



UDC 811.111'367.52=111

811.163.3'367.52=111

Original scientific article

Accepted for publication on 27. 3. 2023

<https://doi.org/10.29162/jez.2023.3>**Liljana Mitkovska**¹**Eleni Bužarovska**²¹ AUE-FON University, Skopje² University of Ss Cyril and Methodius, Skopje

Contrasting a phenomenon at the syntax-discourse interface: Subject-verb inversion in English and in Macedonian

This paper discusses the results of a contrastive analysis of subject-verb inversion (SVI) in English and Macedonian, a South Slavic language. We look at sentences, typically encodingthetic statements, in which the subject follows the verb. Both English and Macedonian belong to SVO languages, but unlike English, Macedonian word-order is considerably more flexible due to its rich inflectional morphology. Our main goal is to determine the scope of distribution of SVI in the two languages which will enable to discover the reasons for the distributional differences in the two languages. To achieve this, we compared the semantic, syntactic and discourse-pragmatic properties of the inverted structures in the examples collected from parallel fiction and academic texts. The sharp differences in the use of SVI between the two languages indicate that lexical and grammatical constraints severely restrict SVI in English, in contrast to Macedonian where it is governed by discourse principles.

Keywords: presentational constructions, theticity, information structure, word order

1. Introduction

Comparison of word order phenomena between typologically different languages may contribute to a better understanding of interface relations between syntax, semantics and pragmatics. This is well exemplified in subject-verb inversion, a syntactic phenomenon that can be explained by invoking the interplay between different language levels.

This paper presents the results of the contrastive analysis of subject-verb inversion in English and Macedonian, a South Slavic language with a rich verb inflection system and analytic case marking. Both languages belong to SVO languages and allow word order variations. However, the word order in Macedonian is more open to the impact of discourse-pragmatic factors which contribute to more flexible linearization patterns of sentence constituents, a characteristic it shares with the other Slavic languages (Siewierska & Uhlířová 1998). Free or “pragmatic” word order in a language is presumed to correlate with rich morphological marking of core arguments and the existence of referential null subjects (Teixeira 2018: 50). Thus, for instance, all Slavic and Balkan languages and languages such as Spanish and Italian permit null subjects in contrast to English and have a more flexible word order. English is considered to belong to languages with a rigid word order “sensitive mostly to the grammatical relations subject and object.” (Givón 2001, vol.1: 271).

The analysis focuses on clauses in which the subject NP follows a lexical verb or a copula¹ either in one or in both languages. English inverted structures in which inversion is obligatory (Prado-Alonso 2011: 140) are excluded from the analysis. The paper analyzes three main formal types of constructions with VS inversion subsumed under subject-verb inversion (SVI). The Macedonian translational equivalents of the English examples below also feature SVI.

a. copular verb inversion

(1) *On the door side of the bed* **was** a small woolly mat ...² (Birner 1996: 80)

b. intransitive verb inversion

(2) *In the forest* **lived** a family of bears. (Teixeira 2018: 3)

c. passive verb inversion

(3) *On the table* **has been placed** an apple pie. (Teixeira 2018: 67)-

It has been noted in the literature that SVI is a relatively rare phenomenon in English, unevenly distributed across various genres. However, the results of some corpus-based investigations are conflicting. Thus Biber et al. (1999: 926) found that SVI is more common in fiction and news (1000 per million words) than in academic texts (500-600 per million words) in the British National Corpus, while Prado-Alonso (2011: 153) obtained opposite results analyzing FLOB and FROWN³: the

¹ Auxiliary inversion is not considered, as well as the quotative (reporting) function of full inversion.

² Predicates in the relevant part of all examples are bolded and the subjects are in normal font; fronted adverbial is underlined where necessary.

³ Freiburg-Lancaster-Oslo-Bergen Corpus of British English (FLOB; compilation date: 1991); the Freiburg-Brown Corpus of American English (FROWN; compilation date: 1992).

occurrence of SVI in fiction is somewhat lower (27.56 per 100 000 words) than in non-fiction (35.06 per 100 000 words).

In Macedonian, subject-verb inversion is a syntactic device for discourse purposes (Bužarovska et al. 2019), much more common than in English. For example, in an 8000 word sample of English short stories we found only 4 examples, while a 5400 word Macedonian sample yielded 40 examples (quotations excluded). The fact that inverted constructions in English are much rarer than in Macedonian raises the following questions: Is the SVI in English the same type of phenomenon as in Macedonian? If so, what is the difference in frequency due to?

To determine the scope of distribution of SVI in the two languages we compiled samples of texts translated in both directions in two written genres: prose fiction and academic writings. Each sample contains texts that have corresponding translations into the other language. The analysis is conducted in two steps: first we detect all instances of SVI in original texts in Macedonian and compare them with their translation equivalents in English. In this way we establish how often and in what cases Macedonian inverted constructions have inverted counterparts in English and examine how English renders the equivalents lacking inversion.

2. Theoretical prerequisites

In our analysis of SVI, we adopt a discourse-based approach that links the information structure of inverted constructions to theticity. Assuming that inversion correlates with the communicative function of the sentence in which it occurs in discourse we employ the logical distinction between *categorical* and *thetic statements*. This universal distinction “is expressed to different degree and by different procedures in different languages.” (Schwarz 2010: 4). Categorical statements predicate a property of an entity, while thetic statements introduce new information into the existing discourse which may refer to an entity or an event “which necessarily involves an entity” (Lambrecht 1994: 144).

The main discourse function of participant-central thetic statements (4) is to “promote a new referent, either brand new or inactive one, coded by both definite and indefinite noun phrase, to active status” (Lambrecht 1994: 178). Suited the best for this function are verbs denoting appearance or existing (*appear, come, arrive* etc) of the discourse-new referent in the location specified by the sentence-initial adverbial. Known as *stage topics* (Erteschik-Shir 2007; Lahousse 2007) these adverbials set the spatio-temporal stage for a discourse-new entity. They can be covert when contextually inferrable. Overt stage topics, which establish common ground, are presupposed information, while the rest of the sentence constitutes a single information unit with a focus status (wide focus) complying with the cog-

nitive processing tendency to present new information after given (Comrie 1989: 127). Such information structure triggers obligatory subject inversion in Macedonian (Bužarovska et al. 2019; Bužarovska 2021) and non-obligatory in English (Prado-Alonso 2011).

- (4) *Zad niv **odat** dvajca tinejdžeri. Zboruvaat glasno i nešto se smeat.* (RB1)
*Behind them **are walking** two teenagers. They're talking loudly and laughing about something.*

The communicative goal of event-central thetics (5) is to inform of a discourse-new event that occurred in a spatio-temporal frame established in the situation (as an answer to the question *What happened?*). Given that the discourse function of both types of thetic statements is to introduce a new proposition in the discourse we refer to their linguistic instantiations as presentational constructions.

- (5) *Zacaruva* stravot, *kako pred vojna.* (LS1)
*Fear **reigned**, as if before a war.*

It has been noted (e.g. Calhoun et al. 2018; Schwarz 2010) that crosslinguistically presentational constructions are prosodically and syntactically marked. In languages with fixed word order, such as English, theticity relies on prosody (Lambrecht 1994: 28; Schwarz 2010: 5) but languages with pragmatic word order, such as Macedonian, signal theticity predominantly by inversion.

