

Theoretical Approaches to Disharmonic Word Order

Theresa Biberauer and Michelle Sheehan

1. Introduction

Word order has not always been of great interest to grammarians. In ancient times, when the study of grammar meant the study of what we would today identify as the phonology, morphology and syntax of a particular language,¹ word order was typically a minor syntactic concern, with largely morphologically based categorization considerations taking centre stage. As Weil (1879 [1844]: 11) notes, by the mid 19th century, grammarians had “very carefully studied isolated words, as also their syntactical concatenation; but most of them [had] given no attention to the order in which words may follow each other.” To the extent that they were concerned with word order, ancient grammarians were interested only in providing some rationale for the order of constituents. Thus Priscian (*floruit* 500 AD), drawing on the work of his contemporaries, proposed an abstract OV order for Latin based on the idea that “the noun precedes the verb because the substance expressed by the noun precedes the accidents expressed by the verb” (Seuren 1998: 29, citing Luhtala 1994: 1467). This pursuit continued into the seventeenth and eighteenth century, with grammarians being famously interested in word order as an indicator of the order of thought. Thus eighteenth century linguists in the *grammaire générale* tradition compared the word orders of different languages in search of the *ordre naturel*. Some, including Beauzée, afforded SVO this status, making French ‘analogical’ in that its words tracked the order of thought, as opposed to Greek, Latin and German, which were ‘transpositive’ as the correlation was indirect (Graffi 2000: 84). Others, including the philosopher Diderot, rejected the idea that the word order of a particular language could achieve such a status (cf. Graffi 2000: 17, citing Jellinek 1913-14 II: 425-464). The idea of a natural order nonetheless retained currency and is also observed in the work of Humboldt in the century. Weil himself proposed a more nuanced status for word order, and he is perhaps most famous for noting that “the syntactic march is not the march of ideas” (Weil 1879[1844]: 21).² As such, the comparative study of basic word order was of little interest until the pioneering work of Joseph Greenberg in the mid 20th century. In this introduction, we review Greenberg’s work and the typological tradition to which it gave rise before considering the status of word order in the generative tradition and future prospects in this domain more generally.

2. Harmony and Disharmony from Greenberg to the Present

2.1 Greenberg’s correlation pairs and the notion of harmony

¹ As Seuren (1998: 29) notes:

“The Greeks and Romans were not directly concerned with universal properties of human language, their linguistic horizon being extremely restricted.”

² This quote is misleading, though, as he nonetheless maintained that “to treat of the order of words, is then, in a measure, to treat of the order of ideas” (Weil 1879[1844]: 11). Weil was principally interested in the reason why the modern European languages (French, German, English) had such little freedom in their word order compared with the Ancient languages (Latin and Greek). His claim here, is that, to the extent that word order is free, it reveals pragmatic meaning, an idea later adopted by the Prague school

Greenberg (1963: 60) notes that “linguists are in general familiar with the notion that certain languages tend consistently to put modifying or limiting elements before modified or limited, while others just as consistently do the opposite.” This is the basis of the notion of ‘harmony’ which lies at the heart of this volume. Thus, in English, modifiers tend to follow modified elements like verbs and adpositions, whereas the opposite is true in Hindi:

- (1) John [is [at [school]]] V P O
 (2) Raam [[[skuul] par] hai] O P V
 Raam school at is
 ‘Ram is at school’

The basic word-order phenomena discussed by Greenberg are the following (based on Greenberg 1963: Appendices I-II):

- (3) i. verb initial/medial/final
 ii. adposition-noun order
 iii. noun-adjective order
 iv. noun-genitive order
 v. noun-demonstrative order
 vi. noun-numeral order
 vii. pronominal-verb order

For Greenberg, though, the term ‘harmony’ actually has a more technical definition, relying crucially on his notion of ‘dominance’. A particular order is dominant over another order, where it is less constrained in the following terms:

“A dominant order may always occur, but its opposite, the recessive, occurs only when a harmonic construction is likewise present.” (Greenberg 1963: 62)

This is effectively illustrated by a tetrachoric table, as shown below:

	V-DP	DP-V
pro-V	Y	Y
V-pro	Y	N

Figure 1: Positioning of lexical nominal and pronominal complements in relation to the verb³

Figure 1 indicates that three of four potential word-order combinations involving verbs and lexical/pronominal complements are attested. Crucially, the fourth, whereby pronominals follow, but full lexical complements precede, the verb, is unattested. This means that V-DP is dominant over DP-V, as the latter order is more constrained than the former, occurring only where the order of pronominal and verb is harmonic with the order of full nominal (DP) and the verb.⁴ Greenberg claims that harmony between two correlation pairs arises wherever we see this particular pattern in a tetrachoric table. Note that for Greenberg, then, harmony is a

³ Where pro = pronoun, V = verb, DP = Determiner Phrase (lexical nominal).

⁴ Note that it might be said that, for this reason, Greenberg (1963) also carries the seeds of Kayne’s influential Antisymmetry hypothesis, discussed below and in several of the papers in the volume. Kayne (this volume) himself cites this universal in support of Antisymmetry.

notion which is defined across E-languages based on patterns of attested cross-linguistic variation (in this case a sample of 30, but ideally the sum of all attested languages).⁵

Many of the papers in this book adopt a slightly different notion of harmony, defined in relation to a specific language, but drawing on these cross-linguistic patterns. In these terms, two phrases are harmonious if and only if their respective ‘modifying or limiting elements’ pattern together in occurring uniformly at the right or left edge of the phrase concerned. Thus VP and PP can be said to be ‘harmonic’ in this sense in the English and Hindi examples above, as in both cases, the ‘modified’ V/P systematically occurs to the left/right. Likewise, in a specific language with pro-V and V-DP orders, the order of pronominals and verbs can be said to be disharmonic with the order of full DPs and the verb, as the two orders fail to align. This is, in a sense, an I-language reappraisal of Greenberg’s E-language notion of harmony. Indeed, Greenberg himself says of harmony that it is “very obviously connected with the psychological concept of generalization” (Greenberg 1963: 62), a position further discussed by Hawkins (1980, 1982) and Roberts (2007a (III): 14). Significantly, Newmeyer (2005a: 105) questions the validity of this move, saying:

“Our minds/brains, after all, have no clue as to the typological status of any aspect of any element of our mental grammars. The relationship between typological generalizations and I-language is therefore necessarily quite indirect.”

We return to this issue below (see the discussion in sections 3 and 4 in particular). Our immediate concern, however, is a more detailed consideration of the notion of ‘harmony’ and the theoretical ideas it has given rise to.

2.2 Harmony and the Head Parameter

Building on Greenberg’s landmark paper, Vennemann (1972, 1974a, b) proposed an assimilation of the various word-order correlation pairs to a single operator/operand template. This in turn allowed him to posit a *Natural Serialization Principle* (NSP) whereby an unordered set {operator {operand}} is universally ‘serialised’ or linearized as either operator-operand or operand-operator in a given language. In later work (Vennemann 1976, Vennemann and Harlow 1977), Vennemann explicitly refers to operands as *Heads* and operators as *Specifiers*; as Dryer (1992: 88) notes, however, it is important not to equate this use of *Specifier* with the generative notion ‘specifier’ as it is clear that Vennemann’s intention here was to refer to dependent elements. The pairs in (4) illustrate the types of elements Vennemann was concerned with:

(4)	Operand/Head	Operator/Dependent (“Specifier”)
	Verb	Object
	Verb	Adpositional Phrase


⁵ Greenberg’s (1963) paper also arguably contains the roots of cartography (cf. Cinque 1999, 2005 amongst others). Consider the following:

“Another type of relation than those that have just been considered is illustrated by Universals 20 and 29. These may be called proximity hierarchies. What we have is a rule that certain elements must be closer to some central element than some other satellite. The central element may be the root morpheme or base of a word or the head-word of an endocentric construction.” (Greenberg 1963: 104)

He goes on to add that “[t]hese hierarchies are presumably related to degrees of logical and psychological remoteness from the center, but no analysis is attempted here.” (ibid.)

Verb	Manner Adverb
Noun	Relative Clause
Noun	Genitive
Noun	Adjective

In a sense, the NSP can be considered a precursor of the Head Parameter, the idea that in a given language L a head universally precedes/follows its complement. Consider this in relation to Chomsky (1970) and Jackendoff's (1977) X-bar theory:



Here, Vennemann's operand could be seen as equivalent to the Head X, while a relevant subset of his operators are equivalent to Comp.

