizers in English," ed. by Denis Delfitto, Martin Everaert, Arnold Evers, and Frits Stuurman, *Going Romance and beyond*, 1-43, OTS Working Papers, University of Utrecht, Utrecht.

Emonds, Joseph (1976) *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax: Root, Structure-preserving and Local Transformations*, Academic Press, New York.

Fukuchi, Hajime (1985) *Danwa no Koozoo* (*The Structure of Discourse*), Taishukan, Tokyo.

Gundel, Jeanette K. (1974) *The Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory*, Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington, Indiana.

Haegeman, Liliane (2012) *Adverbial Clauses, Main Clause Phenomena, and the Composition of the Left Periphery* (*The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 8*), Oxford University Press, New York.

Hasegawa, Nobuko (2010) "Thetic Judgment as Presentational," *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 26, 3-24.

Honda, Masatoshi (2021) "Clause Typing and Presentationals: Further Evidence from Participle Preposing in English," *Studies in Language Sciences* 27, 125-144, Graduate School of Language Sciences, Kanda University of International Studies.

Jespersen, Otto (1954) *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, George Allen & Unwin, London.

Kuno, Susumu and Takami Kenichi (2013) *Nazotoki no Eebunpoo: Syooryaku to Toochi* (*Mystery-Solving English Grammar: Deletion and Inversion*), Kurosho, Tokyo.

Kuroda, Shigeyuki (1965) *Generative Grammatical Studies in the Japanese Language*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Kuroda, Shigeyuki (1972) "The Categorical and the Thetic Judgments," *Foundations of Language* 9, 153-185.

Lakoff, George (1987) *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things, What Categories Reveal about the Mind*, University of Chicago, Chicago.

Lambrecht, Knud (1994) *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representation of Discourse Referents*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Matsubara, Fuminori (2019) "Inyooku Toochi no Ninkajyooken—Kinooteki Apuroochi—(On the Licensing Condition of Quotative Inversion—A Functional Approach—)," *Journal of English Grammar and Usage* 26, 176-191.

Murahata, Goro (2018) "A Critical Analysis of the Interjections 'Oh' and 'Ah' as Pragmatic Markers in MEXT Authorized English Textbooks." *Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan* 29, 49-64.

Nitta, Yoshio (1991) *Nihongo no Modaritii to Ninsyoo (Modality and Person in Japanese*), Hituzi Syobo, Tokyo.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Startvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman, London.

Radford, Andrew (2004) *Minimalist Syntax: Exploring the Structure of English*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Rizzi, Luigi (1997) "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery," *Elements of Grammar,* ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281-331, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

Rizzi, Luigi (2004) "Locality and Left Periphery," *Structures and beyond (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume* 3), ed. by Adriana Belletti, 223-251, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Rizzi, Luigi and Guglielmo Cinque (2016) "Functional Categories and Syntactic Theory," *Annual Review of Linguistics* 2, 139-163.

Rizzi, Luigi and Ur Shlonsky (2007) "Strategies of Subject Extraction," *Interfaces+ Recursion= Language Chomsky's Minimalism and the View from Syntax-Semantics* (*Studies in Generative Grammar 89*), ed. by Uli Sauerland and Hans-Martin Gärtner, 115-160, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.

Takami, Kenichi (1995) *Kinooteki Koobun-ron ni yoru Nichieego Hikaku* (A *Comparative Study of Japanese and English in Functional Syntax*), Kurosio, Tokyo.

Uchida, Seiji (1985) "Ah vs. Oh—Goyooron teki Jyunsetsu to Gyakusetsu (Ah vs. Oh—Pragmatic Resultative vs. Adversative—)," *Eego Seenen* (*The Rising Generation*) 131(1), 9.

Uchida, Seiji (2010) *Goyooron no Syatei* (*The Scope of Pragmatics*), Kenkyusha, Tokyo.

Webelhuth, Gert (2011) "Motivating Non-Canonicality in Construction Grammar: The Case of Locative Inversion," *Cognitive Linguistics* 22, 81-105.

Wu, Hsiao-hung Iris (2008) *Generalized Inversion and the Theory of Agree*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Materials

Barbre, Jean (2012) *Activities for Responsible Caregiving: Infants, Toddlers, and Twos*, Redleaf Press, Minnesota.
Fox, Mem (2021) *Where is the Green Sheep?*, Scribe Publications, Melbourne.

(Received October 24, 2022)