SVI in English presentational constructions have been examined within different theoretical frameworks.⁴ It seems that all approaches acknowledge the role of discourse factors, including generative studies, which treat inversion as a focus construction or a pragmatic device for stylistic purposes (Prado-Alonso 2011: 53).

Formal accounts put more emphasis on the structural position of the constituents in inverted constructions. Thus syntactic accounts (Bresnan 1994) hold that inversion is triggered by the locative preverbal adverbial and unaccusative verbal semantics. This is countered by lexical-functional views (Levin & Rappoport 1995) which recognize the role of discourse requirements for the use of non-unaccusative verbs in presentational constructions.

Inversion in cognitive linguistics (Chen 2003; Duffley 2018) is treated as a different event construal involving speaker perspective and viewpoint orientation, or as a ground-before-figure construction. Functionally-oriented research considers SVI to be an especially marked structure used for topic management, information structure packaging or rhetorical effects. The inverted construction, according to Green (1980), performs several functions in discourse: quotative, emphatic, presentational and linking. Discourse-functional approaches emphasize the informa-

tion-structuring function of inversion, for instance Birner (1994) and Huddleston & Pullum (2002) consider it an information-packaging construction. Birner (1996: 137) asserts that “inversion serves an information-packaging function linking relatively unfamiliar information to the prior context via the clause-initial placement of information which is relatively familiar [...] in the current discourse.” Hence, at the text level, inversion contributes to discourse management.

In our analysis we focus on relevant factors that influence the occurrence of SVI. More specifically, we examine how syntax, verbal semantics and semantic-syntactic properties of subject constituent (discourse status and phonological heaviness) interact with the discourse function of these structures.

Discourse-syntactic interplay is manifested in “the competition between formal structure and information structure” (Lambrecht 1994: 24). In languages with strict word order, such as English, the formal structure heavily constrains the application of the pragmatic principle “avoid placing the focus argument in the subject position” (Lambrecht 1994: 20). Therefore, SVI is often treated as a deviation from the canonical word order, which generates certain rhetorical and stylistic effects: the “immediate observer effect” (Kreyer 2006) creates an illusion that the reader is “in the discourse” observing these events as an eyewitness; vividness or dramatic effect (Dorgeloh 1997) characterizes presentational constructions that introduce some unexpected or topical participant.

Lexical-syntactic interface presupposes an interaction between semantic properties of the verb and inverted word order. The presentational function of the proposition is compatible with unaccusative verbs⁵ expressing existence and appearance, but unergative verbs, when “pragmatically construed as non-agentive”, are also admitted (Lambrecht 1994: 181). The occurrence of ergative verbs is attributed to their semantic impoverishment to copula-like meanings (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995: 251–260). The presentative discourse function restricts the choice of subject in inverted constructions to discourse-new participants. On the syntactic level, this function correlates with the cognitive principle of end-weight triggering inversion of new, long and complex subject constituents to “ease the processing burden” on the listener (Lozano & Mendikoetxea 2008: 96).

In view of the typological differences between English and Macedonian and the discussed properties of the English SVI, we expect that only a small portion of Macedonian presentational constructions will have SVI equivalents. Thus, we postulate the following research questions:

⁵ The unaccusativity hypothesis argues that intransitive verbs can be split into unaccusative and unergative classes depending on the syntactic properties of their single argument (Perlmutter 1978). Subsequently various semantic factors have been recognized to motivate this syntactic distinction (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995; Birner 1995, 1996; Sorace 2000).

1. Do English and Macedonianthetic sentences comply with the same discourse and syntax-lexical requirements?
2. Do English and Macedonian inverted constructions create identical stylistic effects?
3. Do the English SV translation equivalents of the Macedonian SVI have the same information structure?

3. Data analysis

In this section we present the attested SVI examples in Macedonian and English texts and then discuss the translational equivalents through a contrastive analysis of the structures.

3.1. Overall results

The frequency of attested examples in the selected original and corresponding translation texts is shown in table 1. VS inversion found in affirmative clauses both independent, matrix and various types of dependent clauses are all included in the results.

Table 1. Frequency of SVI in Macedonian and English texts

	Macedonian text			English text		
	N words	N examples	Per 1000 words	N words	N examples	Per 1000 words
Fiction: from Mac to Eng	25 377	169	6.66	28 852	16	0.55
Fiction: from Eng to Mac	26 280	93	3.54	27 968	9	0.32
Academic: from Mac to Eng	23087	127	5.50	25 952	13	0.50
Academic: from Eng to Mac	26 953	144	5.34	27 466	13	0.47
Total	101 697	533	5.23	110 238	52	0.46

The results in the table show that inverted structures in Macedonian texts by far outnumber the inverted occurrences in English texts: 5.23 vs. 0.46 per 1000 words overall, 5.1 vs. 0.43 in fiction and 5.4 vs. 0.48 in academic texts. These findings confirm conclusions reached in corpus studies that SVI in English is a rare phenomenon. The data reported in Section 1 above, normalized to tokens per 1000 words, as used in our research, are comparable to ours: Biber et al. (1999: 926) found 0.5-0.6 in academic and 1.0 in fiction and news (50% of those are reporting) and Prado-Alonso (2011: 153) reports 0.3506 in non-fiction and 0.2756 in fiction. There are no previous accounts regarding the frequency of SVI in Macedonian that can serve as a comparison, but our results correspond to the observed stark difference between English and Macedonian.

Our results do not indicate any systematic differences between the two examined registers. What stands out is the lower number of SVI examples in the translated Macedonian fiction texts in comparison to the original texts. Given that the results in the English texts exhibit similar differences, the low use of SVI is most probably due to the type of texts.

In what follows, we discuss the Macedonian SVI examples and compare them to the English equivalents in the examined texts. First, we look at the SVI sentences in Macedonian and the English examples with corresponding SVI structures and then turn to those equivalents that exhibit SV word order in English.

3.2. *Macedonian SVI and their corresponding translation equivalents in the English texts*

In this section, we examine the properties of SVI in the attested Macedonian examples in comparison to the parallel English equivalents. Only 42 parallel SVI English sentences of the 532 Macedonian SVI examples were found. There are also 10 English SVI examples without inverted counterparts in Macedonian, which belong to idiomatic expressions. Therefore, they will not be discussed further. In both samples of SVI sentences, we find inversion predominantly in the main clause, but instances of SVI in dependent clauses do occur in both languages (6). In the Macedonian fiction sample, 14% of the occurrences are found mostly in dependent temporal, relative and conditional clauses, or in those with marked sentence patterns (optative, cleft). The academic sample contains about 10% SVI in dependent clauses, predominantly *da*-complements, relative clauses and 3 in marked sentence patterns (cleft).

Most of the English counterpart sentences are independent or main clauses, but in 10 cases inversion occurs in dependent clauses, with no difference between the registers. We find SVI in the concessive, manner (*as if*), relative, reason, *that*-complement and cleft clauses. These findings correspond to Biber et al.'s (1999: 918, 926) conclusion that inversion in English is “overwhelmingly a main-clause phenomenon: over 90% of all inversions in conversation, fiction, and, news occur in main clauses; c. 75% of all inversions in academic prose occur in main clauses”⁶

- (6) *Though at her right sat* G. Reece Stoddard, a most desirable and distinguished young bachelor, *the all-important left held only Charley Paulson.* (SF)

Iako oddesno i sedeše Dž. Ris Stodard, mošne poželen i ugleden mlad ergen, *na presudното mesto odlevo, za žal, sedeše Čarli Polson.*

⁶ That SVI in dependent clauses is possible in English has also been argued by Birner (1996); Dorgehloh (1997); Chen (2003), among others.

