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1. Introduction

As a point of departure for our discussion, let us observe (1a, b), both of which are composed of a reporting clause containing a reporting verb (i.e. said / whispered) and its direct speech complement (i.e. quote):

(1) a. "I don’t believe in ghosts," [said Ruth / Ruth said].
   b. "Who’s there?" [whispered Franklin / Franklin whispered].

(1a, b) show that the quote selected by the reporting verb allows subject-verb inversion in the reporting clause, which is often called "quotative inversion" (QI) (Collins & Branigan 1997, Collins (1997), Doeleman (1998), Suñer (2000))

QI is allowed to take place in the same fashion when the reporting clause surfaces between the split quotes, as illustrated in (2), and when it surfaces in sentence-initial position, as in (3):

(2) a. 'I wonder,' [John said / said John], 'whether I can borrow your bicycle.'
   (Quirk et al. 1985:1022)

(3) a. Declared tall, nineteen-year-old Napier: 'The show will go on.'
   (Quirk et al. 1985:1024)
   b. Said a pollster: 'Frenchmen still like to believe that they are the world’s greatest lovers.'
   (Biber et al. 1999:922)

Collins & Branigan (1997) and Collins (1997) analyze the derivation and structure of QI constructions at great length within Chomsky’s (1991, 1995b) minimalist framework. However, both analyses are based on many theoretical assumptions and concepts abandoned in Chomsky’s (2000, 2001, 2004, 2008, 2013) current minimalist framework, as we will see in detail below. Although this is not problematic for these analyses, it is clearly worth reanalyzing the syntax of QI from the present minimalist perspectives.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate syntactic behavior of QI constructions and advance a new analysis of their derivation and structure by adhering to Chomsky’s (2000, 2001, 2004, 2008, 2013) Agree-based minimalist framework. I will also suggest that QI applies to earlier English in a different manner from Present-day English (PE).

2. Syntactic Distribution of Quotative Inversion

Collins & Branigan (1997) and Collins (1997) demonstrate that QI constructions are more restricted in their syntactic behavior than non-QI constructions. Let us here explore QI’s syntactic characters.
First, QI requires the subject and the verb in a reporting clause to be adjacent, so that the subject must precede the complement of the verb, as is evident from the contrast between (4) and (5):

(4) a. "Where to?" asked the driver of his passenger.
    b. "They’ll never make it!" cried John to Mary.
    ((a, b) Collins & Branigan 1997:4)

(5) a. * "Where to?" asked of his passenger the driver.
    b. * "They’ll never make it!" cried to Mary John.
    ((a, b) Collins & Branigan 1997:4)

Second, the QI subject disallows quantifier floating while the non-QI subject permits it. Thus, all the guests in (6b), where all is not floated, is admissible but the guests all in (6c), where all is floated, is not:

(6) a. "We must do this again," the guests all declared to Tony.
    b. "We must do this again," declared all the guests to Tony.
    c. * "We must do this again," declared the guests all to Tony. ((a-c) Collins & Branigan 1997:6)

Third, QI is hard to apply to pronominal subjects, as seen in (7):

(7) a. ??/"What do you mean?" asked he.
    b. ??/"I don’t believe in ghosts," said she.

Fourth, QI never applies to reporting clauses containing a sentential negative, as exemplified in (8b, c):

(8) a. "Let’s eat," John didn’t say just once.
    b. "Let’s eat," not said John just once.
    c. * "Let’s eat," said not John just once.
    ((a-c) Collins 1997:34)

Fifth, since the QI subject and the QI verb must be adjacent (see (4) and (5)), this prevents any adjunct AdvP from intervening between them, as is evident from

1 According to Collins & Branigan (1997:7) and Collins (1997:33), accusative pronominal subjects make their examples worse than nominative equivalents:

(i) a. "What do you mean?" asked him.
    b. "I don’t believe in ghosts," said her.

the deviance of (9d):

(9) a. "Age doesn’t matter," said Kevin (to Tracy) gallantly.
    b. "Age doesn’t matter," said Kevin gallantly (to Tracy).
    c. * "Age doesn’t matter," gallantly said Kevin (to Tracy).
    d. * "Age doesn’t matter," said gallantly Kevin (to Tracy).

Sixth, QI results in failure with auxiliary verbs in reporting clauses:

(10) a. "That’s not my fault!" the student had murmured.
    b. * "That’s not my fault!" had the student murmured.
    c. * "That’s not my fault!" had murmured the student.