Hawkins (1980) offers an eloquent critique of the NSP, based partly on the observation that only 47.89% of the languages in Greenberg's sample actually have consistent operator-operand/operand-operator order across all the categories he considered. These are given below:

- (6)
- i. verb initial/medial/final (collapsed to verb-object order by Vennemann – see (4) above)
 - ii. adposition-noun order
 - iii. noun-adjective order
 - iv. noun-genitive order⁶

The lack of ordering consistency across pairs of elements means that very few languages are consistently 'harmonic' in the I-language sense employed above (i.e. for a given system, the modified X systematically occurs in a fixed position – left/right – in relation to its modifier). As Hawkins notes, then, what might be termed *disharmonic languages* actually outnumber their consistently harmonic counterparts, and the NSP's inability to account for the former is thus a major failing.⁷ Vennemann (1975) had in fact proposed that languages which fail to conform to either word-order type are in a state of flux, being in the process of undergoing a diachronic change, but, as Hawkins notes, this is a problematic claim. Of the 24 logically possible word-order combinations, 8 remain unattested (cf. Hawkins 1980: 198).⁸ There is thus a second sense in which the NSP is problematic as it fails to provide an account of these 8 unattested types. All orders diverging from the consistently harmonic orders (in the I-language sense) have the dubious status of intermediary stages of diachronic change for Vennemann, and, unless independent considerations are identified as to why the unattested systems fail to surface as intermediary systems, they cannot be ruled out by his approach. It is also worth noting that many attested disharmonic systems do not obviously appear to be in the process of change in the direction of harmony, i.e. a stable system. English, for example,

⁶ Given Greenberg's original 3-way distinction for (i), this gives 3×2^3 (24) potential combinations.

⁷ As Hawkins puts it (1980: 198), a scientific theory which accounts for less than 50% of the data is not a good theory.

⁸ Vennemann proposes the merging of SVO and VSO languages to give the single type VO, but Hawkins takes issue with this move, mainly because, as Greenberg (1963) showed, VSO languages display much stronger correlations than SVO languages.

has retained retains its disharmonic Saxon genitive over many centuries, with this structure in modern English being significantly more productive than the postnominal PP option (consider: *my friend's house* and *the house of my friend*). Sapirian 'drift'-oriented interpretations of Vennemann's NSP therefore do not appear to hold up (cf. Sapir 1921 on 'drift' and Roberts 2007b for discussion of potential theoretical interpretations of this notion). Finally, Hawkins points out that the NSP posits a series of bilateral relations between correlation pairs which in turn prevents one from capturing Greenberg's notions of dominance and harmony in their original sense: unilateral implicational universals lie at the heart of the Greenbergian notion of dominance and, in eliminating them, Vennemann again detracts from the viability of the NSP.⁹

There is thus a sense in which the Head Parameter (in the form of the NSP) was proposed early in the typological literature and quickly rejected. In a slightly later paper, though, Hawkins (1982) returns to the issue and discusses the notion of harmony more explicitly in relation to X-bar theory and potential 'spec' and 'head parameters'. He observes that X-bar theory, with its three-way head/specifier/complement distinction, might provide a finer grained distinction than the two-way modifier/modified or operator/operand distinctions used by Greenberg and Vennemann respectively. Once again, though, he notes that there is no evidence that specifiers, heads and complements are systematically ordered (albeit in potentially different ways) across a given language. Even once we allow for the specifier/complement distinction, he argues, "languages will vary according to the degree of cross-categorical generalization which their grammars incorporate" (Hawkins 1982: 9). Translating into a generative perspective, then, Hawkins (1982) concludes that word order cannot be regulated by a single parameter; it might, however, be regulated by a series of spec and head parameters which are psychologically related. In fact, Hawkins argues explicitly that "[g]rammars with more cross-categorical generalizations will be simpler than, and hence preferred over, those with fewer." This is essentially a formalization of Greenberg's intuition that harmony is connected to generalization. In the modern generative context, specifically, Chomsky's "three factors" framework (cf. Chomsky 2005), this can very naturally be understood as the consequence of an intuitively plausible "third factor"¹⁰ – something like Roberts' (2007b) Input Generalization, a strategy acquirers are assumed to employ in analysing the Primary Linguistic Data (PLD) they are exposed to. Particularly worth noting in the present context, though, is that the fact, typically overlooked by generativists, that Hawkins rejected the idea that a single word-order parameter (e.g. the Head Parameter) could account for attested word-order variation and also that this variation could be understood as a direct reflex of UG alone as early as the early 1980s.

Dryer (1992) tests Greenberg's word-order correlations on a much larger, more balanced 625 language sample. He finds that the following potential correlation pairs (posited by Greenberg or others) fail to pattern with verb-object order in his larger sample:

(7) **Non-correlation pairs** (Dryer 1992: Table 40, 108)

- (i) adjective-noun
- (ii) demonstrative-noun

⁹ Hawkins goes on to propose his own theory of the Greenbergian word-order correlations based on the combination of four absolute implicational universals and his relative principle of 'Cross-Category Harmony' (CCH), which aims to predict the relative frequencies between the 18 permitted word orders (to which we return in section 3.1).

¹⁰ In the context of Chomsky's "three factors" approach, the factors assumed to play a role in determining the form of adult grammars are specified as UG (Factor 1), the PLD (Factor 2) and, additionally, rather vaguely specified "third factors" or non-language-specific considerations, which include principles of efficient computation and principles of data analysis employed in acquisition (see Mobbs 2008, in progress for further discussion).

- (iii) adverbial intensifier-adjective (e.g. *very tall*)
- (iv) negative particle-verb
- (v) aspect/tense particle-verb.

At first glance, this appears to strengthen the idea that the distinctions of X-bar theory might underlie linear order as none of the non-correlations pairs involve clear head-complement relations. (i) is generally taken to involve adjunction or a spec-head relation in the extended nominal projection (Svenonius 1993), but not usually complementation (although see Abney 1987). (ii) is commonly thought to involve a spec-head relation (see i.a. Cinque 1995, Bernstein 1997 and 2008 and Giusti 2002), (iii) is taken to involve either adjunction or a spec-head relation (Bresnan 1973, Jackendoff 1977, though see Corver 1997 for a head-analysis of a subset of degree words). Finally, the status of (iv) and (v) is unclear, as is made manifest by several of the papers in this volume (cf. Chan, Sheehan; see also Biberauer and Sheehan 2011 on the problems posed by particles in the generative context).

Dryer nonetheless takes his findings to be evidence against a link between X-bar theory and the correlation pairs, and in favour of his Branching Direction Theory (BDT).¹¹ Thirteen of the verb-object patterns from Dryer arguably involve head-complement relations:

- (8) **Head-complement correlation pairs** (taken from Dryer 1992: Table 39, 108)
- (i) verb-object
 - (ii) adposition-DP
 - (iii) copula verb-predicate
 - (iv) want-VP
 - (v) auxiliary verb-VP
 - (vi) negative auxiliary-VP
 - (vii) complementizer-S(entence)
 - (viii) article-noun
 - (ix) plural word-noun
 - (x) noun-genitive
 - (xi) adjective-standard of comparison
 - (xii) verb-PP
 - (xiii) adverbial subordinator-S(entence)

The remaining four, however, are less obviously head-complement relations:

- (9) **Other correlation pairs** (taken from Dryer 1992: Table 39, 108)
- (i) question particle-S(entence)
 - (ii) noun-relative clause
 - (iii) verb-manner adverb
 - (iv) verb-subject

Question particles are often taken to be heads (cf. Cable 2010 for recent discussion), but some problems for this are raised by Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts (2011) and Sheehan (this volume). In traditional analyses, relative clauses are taken to be adjuncts, but on Kayne's (1994) raising account, they are complements of the determiner, and so might

¹¹ . The BDT, unlike the Head Parameter, is able to account for the fact that harmony affects not only heads (defined in terms of subcategorisation) but also potentially branching adverbial modifiers; in sum all "fully recursive phrasal dependents" (Dryer 1992: 116). Nevertheless, Dryer (2008) ultimately discards his earlier BDT analysis, arguing against the hierarchical constituents it assumes and ascribing the observed word-order patterns to more general processing considerations.

arguably pattern with complements for this reason, as articles are verb patterners. Manner adverbs are generally assumed to involve either adjunction (cf. Ernst 2002) or, from a Cinque (1999) perspective, a specifier relation, and so are more problematic. Likewise, subjects are accepted to occupy a specifier position in X-bar theory, and so also present a potential problem. Regardless of whether or not X-bar theory can be harnessed to shed light on the word-order patterns uncovered by Dryer's research, it is clear that his findings empirically reinforce Hawkins' observation that it cannot be a single Head Parameter which determines the observed orders; instead, what seems to be required is a series of semi-independent parameters and, additionally, some overarching preference for harmony (of the I-language variety discussed above). In all cases, Dryer finds that the preference for harmony is statistical rather than absolute, so that there are actually few languages which are fully harmonic in these terms (cf. Dryer 1992: fn17, 109). The disharmonic words orders that are the focus of this volume thus instantiate a phenomenon that is crosslinguistically very common.