To determine the discourse-pragmatic and syntactic-lexical properties of SVI clauses we look at the elements used in inverted structures: the pre-posed and post-posed constituent and the types of predicates involved.

3.2.1. Pre-posed adverbial

A large number of sentences with SVI in both Macedonian and English sample have a pre-posed adverbial, containing information retrievable from previous discourse. It is accessible either contextually (through inference) or anaphorically, as in (7), where *ovie hartii* ‘those papers’ refers to the previously mentioned ‘pages’. This constituent serves to prepare the reader/hearer for the upcoming new information.

- (7) *No mene vnimanieto mi go privlekoa listovite so šareni marki, označeni so likovite na zelenite pečati. Koj da znae togaš deka vo ovie hartii e ispišana seta otkornička odiseja na moeto semejstvo?* (LS2)

But it was the pages with multicolored stamps embellished with the green forms of postmarks that most captured my attention. Who would have known, then, that in those papers was inscribed the whole of my family’s odyssey?

We consider these constituents stage topics (henceforward ST), as discussed in Section 2. They are usually overtly expressed, but they can also be covert, if contextually implied. Covert stage topics are found in sentences in which the location or the time of the newly introduced entity/event is derivable from the previous context or from speaker’s spatio-temporal location. It has been noted that such clauses are extremely rare in English (Teixeira 2018: 66). Complying with this, our English samples yielded no examples with a covert ST (excluding copular and dependent ones). In our Macedonian sample about 8% of the clauses start with the predicate, leaving the ST implicit. All their English translational equivalents have SV pattern (8), but are interpreted as event-central thetics with sentence-focus information structure, indicated by the stress on the first content word. Stress placement on the verb in the English equivalent triggers topic-focus information structure characteristic of categorical statements (e.g. *What came to an end?*).

- (8) *Se svrši uvidot. Raskrevavme podlipnati ...* (OČ)

The scene investigation *came to an end*. *We cleaned up, sobbing a little ...*

Though SVI clauses without a frame-setting ST are generally precluded in English, they may occur with copula constructions (Birner 1996: 40–45; Biber et al. 1999: 911), which was confirmed in seven examples. In these sentences, the non-verbal predicate constituent, usually an adjectival or a noun phrase (17 and 19 below), is fronted. This element contains information retrievable from the preceding text, which links the sentence to the previous discourse. Thus STs combine the stage-setting function with the cohesive.

Overtly pre-posed circumstantial conditions can be of different type. Both in the Macedonian and English samples, locative STs dominate in academic and fiction texts without significant difference. They are followed by temporal ones, more common in Macedonian. STs denoting abstract locations are more frequent in academic texts (9). Locative and temporal adverbials are realized by adverbs, PPs, deictic adverbs and occasionally by temporal clauses.-

- (9) *Only they are not so simple, and through this contented sadness runs more than the surface bittersweet of resignation.* (GO)

No, ne e se taka lesno, niz negovata navodna zadovoljuvačka taga se protka-juva poveќе otkolku površnata gorkoslatka rezigniranost.

In comparison to locative STs, the use of temporal STs in inverted constructions is considerably lower (more than three times in Macedonian and only 2 examples in English).

- (10) *Večerta dojde* Jon. (TO)

That night Jon *came to our house.*

Sentence initial manner/instrumental (11) and reason (12) adverbials are marginally represented in the Macedonian samples. Contrary to the claims in the literature on the English SVI sentences (e.g. Teixeira 2018: 65) that other types of adverbials cannot trigger subject inversion in English, we found several sentences with manner adverbials among our examples (cf. 11).

- (11) *So begins* the section on self-oppression ... (HH)

So ovie zborovi počnuva delot za samoopresija ...

- (12) *Od nivnata vreva, ... ne se sluša* ni telefonot, ni domofonot. (DS)

Because of their racket, ... neither the telephone, nor the speakerphone... can be heard.

A number of examples have two fronted adverbials, combining time and place or some other adverbial, present more often in the Macedonian sentences (13).

- (13) *Sega, od toj razgovor sličan na laenje se razbudija* Ušite.

Now, at the barking talk, the Ears *awoke.* (RBr)

Another type of constituent which often occurs before the verb in clauses with SVI in Macedonian is the one coding the dative participant in experiencer/beneficiary function (14), often interpreted as a possessor (15) in constructions marking both a participant and a more precise location affected by the event.

- (14) *Na prozorecot, ... ti doletuva* dvojka gulabi. (DS)

A pair of cooing doves *fly to the window* ...

(15) *Pak mi streperi mobilniot vo rakata.* (OČ)

The cell phone *in my hand was shaking again.*

In both cases the experiencer and/or benefactive dative typically codes a person representing the participant who is the locus of the emotional effect caused by the described situation. According to Dąbrowska (1997), the dative codes the person whose personal zone is affected, the so called ‘Target Person’. For that reason, Maldonado (2002: 35) calls it “a participant with setting properties”. Therefore, the dative can be considered a type of stage topic in SVI constructions. For instance, the event is located in the personal sphere of the affected participant, in general (14) or by affecting a part of his body (15) serving to establish the event frame. Since this participant is usually the main topic in the context, most often only the dative clitic is used, obligatorily placed before the verb. However, if this participant needs to be mentioned, it takes the initial position as in (16). Though the experiencer as the locus of the designated state is not as widespread construction in English as in Macedonian (compare the translational equivalents in 14, 15 and 47 below), interestingly, in example (16) it is placed in ST role comparable to the Macedonian dative participants.

(16) *Heavy and luxurious they were, moving under the supple fingers like restive snakes – and to Bernice remained* this relic and the curling-iron and a tomorrow full of eyes. (SF)

Teški i raskošni, se vieja pod veštite prsti kako nemirni zmii – a na Bernis i ostana toj spomen i figaroto i utrešnina polna pogledi.

3.2.2. Verbs used in SVI

In both languages SVI occurs with copula verbs, intransitive verbs and transitive verbs in passive sentences. Each of the three types is discussed below. SVI with active transitive verbs is not allowed in English, but possible in Macedonian. Its use is, however, beyond the scope of this paper.

In Macedonian, middle *se*-constructions (reflexive marker *se*+verb) commonly occur in SVI clauses. They represent a semantically heterogenous class, with subjective reflexive gravitating towards the active pole, and objective reflexive towards the passive one, (Mitkovska 2021: 63–65). The former, in which the subject referent has an active role, despite being self-affected, behave largely as unergative verbs. The latter, displaying anticausative semantics, are closer to unaccusative verbs and have the same effect inthetic sentences as the non-reflexive unaccusatives.

a. Copular predicates

The copula *be* has been reported in the literature to be the most frequently occurring verb in the English SVI sentences (e.g. Teixeira 2018: 67; Chen 2003: 59; Biber et al. 1999: 954; Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995: 240). About 30% of the SVI in our English data contain the copular *be* (10 in academic and 6 in fiction texts); it is considerably less frequent in the Macedonian samples with 7.13% (38 out of the 533 SVI clauses, 23 in academic and 15 in fiction texts).