Seventh, QI is impossible with reporting verbs embedded:

(11) a. "Where is the kitty cat?" Mary wanted to say.
    b. * "Where is the kitty cat?" wanted Mary to say.
    c. * "Where is the kitty cat?" wanted to say Mary.
    ((a, b) Collins & Branigan 1997:12)

Lastly, QI never applies to reporting verbs that select DP indirect objects, which is referred to as the "transitivity constraint" by Collins (1997: 49). Thus, the reporting verb in (12) and (13), which selects a DP indirect object, cannot undergo QI:

(12) a. "What is the exchange rate?" Mary asked John.
    b. * "What is the exchange rate?" asked Mary John.
    ((a, b) Collins 1997:50)

    b. * "I am so happy," told Mary John.
    ((a, b) Collins 1997:50)

3. Collins’ (1997) Analysis

Collins & Branigan (1997) and Collins (1997) pro-
vide detailed analyses of the derivation and structure of QI constructions in Chomsky’s (1991, 1995b) minimalist terms. The latter revises and develops the former and thus I will examine the latter here.

The contrast between (4) and (5) regarding a QI subject position leads Collins to eliminate the possibility of rightward adjunction of a QI subject from Spec-TP; otherwise, (5a, b) are incorrectly predicted as grammatical. Further, the fact about quantifier floating in (6) induces Collins to conclude, following Sportiche (1988), that a QI subject does not raise to Spec-TP but stays in Spec-vP (Spec-TrP (Transitivity Phrase), to use Collins’ terminology). Notice that if it raises to Spec-TP, it may strand a quantifier in Spec-vP, which causes (6c) to be erroneously predicted as grammatical.

Collins also suggests that instead of a quote an empty quotative operator (OP) initially merges in Complement-V and is coindexed with the quote. This suggestion is attributed mainly to the fact that the quote in examples like (2a, b) is split into two discontinuous parts, which makes it difficult to account for how one part of the quote undergoes fronting.

According to Collins’ analysis, QI examples like (1a) build the following structure in the course of the derivation (pp.35, 40):

(14) T [T rP Ruth Tr [VP said OP] (TrP = vP)]

In (14) OP is assumed to have a D-feature and a Case feature (but not φ-features) and overtly raise to Spec-TP through outer Spec-TrP to check an EPP-feature of T. Raising of OP to outer Spec-TrP is triggered by positing a strong D-feature of Tr. Notice that if OP raises from Complement-V to Spec-TP in one stroke, this yields a violation of Minimality because of the existence of Ruth.

Further, the V said in (14) is assumed to have a Case feature and φ-features and overtly raise to T through Tr. This gives birth to the following TP structure (pp.40, 43):

(15) [TP OP [T rP [T rP Ruth [Tr said] [VP said OP]]]]

The Spec-head relation within TrP between OP and Tr-said leads to checking of their Case features and the D-feature of Tr-said. At LF, the Case feature and φ-features of Ruth covertly raise to T and thus checks the Case feature of T and the φ-features of T-said.

In Collins’ analysis, (8b, c) are given the following structure, where NegP is assumed to intervene between TP and TrP:

(16) T [NegP [Neg not] [TrP John [Tr said [VP said OP]]]]

(8b) is ruled out as deviant since there is no landing site for said between the Neg head not and John. (8c) is excluded as deviant since not blocks said from raising to T, causing a violation of Head Movement Constraint (HMC) or Minimality.

Under Collins’ analysis, (9d) reaches the following structure:

(17) T-said [TrP gallantly [TrP Kevin [Tr said [VP said OP …]]]]

Collins accounts for the deviance of examples like (9d) by saying that AdvPs may not adjoin to TrP, which follows from Chomsky’s (1995a) argument against adjunction to an XP that has a semantic role at LF. Therefore, categories like TP, T’, Tr’, etc. are candidates for an AdvP to adjoin to, which allows (9a-c) to be derived as grammatical.

To eliminate the ill-formed examples like (10b, c) and (11b, c), Collins makes the following stipulation (p.41):

(18) The EPP-feature of T may enter into a checking relation with the quotative operator only if V[Quote] adjoins to T.