2.3 Disharmony

Today, there is recognition in both the typological and the generative literature that very many and possibly even the majority of languages fail to be fully harmonic in the sense that all head-complement pairs pattern alike (this point is once again picked up on by Cinque, this volume).¹² Given the fact that an across-the-board Head Parameter, set once for all categories, clearly cannot account for the observed variation, generative grammarians have proposed interacting parameters designed to account for disharmonic word orders. Li (1990: 41), for example, proposes the following constraint to account for word-order patterns in Mandarin:

(10) The Chinese Word Order Constraint

- a. Chinese is head-final except under the requirements of Case assignment.
- b. Case is assigned from left to right in Chinese.
- c. A Case assigner assigns at most one Case.

This constraint has the advantage of accounting for the unusual word-order properties of Mandarin (e.g. the initial position of Case-assigning verbs and adpositions in a language where the nominal domain appears to be head-final and relatives also precede their associated nominal), whilst maintaining a single setting for the Head Parameter in that language. Analysis of V2 effects in West Germanic languages (Travis 1984) and of OV orders in Vata (Koopman 1984) can be seen to do essentially the same thing in relation to the behaviour of clausal XPs. In all cases, transformations, motivated by Case or other features, serve to interrupt a harmonic underlying head-initial or head-final word order.

While these approaches were highly constrained and empirically successful, they implied a notion of linear order at the narrow syntactic level, which came to be viewed as problematic by some. The reason for this was the increasing evidence that grammar is sensitive only to constituent structure and not to linear order. Thus children apparently fail to posit syntactic operations which are non-structure-dependent (Crain and Nakayama 1987), and modules such as Binding Theory seem to be sensitive only to hierarchical notions such as c-command and not to linear precedence. This was coupled with a renewed interest in

¹² Moreover, as Emonds (this volume) points out, the behaviour of specifiers, which might be considered the complements of phrasal projections, means that many so-called head-initial languages are, in a certain sense, really disharmonic (cf. also Hawkins 1980 on this).

something highlighted by Hawkins (1980, 1982): the observation that there are robust gaps in attested word orders. Kayne (1994) brings these various concerns to the fore, and proposes a theory whereby two asymmetric structural relations (dominance and asymmetric c-command) come together to determine linear order. The following section briefly considers this proposal and relates it to our principal concern: disharmonic word orders.

2.4 Antisymmetry

In a certain (controversial) sense, antisymmetry can be viewed as a return to the *grammaire générale* idea that there is a natural order of language (see section 1 above), though it is less clear in the generative paradigm that this is in any way connected to the order of thought.

Kayne's (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA) proposes the following direct connection between hierarchical structure and linear order:

(10) **Linear Correspondence Axiom** (Kayne 1994: 6)

[For a given phrase marker P , where d is the non-terminal to terminal dominance relation, T the set of terminals and A the set of ordered pairs $\langle X_j, Y_j \rangle$ such that for each j , X_j asymmetrically c-commands Y_j – TB/MS], $d(A)$ is a linear ordering of T .

The LCA states that the dominance relation applied to the set of ordered pairs determined by asymmetric c-command relations gives a linear order of the set of terminals in a given phrase marker. Kayne argues, largely on an empirical basis, that the relevant linear order is precedence rather than subsequence so that the following holds:

(11) **Implication of the LCA**

A terminal X precedes a terminal Y iff a category dominating X asymmetrically c-commands a category dominating Y .

Kayne's proposal that (11) is a principle of grammar (UG) and that the relevant relation is universally precedence leads to what has become known as the Universal Base hypothesis, given the further assumptions in Kayne 1994, (discussed by Kayne, this volume and Toyoshima, this volume). This refers to the fact that, in the absence of any movement, a phrase will have default spec-head-comp linear order, based on its inherent c-command relations.¹³ It follows that all other surface word orders must be derived from this basic order via movement. This might, in a sense, be considered an extreme version of the proposals in Li, Travis and Koopman (see section 2.3 above), whereby disharmony arises via transformations from a harmonic base. In the case of the LCA all orders diverging from consistent head-initial order must be movement-derived, even harmonic head-finality. Importantly, though, independent considerations (e.g. V-raising, the presence of a canonical subject position, the presence of a canonical topic position and the activation of the left periphery more generally) entail that harmonically head-initial systems also require movement (compare standard generative analyses of English, French, Swedish and Niuean¹⁴ in this regard, for example). To the best of our knowledge, no language features only structures directly reflecting the Universal Base (see section 2.5 of this introduction, and Cinque, this volume, for further discussion).

¹³ This is assuming Kayne's (1994) category-based definition of c-command.

¹⁴ Cf. Pollock (1989), Holmberg and Platzack (1995) and Massam (2000, 2001, 2005) for discussion. Cf. also Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2001, 2007) on the so-called *Subject in Situ Generalization* and its proposed universal consequences.

One of the conceptual attractions of the LCA is that it apparently permits the eradication of linearity from Narrow Syntax (especially under Chomsky's 1995 reappraisal).¹⁵ Kayne (this volume), however, claims that 'order' is still required at the narrow syntactic level, calling into question this apparent advantage. Its main empirical advantage, and the one that is of central importance here, is that it provides a potential explanation for several word-order asymmetries. Firstly, as Kayne notes, movement is very generally to the left in natural languages, and not the right. Rightward 'movement', where it occurs has very different properties to its leftward counterpart, being subject to numerous restrictions (e.g. the Right Roof Constraint; cf. Ross 1967 for discussion). The LCA provides an immediate explanation for this fact, given Chomsky's (1993) Extension Condition. If movement is only possible to the root of the tree, and the root of the tree is the highest position in c-command terms (i.e. it c-commands all other nodes), then it follows that movement will always be leftwards (see Sheehan 2010 for an LCA-compatible account of extraposition). Kayne also notes other word-order asymmetries which similarly derive from the lack of rightward movement, such as the apparent lack of verb-penultimate languages and penultimate position effects more generally (cf. Kayne 1994 for further examples). A final example which is worthy of note concerns the apparent lack of *wh*-movement in OV languages. Kayne attributes this to the ban on multiple specifiers imposed by the LCA.¹⁶ If head-finality is derived via roll-up movement, then it follows that *wh*-movement to spec CP will be banned where TP-to-spec-CP movement has taken place. In its initial form, then, the LCA appears to be a restrictive theory of word order with the potential to account for a number of word-order gaps and asymmetries of the kind observed by typologists.¹⁷ As Roberts (2007a (III): 13-14) notes, from the perspective of the LCA, the notion of harmony reduces to a preference for either all or no heads to trigger comp-to-spec movement. Mixed systems, by this standard, are more difficult to acquire, and hence are predicted to be less frequent.¹⁸

2.5 Remaining questions

The existence of harmony and of both harmonic and disharmonic orders creates particular difficulties for principles and parameters approaches to word-order typology, which predict that, all things being equal, any grammatical system must fall on one side or another of any cross-linguistic dichotomy. From this perspective, the fact that disharmonic languages are so prevalent is apparently positive for Kayne's LCA, which takes word order to be tied to language-specific movement operations. There is also a sense, though, in which the Universal Base Hypothesis is deeply surprising in the light of typological research. According to Greenberg (1963) and Hawkins (1980), the purest harmonic word-order types are VSO and SOV, with SVO being a mixed type with much less clear correlations. From Kayne's perspective, there is a sense in which SVO is the underlying order of all languages. Of course, whether this is a problem depends on what status is afforded to this universal base. If Cinque (this volume) is right, for example, then even head-initial surface orders are derived, in which case, there is clearly no sense in which SVO is predicted to be the most frequent

¹⁵ Chomsky (1995) takes the LCA to function as a linearization algorithm, applying only at the mapping to PF. See also Moro (2000).

¹⁶ This stems from the category-based version of c-command which Kayne posits. In such a system, multiple specifiers of the same category mutually c-command each other and so cannot be linearized.

¹⁷ The hypothesis, however, is not without its critics and we return to this matter in section 4.2 below.