All three types of copular constructions: presentational, identificational and attributive, occur in both languages. The majority of SVI in Macedonian samples are attributive copular constructions in which the stative copula *sum* 'be' links the fronted adjectival predicate (*thrilling, reliable, objective, etc.*) to its nominal head functioning as the postposed subject of the clause. These are also common in the English counterpart examples (17). The pre-posed predicate element is often realized by a deictic (18) which directs the attention to a particular locative (or temporal) frame in which the newly introduced referent is located. Nominal predicates are inverted with the subject in identificational constructions (19) which express a relation of identity between the referents of the subject and the nominal predicate. The inverted subject is placed in focus while the fronted nominal predicate, as the topic, links the sentence to the previous discourse. In (19) it elaborates on the statement *Rašela se vljubi*. 'Rachel fell in love' in both the Macedonian original and its English translation.

- (17) *Najneobjektivni se* grčkite statistiki. (KB)

The least objective of all were the statistics produced by the Greeks.

- (18) *Tuka beše* i negoviot globus što go vrteše koga ne možeš da ja utvrdi tatkovinata. (LS2)

Here, too, was a globe he rotated when he couldn't settle upon his homeland.

- (19) *Izbranihot na nejinoto srce beše* Jon, edno zdravo, cvrsto momče ... (TO)

The person chosen by her heart was Jon, a strong and healthy young man ...

b. Intransitive verbs

Intransitive verbs are encountered in the predicates of SVI sentences in both languages, though not in the same proportion: 73.36% of the Macedonian examples contain intransitive verbs, while the ratio in English is 38.46%. This is due to the high occurrence of copular verbs in English SVI and to the lexical-syntactic constraints on the construction.

The majority of intransitive verbs in the two Macedonian samples belong to the class of unaccusative verbs (20). The core members are represented by a numerous class of state verbs of existence (*se naoĝa* ‘be located’, *postoi* ‘exist’, *caruva* ‘reign’, *prevladuva* ‘prevail’, *vladee* ‘rule’) and verbs of body position (*stoi* ‘stand’, *sedi* ‘sit’, *leži* ‘lie’, *visi* ‘hang’ etc).

The next semantic class comprises directed motion verbs (21), implying change of location (*dojde* ‘come’, *pristigne* ‘arrive’, *vleze* ‘enter’, *pomine* ‘pass’, *doleta* ‘fly to’, *preleta* ‘fly over’ etc) or change of state (*poĉine* ‘die’, *oŝivi* ‘come to life’, *poĉne* ‘start’, *završi* ‘end’, *padne* ‘fall’ etc). Change is also implied in verbs of appearance and happening (*se pojavi* ‘appear’, *isĉezne* ‘disappear’, *ispari* ‘dry out’, *se sluĉi* ‘happen’), including *se*-anticausative verbs (*se zatrese* ‘shake’, *se otvori* ‘open’, *se menuva* ‘change’, *se razbudi* ‘wake up’, *se prevrti* ‘overturn’ etc).

- (20) *Na edna leska stoeše* bel polžav. (ME)

A white snail **was sitting** on a hazel tree.

- (21) *Edno docno popladne kaj nas dojde* nejziniot tatko. (TO)

One late afternoon her father **came** in to our home.

Within the class of unergative verbs we find verbs of uncontrolled processes (*treperi* ‘tremble’, *vrie* ‘boil’, *slabee* ‘weaken’) including verbs of emission (*ĉadi* ‘smoke’, *zvoni* ‘ring’, *tropa* ‘rattle’), as well as some *se*-decausatives with inanimate subjects (*se spušta* ‘descend’, *se trkala* ‘roll’, *se meša* ‘mingle’, *se krevaa* ‘rise’, *se izviva* ‘curl’, *se širi* ‘spread’ etc) exemplified in (22). Inversion is noted with unergative verbs of controlled motion processes (*minuva* ‘pass’, *odi* ‘walk’, *leta* ‘fly’, *plovi* ‘float’, *sledi* ‘follow’ etc) as in (23).

- (22) *Od supata se izviva* parea. (RB1)

Steam **escapes** from the soup.

- (23) *Nad Skopje letaše* dvoglaviot bel orel, *a pod nego se grupiraa* gimnastiĉarite. (ME)

Above Skopje **was flying** the royal white eagle *and under it were gathering* the gymnasts.

Non-motional unergative verbs are marginally represented in the samples. They are found in contexts where they are stripped of their informativeness, implying that the subject referent is present at a specified location, while engaged in some activity. For instance, the verb *se grupira* ‘gather’ in (23) indicates that the gymnasts were positioned ‘under the eagle’, and what they were doing is of secondary importance. Other verbs can be paraphrased by unaccusatives: *dzuri* ‘stare’ in (24) is interpreted as ‘lie’, *dzirka* ‘peek’ in (25) is understood as ‘can be seen’.

(24) *Vo postelata, pokraj mene ... dzureše* tatko mi. (TO)

In the bed, right next to me, laid my father.

(25) *Od razortomenata dupka dzirka ...* plastično šiše. (OČ)

A ... plastic bottle *peeked from the unroped hole*.

In the English equivalents, the bulk of the intransitive verbs belongs to unaccusative verbs of existence (*reside, remain*), position (*lie, sit, stand, hang*) and appearance on the stage (*appear, come, go*). The most frequent ones are the verbs *lie* (8 tokens) and *come* (6 tokens) as in (26). These results comply with the findings reported in various studies on SVI in English (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995: 240; Birner 1995: 251).

(26) *Down the mountain road in the thin cool rain ... came* an old Ford. (RBr)

Po planinskiot drum, niz retkiot studenkav dožd ... brevtaše eden star Ford.

However, several unergative verbs of controlled motion were also found: *walk, fly* and *gather* (23 above). They marginally occur in English SVI sentences, as they do not typically denote existence or appearance on the scene (Prado Alonso 2011: 94; Sorace 2000: 863). However, their informativeness is lowered in locative inversion. Still, the English sentences of this type are felt as rather marked, unlike their Macedonian counterparts.

Both in English and Macedonian SVI, an important criterion for verb selection seems to be the underlying existential meaning of the construction.⁷ In a favourable context, the presentational function of the construction “adjusts” the verb’s semantics thereby creating the implicature of existence (see Section 2). Such adjustment of the verb to thethetic character of the sentence is especially widespread in Macedonian but rare in English. For instance, the verb *tropa* ‘clatter’ in (27) expresses sound emission produced when using kitchen utensils, thereby implying their “existence” in the kitchen. This triggers inversion in the Macedonian, but not in the English clause.

(27) *Samo vo kujnata ti tropaat* fildžani i ġezvinja, činii i tendžerinja. (DS)

Only cups and pots, dishes and pans clatter in the kitchen.

c. Passive constructions

SVI clauses with both types of Macedonian passive constructions are rather common, but considerably more frequent in academic texts (81 vs. 23 examples), where

⁷ Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995: 20) point out: “... we attribute the restrictions on the verbs ... to the discourse function of the construction.”

se-passives dominate (58 compared to 8 in fiction). In English, on the other hand, while transitive verbs are allowed in their passive form (Teixeira 2018: 77) they do not seem to be very common.⁸ The fact that only 6 examples were found in the texts translated from Macedonian may indicate some influence of the original text.