Collins notes that “the intuition behind this stipulation is that T must be supported by the actual quotative verb in order to check the D[quote] feature of the quotative operator.”
(18) will filter out (10b, c) since the auxiliary verb occupies T and thus the QI verb cannot raise to T, which bars the EPP-feature of T from establishing a checking relation with OP. Similarly, (18) will rule out (11b, c) since the QI verb does not raise to T, with the result that T cannot have its EPP-feature checked by OP.

Collins also attributes the ungrammaticality of examples like (7a, b) to "a general cross-linguistic fact" that pronouns tend to overtly move out of Spec-TP (Diesing (1992), Diesing & Jelinek (1995), Collins & Thráinsson (1993, 1996)). This predicts that pronominal subjects always raise to Spec-TP and do not undergo QI.

With regard to the transitivity constraint shown in (12b) and (13b), Collins takes QI verbs selecting both a DP indirect object and OP to be double object verbs and advances the following structure for (12b) and (13b) (Collins & Thráinsson (1993, 1996)).

\[(19) T [\text{Mary}\Tr [\text{John}\ V_1 [\text{V}_2 \text{OP}]]]\]

(adapted from pp.58, 59)

After raising of V₂ to T through V₁ and Tr (p.136, fn.19), OP raises to outer Spec-TP and further to Spec-TP. However, the first raising of OP skips John, which is closer to outer Spec-TP. This yields a violation of Minimality or the Minimal Link Condition (MLC). This predicts (12b) and (13b) to be ungrammatical.

4. Problems with Collins’ (1997) Analysis

As pointed out above, Collins’ (1997) analysis of QI is conducted within Chomsky’s older minimalist system, of which many theoretical assumptions and concepts have been abandoned within Chomsky’s (2000, 2001, 2004, 2008, 2013) current minimalist system. Hence, it is necessary to reanalyze QI from the present minimalist viewpoints.

In (15), for instance, Collins assumes that the checking relation within TrP between OP and Tr-said is established by means of their Spec-head configuration. However, this Spec-head agreement has been done away with in Chomsky’s present minimalist theory, where Agree in terms of c-command has been adopted since Chomsky (2000:122).

Second, Collins assumes that the above Spec-head relation between OP and Tr-said in (15) has their Case features checked, although OP lacks φ-features. However, Case checking of this kind has been disapproved in the current minimalist model, where Case features are valued and deleted under matching of φ-features between a probe and a goal (Chomsky (2001:6)). Following this model, hence, OP is supposed to have φ-features; otherwise, OP and Tr-said cannot have their Case features valued and deleted, which causes the derivations of both QI and non-QI constructions to crash.

Third, if OP in outer Spec-TrP in (15) has its Case feature checked by Tr-said, as Collins assumes, we predict within the recent minimalist framework that it becomes inactive (i.e. frozen in place) with its all uninterpretable features deleted, so that it is invisible to any further checking or agreement relation with another probe (Chomsky (2000:123, 2001:6)). This bars OP from raising to Spec-TP to delete the EPP-features of T, which Chomsky (2000:102, 2001:4) regards as an uninterpretable feature.

Fourth, in (15), Collins claims that OP lands in outer Spec-TP on the way to Spec-TP to avoid a Minimality violation, which means that Collins takes outer Spec-TrP to be an A-position. However, the corresponding outer Spec-vP in the present minimalist system is defined as an A’-position and becomes a landing site typically for a wh-phrase that moves out of vP to Spec-CP (Chomsky (2008)). Given this, Collins’ claim cannot be maintained in this system; otherwise, movement of OP in (15) results in an improper movement from A’-position (i.e. outer Spec-TrP/vP) back to A-position (i.e. Spec-TP).

Fifth, Collins follows Procrastinate and suggests that the Case feature and φ-features of Ruth in (15) undergo covert movement to T at LF to check the Case feature of T and the φ-features of T-said. However, the current minimalist theory has renounced Procrastinate and adopted a completely opposite principle where operations must apply as early as possible, i.e. Pesetsky’s (1989) Earliness Principle (Chomsky (2001:15)). Therefore, this principle forbids any covert checking/movement of uninterpretable features at LF and instead requires overt valuation/deletion of these features in syntax. In consequence, the Case feature of Ruth in (15) is not permitted to covertly raise to T but is required to be overtly deleted. Similarly, T too has to have its Case feature and φ-features overtly deleted.