¹⁸ It is not really clear, though, that this is correct, given Hawkins' and Dryer's claim that the majority of languages are actually disharmonic.

order (contra Newmeyer 2005a). Nonetheless, many questions remain unanswered. Is there any evidence for the movement required to derive head-finality from a universal base? How are word-order generalisations to be captured by movement or base-generation? Given the attested variation, are word-order parameters to be stated for each (lexical/functional) category, for classes of categories, or for all categories subject to some defeasibility constraint? Is it then true that, in fact, anything goes, beyond, possibly, each category having to have a fixed internal order? If not, what generalisations can be made aside from the simple observation that most languages are tendentially head-initial or head-final? Is word order connected to other aspects of grammar, such as prosody? How stable are disharmonic systems and how are they acquired and thus preserved? Are there alternative linearization mechanisms which should be considered alongside the LCA and Head Parameter-based approaches? What role do extragrammatical factors play in the determination of word order, particularly in frequency-based terms? The papers in this volume aim to answer questions such as these, throwing new light on the nature of the relation between surface order and Narrow Syntax. In the following sections, we consider some of these issues in more detail.

3 Word order and linguistic theory

3.1 Frequency

As noted repeatedly above, the preference for harmony across head-complement pairs is statistical rather than absolute (the question of whether absolute implicational universals also exist is separate and we leave it aside here; see i.a. Whitman 2008 and Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts 2011 for discussion). In recent years, there has been much debate as to the relevance of frequency skewings for theoretical linguistics. Hawkins (1980: 193) first proposed that “the theory of Universal Grammar must include both implicational universals and universals of language distribution in the description and explanation of word order”. Hawkins objects to Greenberg’s use of statistical universals where absolute implicational universals are empirically and theoretically superior, but he also notes that the preference for harmony is statistical rather than absolute. His point, then, is that while gaps can be attributed to UG principles, statistical trends must have a different kind of explanation. In his 1980 paper, he posits Cross Categorical Harmony (CCH) to address the statistical nature of harmony in the word-order domain:

(13) Cross-Categorical Harmony (CCH)

The more similar the position of operands relative to their operators across different operand categories considered pairwise (verb in relation to adposition order, noun in relation to adposition order, verb in relation to noun order), the greater are the percentage numbers of exemplifying languages.

(Hawkins 1980: 98)¹⁹

The reasoning here is that “by reserving implicational statements for the task of distinguishing attested from non-attested co-occurrences, we can, therefore, formulate just one supplementary distributional regularity [i.e. CCH- TB/MS]...which captures generalizations which [statistical implications – TB/MS] are intrinsically unable to state”

¹⁹ The connection between markedness and frequency was also discussed by Lightfoot (1979: 77), who claimed that languages with more marked grammars will be less frequent than languages with less marked grammars.

(Hawkins 1980: 232). This distributional regularity is arguably not a principle of UG, but rather a generalisation over E-languages.

Recently, this position has been endorsed by Newmeyer (2003, 2005b) and others (e.g. Whitman 2008). Newmeyer (2005b: chapter 3) has famously proposed that theoretical linguistics should concern itself only with possible and not probable languages. The frequency of a certain word order, he claims, is to be explained by external factors, such as patterns of diachronic change (as influenced by acquisition), functional pressures or even arbitrary social pressures and language contact. Most specifically, he has endorsed Hawkins' (1994, 2004) processing-based account of the preference for harmony (cf. also Hawkins, this volume). In this more recent work, Hawkins has moved towards an explicitly functional explanation for the CCH, based on his Performance-Grammar Correspondence Hypothesis (PGCH), which claims that languages have grammaticalised word orders which are efficient from a processing perspective. From this perspective, principles of processing efficiency such as Minimize Domains (MiD) (Hawkins 2004: 31, this volume) favour head adjacency as well as optional processes such as extraposition. Hawkins also argues that other more nuanced typological trends can be traced back to the PGCH, for example the tendency for rigid VO languages to develop initial articles. This is because initial articles serve to construct NP and this is more efficient at the left-edge in VO but not OV languages. A final asymmetry of this kind is that "[l]eft-branching phrases [...] are often more reduced and constrained in comparison with their right-branching counterparts [...]" (Hawkins this volume, p.13). Thus pronominal relatives are often reduced compared to their postnominal equivalents.

The authors in this volume take different positions in this debate. Cinque's approach might, as he himself notes (p.18), lead us to expect that unmarked systems (i.e. those featuring fewer deviations from the 'ideal harmonic derivations' he postulates; see also discussion in section 3.2 below) should (all else being equal) be more frequent than more marked systems. This is not to say, however, that frequency cannot be affected by extragrammatical factors; hence his discussion of the relative scarcity of VOS orders in natural languages, despite the fact that the latter is one of the two abstract harmonic orders proposed by Cinque. In other papers, too, infrequent orders are taken to be ruled out by Universal Grammar or at least made difficult to generate by it. Thus, one of the reported benefits of Toyoshima's graph-theoretical linearization approach is that it "accounts for the rarity of the other three logically possible [word-order] variations (VOS, OVS, OSV)" (Toyoshima, this volume: 1). Djamouri, Paul and Whitman, on the other hand, argue explicitly against the approach taken by Cinque whereby frequency is indicative of markedness. Instead, they attribute the rarity of head-initial PPs in VO languages to diachronic factors. To the extent that diachrony is a reflex of acquisitional considerations, however, it could still be the case that markedness plays a role in determining the frequency of systems of different types.

Even if one accepts that third factor pressures of the type alluded to in Chomsky (2005; see section 2.2 above) can interact with UG to give the Greenbergian correlations, it remains to be decided at what level this interaction takes place. Kiparsky (2008) seems to imply that the interaction operates at quite a deep level:

"The generative program opens up the possibility that [third factors –TB/MS] might have become biologized within UG itself..." (Kiparsky 2008:25)

Abels and Neeleman (2009) likewise speculate (as one possibility) that the requirement that a filler precede a gap might act "as motivation for a grammatical principle stating that a moved constituent must be linearized at PF as preceding its sister" (cf. Ackema and Neeleman 2002 for the original discussion and motivation of these ideas). Once again, the implication appears

to be that third factor considerations could shaped the very nature of UG. It is difficult to see how such a thing could be possible unless one adopts the evolutionary scenario put forth by Pinker and Bloom (1990), whereby UG evolved gradually via natural selection. The familiar objections to such an approach remain (see Fitch 2010 for overview discussion). A different perspective on the interaction of UG and third factors takes the latter to exert an influence only at the point of acquisition (parameter-setting in some models; cf. Biberauer, Holmberg, Roberts and Sheehan 2010 for more detailed discussion). The advantage to such a view is that third factors are not themselves ‘biologised’, but they rather serve only to constrain variation within a biologically determined variation space. If this speculation is on the right track, Newmeyer’s (2005a: 105) conviction that “[t]he relationship between typological generalizations and I-language is therefore necessarily quite indirect” (cf. section 2.1 above) may not be so well founded: our minds/brains may not *need* to “know” about the typological status of components of mental grammars, as envisaged by Newmeyer, if typological facts can be shown to fall out as the consequence of the interaction between UG and suitably clearly formulated third-factor considerations. As should be clear from this discussion, much work remains to be done to clarify the role of third factors in accounting for empirical skewings, and, more generally, to gain a better understanding of the significance or otherwise of frequency facts in the linguistic domain.

3.2 On the nature of disharmony

In relation to disharmonic word orders, Cinque opens the discussion by noting, as we have in this introduction, that extensive empirical research has undeniably reduced Greenberg’s word-order correlations to statistical tendencies. He goes on to suggest that the search for *surface* word-order universals is arguably misplaced and that what Greenberg’s generalizations really reveal is the order of Merge – the abstract universal hierarchical order of natural language.²⁰ The extent to which the linear order of categories in a given language departs from this abstract order can then be measured, yielding a finer-grained word-order typology. From this perspective the ‘harmonic’ orders are ‘epiphenomenal’, rather than basic, in that they represent cases in which the hierarchical order is systematically reflected at the linear level. Importantly, Cinque proposes that when word-order patterns are reconsidered from this perspective, a pervasive generalization nonetheless emerges:

- (14) [W]hatever precedes the VP/NP reflects the order of Merge, and whatever follows is in the mirror-image of the order of Merge. (Cinque, p. 7)

The status of (14) is open to interpretation. If one assumes, as Cinque does, that surface word orders result directly from c-command relations, as proposed by Kayne (1994), and that there is a universal order of Merge, then word-order variation must be indicative of differences in movement operations between languages. As such, (14) can be taken to be a restriction on movement, as argued in Cinque (2005, 2009). Importantly, Abels (2007), and Abels and Neeleman (2009, to appear) suggest a different perspective: for them, processing considerations such as the filler-gap-related one discussed in the preceding section motivate leftward rather than rightward movement; but this consideration plays no role in determining base generation; consequently, c-command relations need not play any role in this domain, leaving open the possibility that First Merge could deliver both head-initial and head-final structures (cf. also Richards 2004 for a different argument, for leaving open this possibility at the bottoms of projections, building on Epstein et al. 1998).