Passive voice is coded by two forms in Macedonian: reflexive *se*-constructions and *esse*-passive constructions (*be*+past participle). Though they both code agent-defocusing situations, there is a subtle semantic difference between them. The *esse*-passive foregrounds the resulting state of the patient argument (28) while the reflexive passive foregrounds the activity (29). Both types of Macedonian passive constructions can correspond to English *be*-passive, as in these examples. It is, however, often avoided inthetic contexts (see Section 3.3 below).

(28) *Vo ovie hartii e ispišana* seta otkornatička odiseja na moeto semejstvo.
(LS2)

In those papers was inscribed the whole of my family's odyssey.

(29) *Na dzidovite se lepea* oglasi... (ME)

On the walls were hung handwritten advertisements...

The occurrence of passive constructions in SVI structures may be explained by a similar thematic structure of unaccusative verbs and passivized verbs as they have a theme argument in subject position.

3.2.3 Post-verbal subjects

Research on SVI often points out the importance of the discourse status of the inverted subject and especially its length and syntactic complexity (see Prado-Alonso 2011: 47–107; Teixeira 2018: 55–67 for an overview).

Subjects receiving focus interpretation refer to entities that are introduced into the discourse for the first time or reintroduced after a longer stretch of discourse (Birner 1996: 114; Dorgeloh 1997: 42; Bužarovska et al. 2019: 19). Therefore, they can be either unidentified (both discourse and speaker and/or hearer new) or inactive in the previous discourse. Unidentified referents coded by indefinite nominals occur most frequently in the attested SVI examples in both the Macedonian and English samples (see 25, 26 and 29 above). In presentational statements, once introduced in the focus position the referent becomes the topic of the subsequent discourse. The prospect of being thematically important increases its topicality. Being “cataphorically topical but anaphorically inaccessible” (Givón 2001, vol. 2: 345), inverted subjects realized by indefinite nominals depart from prototypical subjects.

92 ⁸ Only 6% of Birner's (1995: 236) SVI examples are in the passive.

However, inversion also occurs with newly introduced, but familiar referents stored in speakers' shared knowledge (see 17, 19 and 24). Similarly, inactive referents are reactivated in the listener's memory by definite nominals (30).

- (30) *Bela ja zatvori vratata i potoa dvete vo molk trgnavme kon dnevnata soba. Na masičkata ležea crtežite na Hubert. I jas i Bela posegnavme po niv, no uspeav prva da gi zemam.* (RB2)

Bella shut the door and we both silently headed towards the living room. Hubert's drawings lay on the coffee table. Both Bella and I reached for them at once, but I managed to get to them first.

Here the subject referent (*drawings*) is reintroduced into the text after a prolonged absence. Although inanimate (unlike prototypical subjects), the referent is topical as it creates expectations of its future involvement in the plot. These expectations are confirmed in the subsequent clauses where the referent becomes the topic of discussion with an important discourse status.

Pronominal subjects are rare in SVI, as they code discourse old referents, but not excluded (Quirk et al. 1985: 1381; Birner 1996: 101). In both languages they are encountered in emphatic contexts as in (31).⁹

- (31) *“Eve, ova sum jas” – zastanuva i pokažuva tatko mi na edna ista fotografija ... sekogaš koga ke go listame semejniot album. Tamu, na požolttenata slika na celoto semejstvo ..., e toj, dete so crni, trkalezni ljubopitni oči ...* (TO)

There, that's me – my father stops and always points out on the same old photograph, whenever we look at the pictures of the family album. There, on the yellowish family photograph ... stands he, a child with black, round curious eyes ...

Regarding the syntactic complexity of the subject constituent, the analysis of the Macedonian examples in our sample revealed that the semantics and form of the subject constituent do not seem to contribute to SVI felicity. Inversion occurs with both animate and abstract subject referents realized either by short (28–29) or long, complex noun phrases as in (32).

- (32) *Na poništenite i spasenite marki, nebare oživuvaa monarsite, despotite, kralevite na propadnatite kralstva, koi vo različni periodi ja vladeeja sudbinata na našeto semejstvo.* (LS2)

It was as if there, on the torn and intact stamps alike, resided all the resurrected monarchs, despots, and kings of fallen kingdoms who at various times had governed my family's fate.

⁹ In such English sentences the pronoun is most often in oblique case (Duffley 2018: 193).

The end-weight principle is considered an important factor that may trigger inversion in English even with unlikely predicates (Teixeira 2018: 69). Prado Alonso (2011: 79) cites several authors who find that about 70% of the inverted subjects comply with the end-weight principle. However, in our rather small sample of SVI sentences, only about a third of the examples, have heavily inverted subjects: compare (33) with the subjects in (24) and (26), for instance.

- (33) *And from the opened case spilled* his black uniform, like a black nebula, stars glittering here or there, distantly, in the material. (RBr)

Od otvoreniot kufer se rasturi negovata crna uniforma, kako crna maglina, so dzvezdite sto bleskaa vamu-tamu, oddalečeni vo materijalot.

However, the end-weight principle does not seem to apply consistently even with unaccusative verbs, as observed by Birner (1994: 247). We find English SV equivalents of Macedonian SVI sentences with rather heavy subjects (34).

- (34) *...ami vo sopstvenata glava, ti doagaat samo obični, poznati, iljada, bezbroj, kojznae kolku pati povtoruvani početoci.* (DS)

... but in your own head, just common, well known, a thousand, myriad, who knows how often repeated beginnings keep popping up.

3.3. Equivalents with no SVI in English

Only 11% of the English equivalents to the Macedonian SVI sentences have a corresponding structure in English, while in 89% a regular SV word order is used. Table 2 shows that 31% of these sentences exhibit otherwise comparable structures in the two languages, with or without a fronted adverbial (35, 36). These English sentences do not mark theticity with a subject–verb inversion, but with prosody, which is not evident in the written text. We expected to find event-central thetics among the non-corresponding sentences, as in (36), where the period ‘a year’ is not discussed further in the text. However, in many cases, the presentational function is also expressed without inversion: the ‘rocket’ in (35) has an important role in the following text.

- (35) *In the sky* a rocket *appeared*. (RBr)

Na neboto se pojavi raketa.

- (36) *I mina* nekoja godinka, *a čuvstvoto zmija si beše tuka* ... (OČ)

And about a year *passed*, *and still the snake feeling was there* ...

Table 2. Structures found in English SV translation equivalents of Macedonian SVI

M-E equivalence (in sentences with no inversion in E)	Fiction M>E	Fiction E>M	Academic M>E	Academic E>M	Total
Same V-constr, no inversion	65	31	33	21	150 31.3%
ST not fronted, no inversion	33	13	10	3	59 12.3%
Specific syntactic constructions	16	8	12	20	56 11.8%
Different type of predicate	9	6	26	13	54 11.3%
Equivalents of se-passive <i>da-con.</i>	1	4	2	29	36 7.6%
Finite VP in M – non-finite in E	1	2	5	14	22 4.6%
ST takes argument position in E	4	3	10	17	34 7.1%
Dat takes argument position in E	3	5	3	8	19 4.0%
Other	14	11	14	7	46 10.0%
TOTAL	146	83	115	132	476 100%

In the rest of the sentences, the English construction differs from the corresponding Macedonian in several ways. First, in a number of sentences (12.6%) the locative adverbial is not fronted, which signals a different discourse property of the English equivalent. Namely, these sentences also perform the presentational function but it is most probably marked prosodically as in (37) and (38).