The sixth problem lies in Collins’ stipulation (18). As
he himself points out that (18) is “the only problematic stipulation” (p.41), it is not clear why the checking relation between T and OP is premised on overt raising of a QI verb to T. Further, we wonder why only QI cases exceptionally allow a main verb to raise to T, whereas other cases do not. What motivates this exceptional overt verb raising in English? As shown above, Collins notes that T needs support by a QI verb to check the D-feature of OP. However, the D-feature of OP does not have to be checked since it is interpretable (p.44). In addition, Collins’ assumption of a D-feature is incompatible with the present minimalist model that dispenses with this kind of categorial feature (Chomsky (2001:6-8)).

The seventh problem relates not to theoretical gaps but to a syntactic property of reporting verbs. Collins assumes that quotes are direct objects of reporting verbs, so that their corresponding OPs merge in Complement-V ((14), (15)). However, this cannot account for the fact that reporting verbs taking a quote do not normally take a direct object (Biber et al. (1999:196)).

(20) a. “Take your elbows off the table!” scowled Grandma. (Suñer 2000:539)
b. “I’m sorry,” she whimpered. (Biber et al. 1999:196)
c. He goes, “Who put that there?” (Biber et al. 1999:1119)
e. “Hurry!” yelled Kevin.
f. “It wasn’t on purpose,” sniffled Peter.
g. “No,” peeped Frog, who looked very, very small. (Lobel, *Frog and Toad Together*)
h. “You would have done it sooner or later,” she smiled, … (British National Corpus (BNC))
i. “My tummy knots have gone!” she exulted.
   (BNC)

This raises a question of why an intransitive verb, when used as a reporting verb, can take a DP-like complement (i.e. OP) and assign Case to it. It is worth noticing that intransitive reporting verbs are manner-of-speaking verbs like those in (21):

(21) assent, cry, exult, falter, gasp, groan, huff, mumble, murmur, mutter, peep, roar, scowl, scream, sigh, snap, sneer, sniffle, smile, snort, sob, stammer, wail, whimper, whisper, yell, etc.

The eighth problem concerns the historical gap with regard to the possibility of pronominal subjects in QI constructions. As shown in (7), PE resists pronominal subjects appearing there. As mentioned above, this is due to the cross-linguistic tendency of pronouns to overtly move out of Spec-vP (Diesing (1992), Diesing & Jelinek (1995), etc.). Then a question arises as to why earlier English tolerates such subjects in the corresponding constructions.6

(22) <early 20th century>
a. “I now propose a toast,” said he, “to Mrs. Roosevelt, the first lady of the land.” (New York Times, May 24, 1902, Google News Archive Search (GNAS))
b. Said she to me in response: “I’m acting in the hope that I may one day make enough money to stop acting.” (New York Times, Nov. 27, 1927, GNAS)

(23) <19th century>
a. ‘Eleanore and I hold little or no confidential communication,’ replied she. (Papers Past, Cultha Leader, Aug. 26, 1887, GNAS)
b. “Oh, Mark,” murmured she, encircling his neck with her arms, … (Golden Era, Aug. 13, 1865, GNAS)

(24) <18th century>
b. "What sort of a husband are you to have?" [after a visit to a fortune-teller], "Sir," replied she, "I am to have a lord soon …" (1766 Goldsmith, *The Victor of Wakefield* X, in Visser 1969:1455)

---

4 Suñer (2000:539) also shows that Spanish allows intransitive verbs to surface as reporting verbs.

5 (20d-i) are my additional examples.

6 (24a, b) are cited by Suñer (2000:561, 562) as well.
QI is found in Early Modern English (EModE) and Middle English (ME) as well.\(^7\)\(^8\)

(1682 Dryden & Lee, *Dk. Guise*, Epil., in OED)
b. ‘Lat se’, quod he, ‘Now quha begynnis?’
(1500-20 Will. Dunbar, Poems (ed. Mackenzie) p.120, in Visser 1969:1357)
c. ‘Na hare sal perishe, ne faile’ sayd he, ‘hat falles on þe heved for to be.’
(c1400 Prick Conscience 5007, in Visser 1969:1369)
d. ‘I have’ quod she, ‘a soule for to kepe, As wel as ye.’
e. ‘Late se þi lettres’, quod I, ‘we miȝte þe lawe knowe.’

If pronominal subjects move out of Spec-\(vP\) cross-linguistically, then it is necessary to account for how to derive these QI examples in early English.