²⁰ What Greenberg called the “proximity hierarchies”.

Other papers in the volume approach the topic of disharmony by considering a specific disharmonic language. Djamouri, Paul and Whitman discuss evidence from Mandarin, which, they argue, represents a stable disharmonic system with both prepositions and postpositions, raising problems for the classical Head Parameter. In a careful empirical study, they show clearly that both prepositional and postpositional phrases can occur in postverbal argument position, but that there are restrictions governing the possibility of PPs in adjunct and subject positions: whereas certain kinds of postpositional phrases are banned from postverbal adjunct positions, prepositional phrases are systematically banned from subject position. Crucially, DPs are also banned from the subject position of existential sentences, suggesting that the distinction is not simply connected to the purported ‘nominal status’ of postpositional phrases (contra i.a. Li 1990, McCawley 1992, Huang, Li and Li 2009)). Inside DP, they show that, whereas prepositional phrases can modify only relational nouns, postpositional phrases can modify any kind of noun. These differences in distribution, they argue, serve as a cue to learners that postpositional phrases are pPs, whereas prepositional phrases are truncated PPs. pPs are analysed as being headed by a light preposition which attracts the complement of P to its specifier, yielding a surface head-final order. Prepositional phrases, on the other hand, are reduced PPs, without p, which therefore have a different distribution from full pPs. Strikingly, Djamouri et al. show that this system has remained reasonably stable from the first century BCE onwards. It must therefore be straightforwardly acquirable, potentially on the basis of specific distributional cues such as those mentioned above.

The same is arguably true in Basque, as Elordieta (this volume) discusses in a later section. Monolingual and bilingual Basque speakers acquire the disharmonic structures of Basque very early on without producing non-target-like orders at any stage of the acquisition process. The same has been shown to be true, even in languages with complex V2 patterns (cf. Westergaard 2009). More generally, it is well known that children acquire the word-order facts of their target language very early, at least as soon as they begin combining words (Bloom 1970, Brown 1973, and see Wexler 1998 on so-called *Very Early Parameter Setting* more generally). In fact, recent research suggests that prosodic cues seem to have had an effect on language-acquiring children at the *pre-lexical* stage already (cf. i.a. Christophe, Nespor, Guasti and van Ooyen 2003, Bion, Höhle and Schmitz 2007, Gervain, Nespor, Guasti and van Ooyen 2003). The theoretical implications of this fact are unclear, as Christophe et al. note. Elordieta (this volume), however, claims that the fact that Basque children acquire disharmonic structures as early as they do undermines the Universal Base Hypothesis in terms of which Kaynean Spec-Head-Comp structures are universal; she therefore interprets this acquisitional fact as support for the Head Parameter. Djamouri et al., on the other hand, claim that the stable disharmony in Chinese arises in a system which is underlyingly head-initial. Now, if head-finality involves movement of a complement to some higher functional head, as i.a. Cinque, Djamouri et al. and de Vos propose in this volume, and children at the two-word utterance stage operate with truncated tree structures, lacking functional heads, as Rizzi (1993/4) has suggested, then the data would appear to be problematic for the Universal Base Hypothesis. However, given that the truncation model is not uncontroversial (see i.a. Wexler 1998 for discussion; Guasti 2000 is a response) and that, according to Cinque, head-initial orders also involve the obligatory presence of functional heads, the data might rather be taken as evidence against that model of acquisition.

Cinque and Djamouri et al. focus on instances of disharmony where the same language contains some categories or even lexical items which are consistently head-initial and others which are consistently head-final. A different kind of disharmony is observed in languages with variable word order, where one and the same category or lexical item either precedes or follows its complement, depending on context. Thus Cognola discusses Mócheno

(German: *Fersentalerisch*), a Tyrolean variety spoken in the speech island *Valle dei Mócheni* (German: *Fersental*), in Northern Italy (Eastern Trentino). This variety displays mixed VO/OV orders, and Cognola focuses her discussion on the complex ways in which the VO/OV alternation interacts with the language's V2 property. Taking particular note of this latter feature of the Mócheno CP, Cognola argues that a similar V2 constraint regulates the structure of the VP, and that this is what is responsible for the observed VO/OV alternations. As such, wherever an XP is extracted via A-bar movement from VP, the lower V2 constraint forces the past participle to raise to a position high in the VP-edge, triggering VO word order in an otherwise OV language. This analysis has important implications for our understanding of the V2 effect, and its potential explanation. It also provides empirical evidence for the existence of a VP-periphery of the kind proposed by Belletti (2004).

3.3 *The connection to prosody*

Ancient rhetoricians such as Dionysius (60 BCE – 7 CE) proposed that the order of words was determined by “the rhythmic movement produced by the succession of long and short syllables” (Weil 1878[1844]: 11-12). This position is not so far removed from recent claims in the generative literature that there is a close connection between prosody and word order. The original proposal for this connection came from Nespor and Vogel's (1982, 1986) complement law:

(15) **Complement Law** (Nespor and Vogel 1982).

Complements rather than heads are preferred locations for stress in all types of domains.

This has the following effect (as spelled out by Nespor, Guasti and Christophe 1996; cf. also i.a. Cinque 1993).

(16) **Relative prominence in a prosodic phrase**

In languages whose syntactic trees are right-branching, the rightmost node of [a prosodic phrase – TB/MS] is labelled *strong*: In languages whose syntactic trees are left-branching, the leftmost node of [a prosodic phrase – TB/MS] is labelled *strong*. All sister nodes of *strong* nodes are labelled *weak*.

This idea is explored by Emonds (this volume) in relation to the syntax and morphology of French and English.

As Emonds points out, it has long been assumed that ordering in the morphological component proceeds on a different basis to ordering in syntax. Thus conventional wisdom has it that the Right-hand Head Rule applies in the morphology of many languages which are otherwise head-initial (Williams 1981, Hoeksema 1985, 1992, Scalise 1988, Lieber 1992). Emonds questions this widely-held belief, claiming that “no head ordering statements pick out a domain coinciding with ‘Morphology’ [in his terms - TB/MS]”. In particular, he takes issue with the commonly held claim that English is head-final in the morphological component and head-initial elsewhere. In the context of a Lieber (1992)-style approach to morphology, because a ‘morphological component’ cannot be meaningfully distinguished from a ‘syntactic component’. Building on Lieber, Emonds’ argument in this volume is that the properties that are typically ascribed to ‘affixes’ (and, thus, morphology) are such that it is impossible to distinguish “morphological” elements from functional elements more generally. Specifically, affixes are typically said to (a) lack semantically interpretable

features of the encyclopaedic type, beyond those which are syntactically active (cf. Chomsky 1965 for the original generative distinction between what Minimalists today call *semantic* and *formal* features), and (b) fail to contribute their own stress to word stress. Functional elements, according to Emonds, exhibit exactly the same properties. Against this background, he considers the headedness of English and French, both above and below what is traditionally taken to be ‘the morphological level’. Emonds’ central claim is that the universal default word order of natural language requires complements (and specifiers, which he views as a kind of complement) to precede heads. This is, in some respects, reminiscent of proposals by Haider, whose *Basic Branching Constraint* (BBC) also establishes head-final structures as the default option (cf. i.a. Haider 2000 for discussion and references). For Emonds, exceptions to the complement-head pattern are, however, possible, subject to UG principles and only in ‘free’ domains, defined as follows:

(17) **Free domain.**

Domain Y is free if (i) no daughter of Y is an obligatorily bound morpheme and (ii) at least one daughter is an X^j that can further project, where $X = N, V, A, P$ and $j = 0$ or 1 .

This serves to force specifiers to be initial, as long as there is a single-specifier condition, so that no further projection of the phrasal head is possible. It also means that in the morphological component, only head-final structures are possible, as long as a bound morpheme is involved. Where morphemes are not bound, however, they can diverge from the universal default word order, as is the case in French. Thus Emonds shows that French compounds are head-initial only where they contain free morphemes, which can project further. He gives an extensive list of compounds of this type, including:

(18) English right-headed compounds	French left-headed compounds
tanker truck	camion citerne
video cassette	cassette vidéo
bedroom suburb	ville dortoir

The relevant trigger for head-complement order in such domains is, of course, stress, which is uniformly on the right in French. This, combined with Nespor and Vogel’s (1982) Complement Law (15) means that French is as left-headed as is permitted by UG. The reason why English is comparatively less left-headed stems from the fact that it exhibits lefthand stress, and so having lefthand heads would “decrease compliance with the Complement Law”.²¹

While there is undeniable evidence for a connection between headedness and stress, as pointed out by Cinque’s (1993) discussion of the Nuclear Stress Rule, it is not clear what the direction of causality is. Is it that the requirement for initial stress forces head-finality or is it rather than stress is sensitive to hierarchy rather than word order, and so tracks the position of complements? Emonds’ contribution suggests that the former is true, and that, as Christophe et al. (2003) have proposed, stress is essentially an acquisition device which the child uses to set the word-order parameters of her language (arguably by the end of the first year of life²²).