(37) *Pred mene vo rasčekor zastana* visočok, krakat maž; vo desnata raka drži fudbalska topka, ... (OČ)

A tallish, long-legged man **stopped in front of me, astride; in his right hand he was holding a football;**

(38) *Vo 1889 godina niz solunskoto pristanište minale* 1.254 parni brodovi (KB)

In 1889, 1254 steamships ... passed through the port of Solun.

In some English equivalents, we find different syntactic constructions, which serve to change the perspective of the described situation. The bulk represents existential *there*-constructions, which may stand as equivalents to several Macedonian verbs that express state (*postoi* 'exist', *vladee* 'rule') or a change of state (*zavladee* 'start to reign') as in (39). In this way, they still keep the pragmatic order of Macedonian sentence elements, i.e. the same referent occupies the final position.

(39) *Zavladea* nov bran tišina. (LS1)

There was a new wave of silence.

In some English equivalents a *there*-construction (40) or clefting (41) is used to render the focalization of a new participant, which is achieved by inversion in Macedonian.

(40) *A koga počna popisot, vo Kozar maalo se vseli* grobna tišina. (LS1)

And when the census began, there settled on Goat District the silence of the grave.

(41) *Vo nego najčesto vleguvaše* tatko mi, a poretko i majka mi, samo koga trebaše knjigite da gi oslobodi od nasobranata prašina. (LS2)

Most often, it was my father who went in there, more rarely my mother, and then only when she needed to free the books of their collected dust.

In 54 of the non-inverted equivalents (11.3%), we find a different type of predicate in the English sentence presenting the situation from a different perspective. In half of those examples, the English counterpart of the Macedonian passive verb is an active structure in English, transitive (42) or intransitive (43).

(42) *Do 1880 godina ne se znaele* točno prihodite i rashodite vo državata. (KB)

Up until 1880 no one really knew the exact amounts of state revenues and expenditures.

(43) *Vo gostinskata soba ... na golemiot dzid, na koj nemaše prozorci, srede beše pomesten* dvokrilniot drven dolap. (LS2)

In the center of the large windowless wall of the guest room... a two-winged wooden cabinet stood.

A similar tendency is noted in the English equivalents of Macedonian SVI clauses with *da*-constructions containing a reflexive verb (passive or anticausative). Macedonian *da*-constructions often have equivalents with infinitive, *ing*-clauses or *that*-clauses in English with an active transitive construction. In (44) the focused participant takes the object position, while the infinitival subject remains unrealized. There is also a tendency to render a finite clause in Macedonian with a non-finite clause or a nominalization in English usually in a prepositional phrase (45). This seems to reify the predication tipping the balance towards thetic interpretation.

(44) *It is often easier to make up* words of this kind ... (GO)

Najčesto, polesno e da se sozdade vakov zbor ...

(45) *Toa pridoneslo da se razvie* stočarstvoto ... (KB)

This trade greatly contributed to the development of animal husbandry...

Finally, we find English equivalents in which the fronted circumstance that frames the event (usually a locative ST) in the Macedonian sentence is rendered as an active participant in the subject position (46), imposing a categorical interpretation. A similar correspondence is achieved with the benefactive/possessive dative, which is often presented as an active participant in the English clause (47).

(46) *Vo izborot e vključen* i raskazot „Tajnata na skopskata Saat-kula“... (LKD2)

The selection *also includes the story* “The Secret of the Skopje Clock Tower”

(47) *Međutoa po Rusko-turskata vojna i na ova proizvodstvo i trgovija im bil nanesen* silen udar. (KB)

This production and trade, *however, was dealt a severe blow after the Russo-Turkish War.*

4. Functions of SVI

In the analysis above we compared the properties of Macedonian and English SVI clauses in view of their main function determining the organization of information in the clause. In this section, we provide some observations regarding the use of the Macedonian SVI examples and their English translational equivalents in a wider context. Though closely interacting with each other, the following functions of SVI can be tentatively distinguished: presentational, text-structuring and rhetorical.

The presentational function stems from discourse needs to place the newly introduced participant in wide focus, which induces post-verbal subject placement. As noted above, the initial ST connects the new information to the previous context, thus creating a natural way of experiencing the scene. This function has been attributed various effects in the studies on English SVI: Dorgeloh (1997: 109, 111) calls it “procedural”, producing “camera movement” effects and vividness (most common in tour guides), while Kreyer (2006) identifies it as “immediate observer effect”. In English, this function is more restricted to “dynamic viewing” (Dorgeloh 1997: 191) serving mainly for rendering static situations. Hence, it is generally employed for space management and description of places (Chen 2003).

In our fiction sample, the descriptions of scenes presented with SVI in Macedonian, are seldom rendered in the same way in English (e.g. 6 and 18 above). Most often, we find different construals (as in 20, 25, 30 above). Notably, in (48), which is part of a description, the writer takes us around the house leading to the ‘cupboard’ where later the main event takes place. Despite its topicality, the translator, a native speaker of American English, decided to place the subject before the verb.

(48) *Vo gostinskata soba, ..., na golemiot dzid, na koj nemaše prozorci, srede beše pomesten* dvokrilniot drven dolap, koj ja budeše vo nas decata postojanata iluzija za svetot otade drugata strana na dzidot, vo dolapot... (LS2)

In the center of the large windowless wall of the guest room, ..., a two-winged wooden cabinet stood. For us children, this cabinet evoked a constant illusion of the world beyond, on the other side of the wall, in the cupboard.

In Macedonian, SVI often creates a vividness effect in the description of dynamic scenes that present a sequence of events, but in English they tend to be translated with a canonical word order. In (49) only the second scene is introduced with inversion.

(49) *Ulicata e sè ušte obleana vo svežo sonce koga ja snemuva, i nabrzo tuka pominuvaat momče i devojka. Se držat za race. Se smeat glasno. Devojkata go baknuva momčeto vo vratot. Zad niv odat dvajca tinejdžeri. Zboruvaat glasno i nešto se smeat.* (RB1)

*The street is still drenched in crisp sunshine when she has disappeared. A short while later a girl and boy **pass by**. They're holding hands. They're laughing loudly. The girl kisses the boy on the neck. Behind them are walking two teenagers. They're talking loudly and laughing about something.*

It has been noted that inverted constructions in English receive more attention from the reader because of their non-canonical word order (Kreyer 2006). Such linearization may generate rhetorical effects involving suspense and drama.¹⁰ Therefore, SVI is an optional and marked variant in English: whether or not it will be used depends on the way the speaker/writer chooses to present the situation. This is supported by Dorgeloh's (1997: 5) report that all examples in her sample "bear a component of subjectivity" and Kreyer's (2006) claim that the language user is an important factor. Consequently, SVI is used if the speaker wishes to highlight some dramatic effects, otherwise created by the context. In (48) there is no inversion because the translator has decided to focus on the cupboard by violating information structure requirements, but complying with syntactic rules, while in (50) below the writer has opted otherwise. Here, the appearance of an old Ford is a long-awaited event. The writer builds up suspense with every subsequent sentence to finally resolve it with the inversion. The introduced participant, which becomes the topic in the next sentence, is of special importance to the plot.