### 5. An Alternative Analysis

First, I would like to answer the question of why intransitive reporting verbs behave like transitive verbs in that they can take a complement (i.e. OP or a quote) and assign Case to it. The key to this matter lies in their character as manner-of-speaking verbs. Importantly, manner-of-speaking verbs mean “say in an X manner” and necessarily contain the meaning of the verb *say*: cry = say with a cry, murmur = say with a murmur, sigh = say with a sigh, smile = say with a smile, yell = say with a yell, etc. This enables us to regard an intransitive reporting verb \(\alpha\) as a complex verb formed by \(\beta + SAY\) (\(\beta\) and SAY are underlying conceptual verbs).

With this in mind, I suggest that it is a transitive part SAY, not an intransitive part \(\beta\), that selects and assigns a \(\theta\)-role and Case to a complement of \(\alpha\) (i.e. a complex \(\beta + SAY\)). Recall that Collins takes *say* to be transitive. Given this, I propose the following structure for QI examples such as (1b), where quote/OP is labeled XP for convenience sake:

\[\text{(26) } \begin{array}{c}
\text{v} \\
\text{VP} \\
\end{array} \]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{WHISPER} \\
\text{DP} \\
\end{array} \]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{Franklin} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{VP} \\
\end{array} \]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{SAY} \\
\text{quote/OP} \\
\end{array} \]

In (26) the V SAY \(\theta\)-marks its complement XP and incorporates to \(v\), so that Agree holds between \(v\)-SAY and XP, deleting their Case features and the \(\varphi\)-features of \(v\)-SAY. Notice that I assume that quote/OP bears \(\varphi\)-features by adhering to Chomsky’s current Case-agreement theory, as mentioned above. Then \(v\)-SAY assigns an external \(\theta\)-role to the subject DP *Franklin* and incorporates further to the higher V, thereby creating a complex WHISPER-SAY, i.e. a reporting verb *whisper*. It stands to reason that since whisper consists of WHISPER and SAY, it inherits both of their syntactic properties: the complement of SAY functions as that of whisper, and the subject of SAY as that of *whisper*.

\[\text{\(\text{\dagger}\) The higher Spec-\(vP\) in (26) is empty since *whisper* takes only one subject and this has already been fulfilled by its component SAY taking a subject. Alternatively, we may analyze the higher \(v\) as akin to the passive \(v\) that universally absorbs its external \(\theta\)-role (Matsubara (2002)). Given this, the higher Spec-\(vP\) is a \(\theta\)-position that does not require a subject. I assume that this \(v\), unlike a (strong) transitive \(v\), does not need to incorporate V.}\]
(26) proceeds to merge with T. T searches for a proper goal to delete its Case feature, \( \varphi \)-features, and EPP-feature. If quote/OP raises to Spec-TP to satisfy the relevant features, as Collins suggests, then this yields a violation of Minimality or MLC since it skips over Franklin, which is closer to Spec-TP. Notice that this violation cannot be avoided by quote/OP adjoining to vP since an vP-adjoined position (i.e. outer Spec-vP) is an A`-position, which bars quote/OP from raising to an A-position, Spec-TP, as stated above. Therefore Franklin is qualified as T’s proper goal and Agree holds between them, thereby deleting their Case features and the \( \varphi \)-features and EPP-feature of T. This expands (26) to the following structure, in which irrelevant parts are omitted:

\[
\text{(27) } \left[ \text{TP Franklin T} \left[ \varphi \text{ Franklin} \right] \left[ vP \text{ whisper} \left[ \varphi \text{ Franklin} \right] vP \text{ V quote/OP} \right] \right]
\]

If (27) is correct and Franklin moves to Spec-TP, then whisper is required to raise to T and further to C ahead of Franklin in order to obtain their inverted order. However, this raises several problems, as pointed out above: 1) main verbs exceptionally raise overtly to T and C only in QI cases; 2) QI subjects that move to Spec-TP may strand a quantifier in Spec-vP, which causes us mistakenly to predict (6c) as grammatical; and 3) this movement of QI subjects to Spec-TP allows their further rightward adjunction, which causes us wrongly to predict (5a, b) as grammatical.

To solve these problems, I resort to Chomsky’s (1995b) copy theory of movement and advance the following with regard to overt QI subject movement and overt QI verb raising in question:

(28) In English a QI subject and a QI verb have their initial copies in movement chains spelled out and pronounced.