Hinterhölzl (this volume) proposes that the tendency towards harmony derives from a prosodic constraint of the following kind:

²¹ Emonds discusses apparent counterexamples to this generalisation from compounds involving prepositions.

²² Worth noting here is that this statement should only be taken to refer to basic word-order parameters; the acquisition of discourse-sensitive word-order options like West Germanic scrambling is known to be delayed (cf. i.a. Schaeffer 1997, 2000 for discussion).

(19) **Mapping Condition to PF** (prosodic transparency)

A heavy syntactic constituent must appear on a dominant branch in prosodic phrasing if its containing phase is weight-sensitive. (Hinterhölzl this volume: 2)

This constraint ensures that, all else being equal, heavy (branching/recursive) constituents will align harmonically in a given language. In this system, disharmonic orders arise, then, (and can be preserved over time) where an optional and interfering prosodic constraint of the following kind applies:

(20) **Mapping Condition to LF** (scope transparency)

If *a* scopes over *b*, the spell out copy of *a* should c-command the spell out copy of *b*.
(Hinterhölzl this volume: 3)

This less straightforward constraint appears to apply at the mapping to PF at the imposition of LF, in a way that is not possible within the standard Y-model. It forces the object to be spelled out in its derived VP-external position in OV languages. Where it fails to apply, it follows that the lower VP-internal copy of the object is spelled out, yielding VO order in the context of the Kaynean model Hinterhölzl adopts, in compliance with (19). Importantly, this condition goes beyond the stipulation that German is OV whereas English is not, as it ties the OV order in German to the fact that it is scope-rigid, something which is apparently also true of other OV languages (cf. also Öztürk this volume).²³

The applicability of (20) in German but not English also serves to explain the following contrast, first discussed by Haider (2000): that (some) OV languages permit right-branching preverbal adverbials in apparent violation of the Head Final Filter (HFF), whereas VO languages do not:

- (21) a. John (more) often (* than Peter) read the book
b. Hans hat öfter (als der Peter) das Buch gelesen
Hans has more-often than the Peter the book read
'Hans read the book more often than Peter' (Hinterhölzl this volume: 4)

In fact, German actually disallows extraposition of these adverbials, something which is obligatory in English:

- (22) a. John read the book more often than Peter
b. *Hans hat das Buch gelesen öfter (als Peter)
Hans has the book read more-often than Peter (Hinterhölzl this volume: 5)

As Hinterhölzl notes, following Haider, this difference cannot be captured by a Head Parameter alone, as the relation between adverbial and vP is not one of complementation. Adopting the Universal Base Hypothesis, Hinterhölzl proposes that the differences between VO and OV languages of this kind stem not from the fact that one involves movement whereas the other does not, but rather from the different sizes of the moved constituents, as

²³ The VO/OV word-order variation attested in Old High German, he claims, stems from the at the time stronger force of the condition on scope transparency in conjunction with the weaker force of the condition on prosodic transparency. This OT-like model can thus potentially offer a prosodic explanation for harmony, a description of synchronic disharmonic systems and an account of diachronic word-order change.

motivated by the differing ‘mapping conditions’ (19) and (20) in the two kinds of languages (cf. also Cinque 2004, this volume for a similar proposal).²⁴

In a VO language, vP intraposition will give rise to an optimal prosodic unit where the adverbial, which is heavy (in his terms), occupies a right branch (in his terms) and receives stress. This also favours pied-piping of the PP if subsequent vP movement is required (e.g. in the presence of another adverbial modifier), correctly yielding the following (unmarked) word order:

(23) [IP John_i [[[vP t_i visited them]_k in Vienna t_k]_j on Friday t_j]]

In German, on the other hand, event-related (time, manner and place) adjuncts can either precede or follow the verb, with the difference crucially correlating with a scope-related interpretive difference (see (24)). Significantly, in both languages, adverbials surface in the unmarked preverbal order T>P>M, with M>P>T being the unmarked order postverbally.

- (24)a. weil Hans oft im Kaffeehaus sitzt
since Hans often in-the coffee-house sits
‘as Hans often sits in the coffee house’
b. weil Hans oft sitzt im Kaffeehaus
since Hans often sits in-the coffee-house
‘as Hans, when he is in the coffee house, often sits’

On Hinterhölzl’s proposal, this is explained because “placement of adjuncts is weight-insensitive” in German (p.5) because of (20): adverbials scope over vP and so must precede them, even if this violates (19). If further adverbials are present then, it follows that pied-piping of the adverbial will be optional.

Tokizaki and Kuwana (this volume), in turn, attempt to provide a different explanation for the connection between stress and word order. They first observe that the juncture between terminals in right-branching structures is longer than the juncture between those in left-branching structures. They take this as evidence that left-branching structures are actually compounds (an idea which Zwart (2009b) has also explored). The repercussion of this is that stress patterns in left-branching structures must adhere to the word-stress pattern of a language. Right-branching structures, on the other hand, need not mirror the word-stress rules of a given language. This fact, it is argued, serves to explain the close connection between word-stress and word order first noted by Nespor and Vogel (1982) and also explored by Emonds (this volume). Although left-branching structures are ‘compounds’, they nonetheless receive their stress derivationally, rather than lexically, presumably via the Nuclear Stress Rule (this idea is, of course, also compatible with Lexical Morphology models such as that of Halle and Mohanan 1985, which assign compounds to a third stratum of stress assignment, following irregular inflection and derivation and regular derivation respectively). This means that stress falls on the most embedded constituent in a given structure. In the case of VO/OV orders, they claim, O is always more embedded than V, as it is potentially branching (and this is true even where it has moved to Spec-VP). In a language with initial stress, it follows that OV order will be permitted and arguably required, as this movement serves to re-establish initial stress at the level of the compound. Where a language has right-edge stress, on the other hand, movement is blocked as it would move the stress too far to the

²⁴ Hinterhölzl argues that movement of the vP to a pre-adverbial position (which he terms *intraposition*) is semantically motivated by the need for the adverbial to become a predicate of vP. As the moved vP functions effectively as a subject after movement, this is A-movement. The ability of vP to function first as a predicate and then as an argument is linked to the phase-based model which Hinterhölzl adopts.

left, violating the word-stress rules of the language. Matters are more complex with other stress patterns, but Tokizaki and Kuwana nonetheless claim that the attested word-order patterns are roughly as predicted by the proposal.

It is interesting to note that while these three approaches are similar in spirit, they differ substantially as to the relationship they posit between grammar and linear order. Hinterhölzl and Tokizaki and Kuwana both adopt a version of the LCA whereby head-finality is derived via movement (albeit of different kinds). Emonds, on the other hand, argues against the LCA and proposes an alternative whereby SOV is the universal base (see again Haider 2002 for another OV base-order proposal). That proponents of both types proposals are able to appeal to (15) reinforces the fact noted by Christophe et al. (2003), that Nespor and Vogel's Complement Law is consistent with both movement-derived and base-generated approaches to head-finality.

In the following section, we consider movement-derived head-finality in more detail.

4 The question of Antisymmetry

4.1 Head-Complement order, movement and the derivation of OV languages

Whether one accepts the LCA in its strongest form or not, it seems reasonably clear that the surface word order in many languages is derived via movement. OV languages, for example, come in at least three guises:²⁵

- (25)
- i. DP-V-X (Nupe, Mande (Niger-Congo) (postpositional) and Pāri (Nilo-Saharan, Nilotic, Sudan), Tobelo (West Papuan, North Halmaheran, Indonesia) Iraqw (Afro-Asiatic, Southern Cushitic, Tanzania) and Neo-Aramaic (Afro-Asiatic, Semitic, Israel) (prepositional)
 - ii. DP/PP-V-CP (West Germanic, Turkish, Persian, Hindi, plus Lokaa and Vata with added complications²⁶)
 - iii. rigid OV (Japanese, Malayalam, Sinhala, Korean, Kannada)

Movement-based approaches to head-finality are highly plausible for type I languages, where only DP direct objects surface in a preverbal position (cf. Roberts 2007a (III): 14 for discussion). Kandybowicz and Baker (2003) (henceforth K&B) discuss one relevant language, Nupe, which displays this word order in perfect clauses. In all cases, only a single argument can and must precede V:

- (26) Musa á etsu yà èwò.
Musa PERF chief give garment
'Musa has given the chief a shirt.'