(50) *The road was empty again. ... Now, all alone, a final car. There was something very, very final about it. Down the mountain road in the thin cool rain, fuming up great clouds of steam, came an old Ford. It was traveling as swiftly as it might.* (RBr)

Patot beše od novo pust. ... i togaš, so sema sama, naiduvaše poslednata kola. Po planinskiot drum, niz retkiot studenkav dožd, isfrlujajki vo vozduhot golemi oblaci para, brevtaše eden star Ford. Odeše najbrzo što može.

In Macedonian, on the other hand, the unmarked word order choice reflects the discourse principle of presenting old information before new. The SVI construction

¹⁰ Related to this is Quirk et al.'s (1985: 522) observation that "the pre-posed constituent alerts the addressee that suspense or 'dramatic impact' is to follow."

carries no special stylistic effects in these situations. On the contrary, when headed by STs, inverted sentences fulfill the expectation that the new information is placed in focus and the opposite would be marked. According to Siewierska & Uhlířová (1998: 111), in Slavic languages “[t]he speaker uses the rheme > theme order to express his/her individual, i. e. subjective, attitude to the conveyed information: the information is evaluated as unexpected, surprising, striking, conspicuous, remarkable, etc.”

The presentational function of SVI is also related to the discourse structuring function (Prado-Alonso 2011: 41). By introducing a discourse-new participant in focus, inversion signals its topicality in the following discourse, achieving cohesion through an initial, discourse-old, adverbial (ST). In (50), the wooden cabinet becomes an important locus of subsequent events. The ST ‘in the guest room’ sets the stage for participant introduction and simultaneously links the sentence with the preceding text evoking a part/whole set relationship with the house (cf. Ward 2011: 1941). Although the English equivalent lacks SVI, inversion is a possible and perhaps a preferable option.¹¹ This optionality indicates that SVI is often determined by the writer’s subjective rendering of the described situation.

Similarly, we notice a difference between English and Macedonian regarding the topic change function of SVI. Of the two SVI subsequent Macedonian sentences in (51) above and (53) below only one is inverted in English, confirming that inversion for cohesive purposes is also subject to more restrictions and personal choice.

(51) *Turskrite statistiki ne se sigurni. Ne se sigurni i drugite statistiki. Najneobjektivni se grčkite statistiki.* (KB)

Ottoman demographic statistics were sketchy at best. Other people’s statistics were also not reliable. The least objective of all were the statistics produced by the Greeks.

The above discussion demonstrates that the three functions of SVI do not operate in isolation but are closely intertwined. However, in Macedonian inverted constructions, the stylistic function is considerably less salient.

5. Concluding remarks

Our research on SVI in Macedonian and English, based on the samples of original and translated texts, provides convincing evidence that this phenomenon is much more widespread in Macedonian than in English. However, the analysis of the attested Macedonian and English clauses with SVI shows that they share similar structural properties: (a) SVI in both languages is more frequently encountered in main than in embedded clauses, (b) they predominantly contain a fronted element

¹¹ According to the three native speakers we consulted.

which is otherwise placed towards the end. These elements typically encode locative circumstances and less so temporal, while other types (manner, instrument or reason) are seldom found in both languages, especially in English. As for the predicates, we found the same types distributed differently: copulas dominate in English, but in Macedonian intransitive and passivized verbs prevail.

Regarding the lexical-syntactic properties, the English construction admits a limited range of core unaccusative verbs, while in Macedonian, the construction tolerates all types of unaccusatives and even core unergatives. This has also been observed in Italian and Spanish which use inversion as a “focalisation device” with all verb types (Lozano & Mendikoetxea 2008: 93). In Macedonian, context and discourse functions play a more important role in the semantic coercion of ergative verbs. As to the semantic-pragmatic and discourse properties of the postposed subject nominal in SVI clauses no differences were noticed, but the syntactic complexity of the subject does not impact equally the inversion in the two languages.

The analysis shows that SVI serves similar discourse functions in the two languages, but to a different extent. In Macedonian, VS is the default order for presentational function, characteristic ofthetic statements. In English, the rigid SV(O) word order severely restricts the realization of this discourse function with inversion. The small number of English SVI constructions is stylistically marked, occurring in special discourse contexts. In unmarked uses, presentational constructions lack SVI in translational equivalents of Macedonian inverted sentences. The canonical word order of these English sentences results from the application of different language strategies. In the analysis, we discussed the following: change of voice, change of argument structure (a peripheral participant is promoted to the core participant status), change of the information structure of the clause by a different construction (existential *there*, clefts) or by placing the initial adverbial (stage topic in the Macedonian equivalent) in the scope of the predicate. In such cases, the new entity most often occupies the focus position or is, presumably, marked prosodically.

To conclude, the established structural and discursive overlapping of the SVI in English and Macedonian undoubtedly prove that we are dealing with the same type of construction, but it is less constrained in Macedonian. The differences in frequency stem from the fact that in Macedonian SVI is the default construction for realization of a specific discourse function: participant or event introduction, while its stylistic function is subsidiary. In English, the strict SVO word order has led to the application of other compensatory syntactic and prosodic mechanisms for placing new information in focus, while inversion most often creates vividness, suspense, and tension. Hence, the basic difference between English and Macedonian SVI lies in markedness: it is an unmarked focus construction in Macedonian and a marked pragmatic-stylistic device in English.

References

- Biber, Douglas & Johansson, Stig & Leech, Geoffrey & Conrad, Susan & Edward, Finegan. 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Birner, Betty J. 1994. Information status and word order: An analysis of English inversion. Steven Everson, ed. *Language* 70(2): 233–259. <https://doi.org/10.2307/415828>
- Birner, Betty J. 1995. Pragmatic constraints on the verb in English inversion. *Lingua* 97. 223–256. DOI:10.1016/0024-3841(95)00026-7
- Birner, Betty J. 1996. *The discourse function of inversion in English*. New York: Garland. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203820964>
- Bresnan, Joan. 1994. Locative inversion and the architecture of universal grammar. *Language* 70(1). 72–131. <https://doi.org/10.2307/416741>
- Bužarovska, Eleni, & Mitkovska, Liljana & Kirkova-Naskova, Anastazija 2019. Zbororedot vo prostata rečenica: inverzija na subjekt i predikat [Word order in simple sentences: subject and predicate]. *Journal of Contemporary Philology* 2(2). 7–25. <https://doi.org/10.37834/JCP192007b>
- Bužarovska, Eleni. 2021. Informaciska struktura i sintaksata na prostata rečenica [Information Structure and Word Order Variations]. *Journal of Contemporary Philology* 4 (1). 41–58. <https://doi.org/10.37834/JCP21410041b>
- Calhoun, Sasha & La Cruz, Ervin & Olssen, Ana. 2018. The interplay of information structure, semantics, prosody, and word ordering in Spanish intransitives. *Laboratory Phonology: Journal of the Association for Laboratory Phonology* 9(1). 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.5334/labphon.65>
- Chen, Rong. 2003. *English inversion. A ground-before-figure construction*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and language typology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dąbrowska, Eva. 1997. *Cognitive Semantics and the Polish Dative*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Dorgeloh, Heidrun. 1997. *Inversion in modern English: Form and function*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sidag.6>
- Duffley, Patrick. 2018. The Cognitive Structure of Full-Verb Inversion and Existential Structures in English. *Cognitive Semantics* 4. 184–229. doi 10.1163/23526416-00402002
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 2007. *The syntax/discourse interface: Information structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1075/fo1.16.1.07gom>
- Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax: An Introduction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Green, Georgia M. 1980. Some wherefores of English inversions. *Language* 56 (3): 582–601. <https://doi.org/10.2307/414451>
- Huddleston, Roland & Pullum, Geoffrey K. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316423530>
- Kreyer, Rolf. 2006. *Inversion in modern written English: Syntactic complexity, information status and creative writer*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783484431058.14>
- Lahousse, Karen. 2007. Implicit stage topics: A case study in French. *Discours* 1. 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.4000/discours.117>
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994/2012. *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representation of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620607>