It is worth noticing that (28) is not a stipulation since spelling out and pronouncing (a part of) an initial copy in a movement chain is not unique to QI cases. Many recent analyses have revealed that this operation is involved in \( \text{wh} \)-movement in English as well as other languages.\(^\text{10}\) and that there is a parametric variation concerning which copies in a movement chain are subject to deletion (Boškovic (2001), Nunes (2004), Landau (2006), Radford (2009), etc.).

Given (28), (27) has the following structure where the initial copy of the QI subject is in the lower Spec-vP and that of the complete QI verb is in the higher V:

\[
\text{(29) } \left[ \text{CP} \left[ c. \text{ whisper} \right] \left[ \text{TP Franklin} \left[ T \text{ whisper} \right] \left[ vP \text{ whisper} \left[ \varphi \text{ Franklin} \right] vP \text{ V quote/OP} \right] \right] \right]
\]

(28) enables us to maintain Agree holding between T and the QI subject, with the result that the QI subject is valued as nominative and Spec-TP is occupied by the QI subject. (28) also allows us to make a generalization that all main verbs in English may undergo overt verb raising to T (and to C if necessary) in the same way as those of morphologically rich languages like Romance languages.

The only difference between both types of language is which copies in a movement chain get deleted. The present analysis is compatible with analyses of \( \text{wh} \)-in-situ languages like Chinese, Japanese, etc., that suggest that their \( \text{wh} \)-phrases may undergo overt \( \text{wh} \)-movement but they have their initial copies in movement chains spelled out and pronounced (Pesetsky (2000), Watanabe (2001), etc.).

I assume that the analysis here applies to transitive reporting verbs in the same fashion as intransitive ones. Thus QI examples like (1a) build a structure similar to (26):

\[
\text{(i) What hope could there be of finding any survivors? (Radford (2009:189))}
\]

\[
\text{(ii) a. What hope of finding any survivors could there be}
\]

\[
\text{what hope of finding any survivors (Radford (2009:190))}
\]

\[
\text{b. What hope of finding any survivors could there be}
\]

\[
\text{what hope of finding any survivors (Radford (2009:190))}
\]

---

\(^\text{10}\) Radford (2009:190) suggests that the derivation of examples like (i) should involve \( \text{wh} \)-movement in (iiia) and spelling out a part of the initial copy of the \( \text{wh} \)-phrase (i.e. of finding any survivors) as well as a part of its final copy (i.e. what hope) in (iiib):
I suggest that a transitive reporting verb consists of two components, i.e. a lower transitive V and a higher intranisitive V, in the same way as an intransitive reporting verb. Hence the V *said* incorporates to the higher V through v to become a complete form as a reporting verb. In other words, the higher V can be regarded as a licensing position for a reporting verb. Then it follows that (30) proceeds to the derivational stages similar to (27) and (29).

As for quote/OP in (26) and (30), I assume that it undergoes overt A'-movement to Spec-CP, more specifically, Spec-Foc(us)P, which is one type of projection constituting a CP layer (Rizzi (1997)). This makes sense since it is spotlighted as the most important information in the sentence. If OP merges in XP, then it is natural to analyze OP movement as A'-movement. In this respect, the present analysis is in accordance with Collins & Branigan (1997), but not with Collins (1997) (see fn. 3).

Further, given that C determines clause type (Chomsky (1995b)), it is reasonable to say that C specifies a quotative force by attracting quote/OP to Spec-FocP. This leads us to restate that the QI verb in (26) and (30) actually raises overtly to Foc. This process is consistent with the one of C specifying an interrogative force by attracting a wh-phrase to Spec-FocP and an auxiliary to Foc (Rizzi (1997)).

To morphologically drive movements of both quote/OP and the QI verb, I propose the following:

(31) A quotative Foc bears an edge-feature [+QUOTE] and a head-feature [+quote].

It should be noted that Foc has its edge-feature [+QUOTE] deleted by quote/OP, which bears a relevant feature, occupying Spec-FocP, while it has its head-feature [+quote] deleted by a QI verb, which bears a relevant feature, occupying Foc.

6. Theoretical Consequences

Let us now consider how the suggested analysis can account for the distribution of QI examples. According to the analysis here, (4a, b) are assigned vP structures like (32a, b), respectively:

(32) a. [v v [VP [V asked] [v the driver [v asked] [VP [v of his passenger] [v asked] quote/OP]]] b. [v v [v cried] [v John [v SAW] [VP [v to Mary] [v SAW] quote/OP]]]

(32a, b) expand to TP structures like (33a, b), respectively, with the subject moving to Spec-TP to delete an EPP-feature of T.