²⁵ Worth noting here is that the OV languages discussed here can, in generative terms, be thought of as differing in relation to the extent to which they are head-final in the clausal context: type I is only minimally head-final, while type III is maximally head-final, with type II occupying quite a broad spectrum in between. Not discussed here, but also relevant to more fine-grained consideration of the typological question we raise here is the matter of the headedness of non-clausal categories (e.g. nominal and adpositional heads).

²⁶ See Baker (2005) for discussion.

Manner adverbs can follow V (but cf. Mous 1993 on Iraqw, Cushitic, another type (i) language):

- (27) Musa á nakàn ba sanyin.
Musa PERF meat cut quietly
Musa has cut the meat quietly.‘ [Nupe, K&B (2003:123)]

Given that DP direct objects, unlike PP/CP arguments and adverbials, enter into an Agree relation with a higher functional head (v in Chomsky 1995), which assigns them Accusative Case, it seems highly plausible that OV order in this language (and others like it) is derived via A-movement, as K&B propose.

In type II languages, it is less immediately clear that the movement-based approach has any immediate empirical advantages over a base-generation account, but advantages arguably emerge upon closer consideration, given certain assumptions. In Dutch, which might be considered a canonical type II language, DPs, predicative PPs and APs and non-sentential adverbs *must* precede V. CP arguments *must* and certain (phrasal and sentential) adverbials *can* also follow V (cf. Zwart 1997 on Dutch, and Baker 2005, on Lokaa, which is SOVCP only in negative clauses). The traditional account of this pattern takes these languages to be base-generated OV languages (cf. i.a. Koster 1975 and den Besten 1977/1983 for Germanic, Kural 1997 for Turkish, and Karimi 2005 for Persian). Stowell’s ‘Case Resistance Principle’ (stating that Case may not be assigned to a category bearing a Case-assigning feature, Stowell 1981:146) then forces CPs to be extraposed to avoid Case assignment. Certain problems arise for such an account, however, notably the fact that it seems to wrongly predict that PPs should pattern with CP rather than DPs. A further problem stems from the fact that extraposition should move the CPs to a non-argument position, predicting they will be strong islands, but they actually appear to permit subextraction in a number of type II languages (cf. i.a. Zwart 1997 on Dutch, Mahajan 1990 on Hindi, Aghaei 2006 on Persian, Biberauer and Sheehan to appear):

- (28) Hoe heeft Piet gezegd dat Jan zich t gedragen heeft?
how has Piet said that Jan himself behaved has
‘How did Piet say that Jan behaved himself?’ [Dutch, Zwart 1997: 66]

Zwart (1997) proposes a movement-based analysis of Dutch, which accounts for these facts and might plausibly extend to all type II languages. DP direct objects raise to a Case position above V, giving DP-V order. PP/AP predicates, however, move to spec PredP, a distinct preverbal position, while CPs simply remain in-situ. Zwart provides evidence that material can intervene between V and a small clause complement, strongly suggesting that the latter at least *can* move (Zwart 1997: 103):


- (29) De kwast waar Jan de deur rood [PP mee t] verft
the brush where Jan the door red with paints
‘The brush that Jan paints the door red with’

More generally, the Germanic languages appear to conform to a “size”-based generalisation, which can, following Wurmbrand (2001: 294), be stated as “the ‘bigger’ a complement ..., the more likely it is to extrapose; the ‘smaller’ the complement ..., the more likely it is to occur in intraposed position” (cf. also i.a. Hinterhölzl 2005: 15). Biberauer and Roberts (2008) relate this pattern to the Final-over-Final Constraint (see section 4.4 below), predicting its occurrence to extend beyond Germanic (see also Biberauer and Sheehan in press). For

present purposes, the important point is that structures like (29) are, like those involving nominal and adpositional complements, clearly amenable to a leftward movement analysis of the sort an antisymmetric analysis would lead us to expect.

An alternative movement-based account of type II languages is provided by i.a. Hinterhölzl (2005, this volume) for German, Haegeman (1998) for West Flemish, Baker (2005) for Lokaa, Biberauer (2003) for Afrikaans and Biberauer and Roberts (2008) for West Germanic generally. These approaches basically derive head-finality via X-movement followed by remnant XP movement, which serves to carry X's complement to a pre-head position (cf. Roberts 2007a (III): 15-16 for a simple overview):

(30)



This captures the fact that in type II languages, everything except CP (and some adverbials) precedes V, even elements that cannot move independently (e.g. particles). It also avoids the positing of distinct functional projections to house DP and predicate arguments. The question remains, though, why CP fails to move to a preverbal position with the VP-remnant. In his discussion of Lokaa, Baker (2005) simply proposes that CPs are extraposed before VP movement. Biberauer and Roberts (2008), on the other hand, propose that CPs are radically spelled out when the vP phase is complete: this entails that the CP is removed from the syntactic computation prior to vP movement, being linearised immediately, with the result that it is, as the first constituent to be sent to the interfaces, spelled out in final position. While these accounts are not implausible, the fact that postverbal CPs remain transparent for subextraction remains potentially problematic, to the extent that it holds in all type II languages.²⁷ The remaining problem is that, from a movement perspective, there is no deep explanation why PPs/APs pattern with DP in being preverbal, whereas CPs do not. From a remnant movement perspective, there is no clear explanation why CP remains postverbal, though proposals exist. The pattern might, for example, potentially be explained by the Final-over-Final Constraint/FOFC (in some formulation) if DP/PP/AP are not subject to FOFC (at least in some languages), whereas CP *is* (cf. Biberauer and Sheehan, to appear, for an account along these lines and see section 4.4 below for discussion of FOFC).

In the case of type III languages, the evidence for movement is somewhat scarcer. In rigid OV languages, all arguments and adverbials precede V. While a remnant movement account of the kind proposed by Biberauer and Roberts (2008) and Baker (2005) can clearly replicate this fact, it is not clear that there is any evidence in favour of such movement. These languages remain, then, from an Antisymmetry perspective, the most controversial in status, and the argument for deriving their surface orders via movement are largely conceptual, stemming from the desire for a uniform approach to word order. Öztürk (this volume) discusses a number of Turkic languages, which might be classed as type III languages, in

²⁷If Huang's (1982) Condition on Extraction Domain is correct, the possibility of subextraction necessarily means that the postverbal CPs under discussion here were base-generated in that position.

relation to the LCA, Similarly, Elordieta (this volume) discusses Basque, a language which is predominantly head-final, but which displays some degree of variability and disharmony.

More generally, a number of the papers in this volume contribute to the ongoing debate surrounding Antisymmetry. Kayne (this volume) can be considered a reassertion of the LCA in its strongest form, rejecting Chomsky's (1995) influential reappraisal of this Axiom as a linearization algorithm. Barrie (this volume) further shows that it is possible to analyse the OVS language Hixkaryana in LCA-compatible terms. In earlier sections, Cognola proposes an LCA-compatible account of OV/VO alternations in Mochenò, and Hinterhölzl of basic word order in German. The other papers in the section under discussion here are, however, more critical of the LCA: both Öztürk and Elordieta question the validity of the LCA for Turkic languages and Basque respectively. In addition, Toyoshima, who offers a novel alternative to the LCA (see section 4.3 below), raises conceptual objections to the version of the LCA adopted in many discussions of word order. He notes that the SVO 'universal base' is largely an artefact of (i) the definition of c-command adopted by Kayne and (ii) the arbitrary choice of precedence over subsequence, which is a primitive of the axiom. These challenges are acknowledged and addressed by Kayne in his contribution.

Kayne's chapter can be divided into three distinct parts. Firstly, he reviews the evidence that OV order must be derived in many languages, drawing on a wealth of research since Kayne (1994). For this reason, there must be more to word order than the Head-Parameter. Secondly, he reviews further empirical evidence that syntax is not symmetrical, drawing on work from generative and typological studies: the predominance of left-dislocation over right-dislocation, the fact that clitics often surface further to the left than full DPs, the fact that agreement on X is often suspended where DP follows X, but not where DP precedes X, certain asymmetries in relative clause formation, the fact that serial verbs surface in the same order in so-called head-initial and head-final languages (Carstens 2002), also discussed in Kayne (2004), the fact, observed by Zwart (2009a), that co-ordination always requires a co-ordinator between the two co-ordinates, which follows if the co-ordinator is always a head and the basic linear order of a co-ordinate phrase is Spec-Head-Comp. The final asymmetry discussed is of a different order to the others and indeed to those discussed previously by Kayne (1994, 2004), though. Kayne notes that while some languages disallow backwards pronominalisation (30), no language is known to block forwards pronominalisation (31):

(31) The fact that he's here means that John is well again.