- Levin, Beth & Rappaport Hovav, Malka. 1995. *Unaccusativity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lozano, Cristóba & Mendikoetxea, Amaya. 2008. Postverbal subjects at the interfaces in Spanish and Italian learners of L2 English: a corpus analysis. In Gilquin, Gaëtanelle & Papp, Szilvia & Díez-Bedmar, María eds. *Linking up contrastive and learner corpus research*, 85–125. Amsterdam: Rodopi. DOI:10.1163/9789401206204_005
- Maldonado, Ricardo. 2002. Objective and subjective datives. *Cognitive Linguistics* 13(1). 1–65. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.2002.010><https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.2002.010>
- Mitkovska, Liljana. 2021. The network of reflexive dative constructions in South Slavic. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 57(1). 59–83.
- Perlmutter, David M. 1978. Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis. *BLS* 4. 157–89. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/bls.v4i0.2198><https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v4i0.2198>
- Prado-Alonso, Carlos. 2011. *Full-verb inversion in written and spoken English*. Bern: Peter Lang. DOI: 10.3726/978-3-0351-0252-9
- Quirk, Randolph & Greenbaum, Sidney & Leech, Geoffrey & Svartvik, Jan. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Sorace, Antonella. 2000. Gradients in auxiliary selection with intransitive verbs. *Language* 76(4): 859–890. <https://doi.org/10.2307/417202>
- Schwarz, Anne. 2010. Discourse principles in grammar: Thethetic/categorical dichotomy. *eTropic: electronic journal of studies in the Tropics*. Vol. 9: *Refereed Proceedings of the Inaugural Tropics of the Imagination Conference, James Cook University Cairns, 2-3 Nov 2009*. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.25120/etropic.9.0.2010>; <https://journals.jcu.edu.au/etropic/article/view/3425>
- Siewierska, Anna & Uhlířová, Ludmila. 1998. An overview of word order in Slavic languages. In Siewierska, Anna (ed.), *Constituent Order in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 105–149. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110812206.105>
- Teixeira, Joana A. 2018. *L2 acquisition at the interfaces: Subject-verb inversion in L2 English and its pedagogical implications*. Doctoral dissertation. Universidade Nova de Lisboa
- Ward, Gregory. 2011. Discourse effects of word order variation. In Maienborn, Claudia & von Stechow, Klaus & Portner, Paul (eds.), *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language and Meaning*, 1934–1963. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Example sources and abbreviations

- DS – Dimitar Solev, <https://blesok.mk/en/literature/not-a-day-without-order-27/>
- GO – George Orwell, <https://blesok.mk/en/literature/politics-and-the-english-language-21/>
- KB – Krste Bitovski, https://macedonianhistory.ca/Stefov_Risto/Solunskite%20Atentati%20-%20e-book.pdf; <http://www.pollitecon.com/Assets/Ebooks/The-Solun-Assassins.pdf>
- LKD2 – Lidija Kapuševska-Drakulevska, <https://blesok.mk/en/literature/the-magic-of-storytelling/>
- LS1 – Luan Starova, <https://blesok.mk/en/literature/the-time-of-the-goats-30/>
- LS2 – Starova, Luan. (2001) *Tatkovite knigi*. Skopje: Matica makedonska. <https://www.wordswithoutborders.org/article/from-my-fathers-books>
- ME – Džeparoski Ivica (ed). (2011) *Macedonian Essay*. St Clement National Library, Skopje.
- OČ – Ognen Čemerski, <https://blesok.mk/en/literature/nest-116/>

RB1 – Rumena Bužarovska, <https://blesok.mk/en/literature/soup-111/>

RB2 – Rumena Bužarovska, <https://blesok.mk/en/literature/dinner-service-for-guests-69/>

RBr – Ray Bradbury, <https://csuclc.files.wordpress.com/2013/03/illustrated-man-by-ray-bradbury.pdf>; <https://okno.mk/sites/default/files/024-Rej-Bredberi-Lek-protiv-melanholija.pdf>

SF – Scott Fitzgerald, <https://blesok.mk/en/literature/bernice-bobs-her-hair-84/>

TO – Tomislav Osmanli, <http://www.unet.com.mk/rashela/>

USPOREDBA FENOMENA NA DODIRNOJ TOČKI IZMEĐU SINTAKSE I DISKURSA: INVERZIJA SUBJEKTA I GLAGOLA U ENGLESKOM I MAKEDONSKOM JEZIKU

U ovom se radu raspravlja o rezultatima kontrastivne analize inverzije između subjekta i glagola u engleskom i makedonskom, južnoslavenskom jeziku. Promatraju se rečenice kojima se tipično kodira tetičke izjave, u kojima subjekt dolazi nakon glagola. I engleski i makedonski jezik pripadaju jezicima s redom riječi SVO, no za razliku od engleskog, red riječi u makedonskom umnogome je fleksibilniji zbog svoje bogate flektivne morfologije. Glavni je cilj utvrditi opseg distribucije inverzije subjekta i glagola u tim dvama jezicima, što će pomoći u otkrivanju razloga razlika u distribuciji između njih. U tu svrhu usporedili smo semantičke, sintaktičke i diskursnopragmatičke odlike struktura koje uključuju inverziju u primjerima prikupljenima iz paralelnih beletrističkih i znanstvenih tekstova. Izražene razlike u uporabi inverzije subjekta i glagola ukazuju na to da leksička i gramatička ograničenja oštro ograničavaju inverziju subjekta i glagola u engleskom, za razliku od makedonskog, u kojem njome upravljaju diskursna načela.

Ključne riječi: prezentacijske konstrukcije, tetičnost, informacijska struktura, red riječi

The addresses of the authors:

Liljana Mitkovska

AUE-FON University, Skopje

ul. "Palmito Toljati" 27, 1040 Skopje, North Macedonia

liljana55@yahoo.com

Eleni Bužarovska

University of Ss Cyril and Methodius, Skopje

bul. "Goce Delčev" br. 9A, 1000 Skopje, North Macedonia

elenibuzarovska@t.mk