(33) a. [TP the driver T [v the driver [v [VP v asked] [v the driver [v asked] [VP [v of his passenger] [v asked] quote/OP]]]] b. [TP John T [v John [v [VP v cried] [v John [v SAW] [VP [v to Mary] [v SAW] quote/OP]]]]

Importantly, (33a, b) undergo application of (28), so that the subject has its copies except its original one in the lower Spec-vP deleted. This yields the following structures:

(34) a. [TP the driver T [v the driver [v [VP v asked] [v the driver [v asked] [VP [v of his passenger] [v asked] quote/OP]]]] b. [TP John T [v John [v [VP v cried] [v John [v SAW] [VP [v to Mary] [v SAW] quote/OP]]]]

(34a, b) expand to FocP structures like (35a, b), respectively, with the verb raising to Foc through T to delete a [+quote] feature of Foc and quote/OP moving to Spec-FocP through the outer Spec-vP to delete a [+QUOTE] feature of Foc:

(35) a. [vFoc quote/OP [v asked] [v he the driver [v asked] [v quote/OP he the driver [v asked] [VP [v of his passenger] [v asked] quote/OP]}}] b. [vFoc quote/OP [v cried] [v John [v cried] [v quote/OP John [v cried] [VP [v cried] [v quote/OP John [v SAW] [VP [v to Mary] [v SAW]]]}}]
Here, (28) applies to the movement chain of the verb raising, with the result that the verb has its copies except its original one in the higher V deleted. This gives birth to the following structures:

\[
\text{(36) a. [quote/OP \{Foc \_asked\} [\text{TP the driver \[v \_asked\]} \_quote/OP the driver \_quote/OP the driver \_quote/OP [\text{TP [v \_asked]} \_quote/OP the driver \_quote/OP the driver \_quote/OP [\text{TP [v \_asked]} \_quote/OP the driver \_quote/OP the driver \_quote/OP [\text{TP [v \_asked]} \_quote/OP the driver \_quote/OP the driver \_quote/OP [\text{TP [v \_asked]}]]]]]]]
\]

b. [quote/OP \{Foc 
\_cried\} [\text{TP John \[v 
\_cried\]} \_quote/OP John \_quote/OP John \_quote/OP [\text{TP [v 
\_cried]} \_quote/OP John \_quote/OP John \_quote/OP [\text{TP [v 
\_cried]} \_quote/OP John \_quote/OP John \_quote/OP [\text{TP [v 
\_cried]]]]]]]

The suggested analysis can capture the linear order of the QI verb \( \rightarrow \) the QI subject \( \rightarrow \) the complement of the QI verb. Hence we can correctly predict that (4a, b) are well-formed whereas (5a, b) are never derived and thus are ill-formed.

The present analysis can also account for the deviance of (6c) by saying that the QI subject never strands a quantifier within it since it stays in its original position, the lower Spec-TP throughout the derivation, as a result of (28). Therefore we can predict that (6b) is well-formed but (6c) is not.

Under the analysis here, we can easily filter out (8b, c) as a violation of HMC or Minimality. Given that (8b, c) build a NegP headed by \( \overline{\text{not}} \) between \( \text{vP} \) and TP, as Collins assumes, then \( \overline{\text{not}} \) blocks the QI verb from raising overtly from V to T (and to Foc) in (35a, b). This leads us correctly to predict (8b, c) to be ungrammatical.

By the same token, we can eliminate (10b, c) and (11b, c) as a violation of HMC or Minimality. In (35a, b) Foc with \( \overline{\text{+quote}} \) finds and attracts the QI verb as a proper goal with the relevant feature. In (10b, c), however, there is an auxiliary merged in T, preventing the QI verb from raising from V to Foc. Similarly, in (11b, c), the QI verb \( \text{say} \) is blocked from raising to Foc by the intervening head such as \( \text{to} \) or \( \text{wanted} \). Therefore we can correctly predict (10b, c) and (11b, c) to be ill-formed.

Let us now consider (9a-d) under the proposed analysis. Given Chomsky’s (1995a) argument against adjunction to an XP that has a semantic role at LF, as Collins adopts, then we can provide a ready account for the deviance of (9d). The only way of deriving (9d) from (36a) is to left-adjoint the adjunct AdvP to the lower \( \text{vP} \). However, this adjunction is prohibited since \( \text{vP} \) has a semantic role at LF. On the other hand, the AdvP in (9a) may right-adjoint to the higher \( \text{v} \), the higher \( \text{v} \), the lower \( \text{v} \), or the lower \( \text{V} \); the AdvP in (9b) may left-adjoint to the lower \( \text{v} \); and the AdvP in (9c) may left-adjoint to the higher \( \text{v} \) or the higher \( \text{V} \). Consequently we can correctly predict only (9d) as ungrammatical.

We are also in a position to account for the deviance of (7a, b) under the analysis here. If pronominal subjects have to move out of \( \text{vP} \) cross-linguistically, as Collins assumes, then (7a, b) are correctly predicted to be ill-formed since (28) requires these subjects to be spelled out within \( \text{vP} \). If so, however, a question still remains as to why (22)-(25) in earlier English are well-formed. There are two possible answers: the first is to assume that pronominal subjects in earlier English, unlike those in PE, do not have to move out of \( \text{vP} \) so that they are subject to (28) and spelled out within \( \text{vP} \). The second is to assume that they, like those in PE, have to move out of \( \text{vP} \) and that (28) does not apply in these cases. Given this, pronominal subjects move to Spec-T and are spelled out there, whereas QI verbs raise to Foc and are spelled out there. If this analysis is correct, the contrast between (7) and (22)-(25) is attributable to i) whether or not pronominal subjects move out of \( \text{vP} \) or ii) whether or not (28) is applied.\(^{11}\)

Furthermore the analysis advanced here can account for the transitivity constraint in (12) and (13) if we follow Collins and suggest that double object QI verbs involve object shift of quote/OP (Collins & Thráinsson (1993, 1996)). I assume that (12b) and (13b) build a structure like (37), in which the double object QI verb selects a \( \text{vP} \) whose head selects a null DP subject in its Spec (Iwakura (p.c.)) and a VP headed by an empty V in its complement (Aoun and Li (1989) and Oba (1993)):

\[
\text{(37) \text{v [\text{TP John \[v \_asked\]} \_quote/OP \{v \_asked\} \_quote/OP [v \_asked]]]]]]}
\]

In (37) the empty V incorporates to \( \text{v} \) and Case-values quote/OP as accusative, while the \( \text{v asked/told} \) incorporates to \( \text{v} \) and Case-values the indirect object \( \text{John} \) as

\(^{11}\) I leave to future work the question of which option is more plausible.
oblique. Merger of the subject Mary expands (37) to the following structure:12

(38) \[v \text{Mary} [v \text{asked/told}] [v \text{John} [v \text{asked/told}] [v [v \text{e}] v [v \text{e}] [VP [v \text{e} quoted/OP]]]]

Suppose object shift is an operation that targets an element with a phonetic content since it plays a crucial role of deriving different constituent orders. With this in mind, I propose the following:

(39) A double object QI \( v \) bears an EPP-feature, transmitted to \( V \).

The EPP-feature in (39) triggers object shift to the outer Spec-VP. Thus the EPP-feature of the \( V \) asked/told in (37) targets quote with a phonetic content and requires it to move to the outer Spec-VP. This movement, however, skips over \([v \text{e}]\) in A-position, which causes a violation of Minimality or MLC. Importantly, the \( V \) asked/told cannot target OP without a phonetic content, in which case the derivation crashes with its EPP-feature left intact. As a result, we can correctly predict (12b) and (13b) to be ill-formed. Since (39) does not apply to non-QI cases, then we can derive (12a) and (13a) without problems.

7. Conclusion

This paper has dealt with the syntax of QI constructions and has advanced a new analysis of their derivation and structure within Chomsky’s current minimalist framework. On the basis of the fact that QI verbs contain intransitive verbs as well as transitive verbs, I have proposed that they consist of dual parts, i.e., a transitive \( V \) and an intransitive \( V \), and that the former selects "quote/OP as its complement and builds a \( vP \) whose Spec accommodates a subject, whereas the latter selects the transitive \( vP \) as its complement and builds a \( vP \) whose Spec is a \( 0^\circ \) position and thus is empty.

Further I have suggested that QI is a composite operation combining Move of a QI verb and quote/OP and Spell-Out of their initial copies in their movement chains. This analysis succeeds in obtaining a proper QI word order and accounting for the distribution of QI examples in a principled way.
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