(32) The fact that John is here means that he's well again.

This asymmetry, he notes, cannot be stated purely in terms of c-command, as the R-expression and pronominal enter into no c-command relation in either (30) or (31). This cross-linguistic asymmetry, Kayne, then, takes to suggest that precedence itself is syntactically encoded, contra Chomsky (1995) and much subsequent work on the LCA.

The remainder of his chapter addresses the more fundamental question of why natural language is antisymmetric. The argument can be deconstructed roughly as follows:

- (32) a. Probe-Goal search shares the directionality of parsing and of production.
- b. Production proceeds from left to right.
- c. Therefore Probe-Goal search proceeds from left to right.
- d. Probes are heads and Goals are contained in their complement domain.
- e. Therefore heads must precede complements.

In essence, this means that "FL has incorporated an abstract counterpart of temporality" (Kayne, this volume: 18). The validity of this argument hinges on the acceptance of (32a),

which Kayne proposes without any specific justification. If Probe-Goal directionality is merely stated in hierarchical terms, then it is consistent with either Comp>Head or Head>Comp linear order (at least for non-head complements, i.e. those that do not fall foul of the much discussed “bottommost pair” problem – see i.a. Chomsky 1995: 418, Richards 2004 for discussion). In a sense, the argument in (32a-e) is a means of reducing (e) to (a), but it is by no means a justification of (e). The discussion of Specifier>Head order is more opaque. Here Kayne rejects Abels and Neeleman’s (2009, to appear) claim that leftwards movement be elevated to the status of an axiom, and maintains the idea that it should derive from the more general fact that specifiers precede heads. His proposal is that specifiers merge with heads directly, rather than phrases (cf. Sheehan 2011 for a similar proposal). The problem is that even in instances of internal merge, the head probes the (derived) specifier prior to movement under standard assumptions, so that the predicted order is actually Head>Specifier according to Kayne’s assumptions. Kayne denies this probing relation, the implication being apparently that Specifier probes Head. The fact that pair-merge must lead to immediate precedence is also invoked, so that the only way for H to pair-merge with two distinct phrases is if they surface on different sides of H. The need for immediate precedence also serves to rule out multiple specifiers (given that the merger of two phrases is banned). Note, though, that as was the case in previous versions of antisymmetry theory, a non-projecting specifier (head) should still be able to merge with a phrase without projecting, giving rise to multiple non-branching specifiers (cf. Guimarães 2001). Ultimately, then, the fact that specifiers must precede heads also follows ultimately from (a). If (a) is rejected, it follows that neither conclusion can be maintained. At the end of his contribution, Kayne makes the radical proposal that the Specifier/Complement distinction may not be reflected structurally, so that branching is ternary rather than binary. Among other things, this has the effect that binding theory can no longer be stated in terms of c-command (unless the definition of c-command is amended).

Barrie’s contribution considers the properties of Hixkaryana, an OVS language. He proposes a smuggling analysis (cf. Collins 2005) whereby the object is carried past the subject via VP-fronting. This serves to derive the fact that OVS languages appear to disallow scrambling, as the object must remain low enough to be carried along via VP-fronting. He contends that this correlation provides empirical support for the LCA, as Head Parameter-based analyses of OVS orders fail to capture the correlation of these two properties. As an anonymous reviewer pointed out, though, this is not necessarily the case as, however OV order is derived, a ban on fronting anything larger than VP will serve to rule out OXVS order. The generalization, then, while it provides strong evidence that OVS order is derived via VP-movement, for the reason Barrie outlines, does not necessarily bear on the derivation of OV order. In fact, given anti-locality (cf. Abels 2003), it could even be argued that the ban on OXVS order is an empirical challenge for his analysis. In the same way that the general availability of scrambling in SOV languages is taken as crucial evidence that OV is a derived order, it could also be concluded that the ban on OXVS is evidence that OV order is *not* derived via movement. This issue is partially addressed by Barrie via his discussion of Japanese vs. Germanic OV. He claims that in the former case, a ghost or proxy (cf. Nash and Rouveret 2002) projection gives rise to rigid OV order, irrespective of Case, whereas in the latter, OV order results from (presumably Case-related) object shift. An alternative interpretation (consistent with the retention of a more restricted Head Parameter) would be that Germanic OV languages derive OV order via movement, whereas Japanese base generates it.²⁸ Evidently, then, there are still a great many open questions relating to the

²⁸ As Biberauer (2008) notes, third-factor considerations – specifically, representational economy at the level of the child’s stored grammar (I-language) – could plausibly lead the child to “reanalyse” a grammar for which all heads are associated with a linearization-related movement diacritic (‘EPP-feature’ in Barrie’s terms) as one in

structural analysis of different types of OV order, and the role that Antisymmetry has to play in increasing our understanding of it.

4.2 Problems with the LCA

The chapters by Öztürk and Elordieta argue that the LCA is not suited to enhancing our understanding of languages exhibiting a considerable amount of head-finality. Öztürk's contribution focuses on some empirical challenges from the syntax and semantics of postverbal constituents (PVCs) in two lesser-studied OV languages, Khalkha and Uyghur. Building on Kural's (1997) challenge to the LCA, Öztürk claims that postverbal constituents in Turkish and Uyghur pose recalcitrant difficulties for the idea that asymmetric c-command maps to precedence. She argues at length that PVCs in these languages display the properties of movement, displaying island sensitivity of the same kind as constituents that have undergone leftward movement and failing to co-occur with resumptive pronouns. Importantly, this is different from what is observed in other OV Altaic languages such as Japanese and Khalkha, where PVCs are clearly base-generated. Any attempt to account for the Uyghur facts via leftwards movement, she argues, will prove problematic, as these languages are otherwise scope-rigid, meaning that scope tracks surface c-command relations. As PVCs can take either wide or narrow scope with respect to preverbal quantifiers, rightward movement would seem to be required in order to capture these facts straightforwardly. Öztürk claims that, in the absence of rightward movement, the facts elude explanation, forcing one to abandon scope rigidity and to posit unmotivated ad hoc movements. According to Öztürk, the reason why Turkish/Uyghur pattern differently from Khalkha, Japanese (and other familiar languages such as English, German, French etc.) is that the former, but not the latter have an EPP requirement. She argues that the presence of a lefthand specifier blocks the possibility of a righthand specifier, and hence rightward movement. To ensure that rightward movement is not possible at any structural level (vP, TP, CP, etc.), the proposal seems to require that all clausal heads bear an EPP-feature: this is what is necessary to trigger the projection of a leftward specifier, which then suppresses the projection of a rightward specifier. It is not, however, clear that this prediction holds up. The correlation between a lack of subject-related EPP (i.e. an EPP-feature on T) and rightward movement which Öztürk's paper highlights seems to hold in a number of languages, but why this should be the case remains opaque.

The discussion of Basque in Elordieta (this volume) also touches on this subject, as Basque is another language which displays both VO and OV orders, depending on context. In her contribution, Elordieta argues against Haddican's (2004) antisymmetric approach to this alternation. Her main claim is that a non-antisymmetric (Head Parameter-based) account of the facts is possible, so that the Basque OV/VO facts cannot be interpreted as specifically lending support to the Universal Base Hypothesis, contrary to what has previously been claimed. In fact, what emerges from Elordieta's discussion is that it is very difficult to construct robust empirical evidence against either approach in the Basque case: without a principled basis for distinguishing between movement- vs Head Parameter-imposed OV and

which all heads simply take their complements to the left, i.e. in which these heads are diacriticless and PF imposes across-the-board head-finality (cf. Richards 2004, 2009 for discussion of the mechanics of a PF Head Parameter). What seems crucial to approaches seeking to combine antisymmetric derivations of head-final orders with Head Parameter-based ones is that there be a principled basis on which we (and language acquirers) are able to determine which of the available options (movement or "base-generation"/a PF parameter) underlies input from different types of head-final languages. In the absence of a principled distinction of this type, the acquisition task arguably becomes intractable, while the syntactician's task of unambiguously characterising what underlies the head-finality of specific systems is also compromised.

VO orders and without constraints on what may move where, both approaches can derive the attested orders (cf. note 28 and also the discussion in Abels 2007). From an acquisitional perspective, we might expect the child to opt for simpler rather than more complex representations of the available input, an expectation which might initially seem to favour non-antisymmetric approaches. This is true, though, only if such simple representations are made possible by UG. Among other considerations, such approaches, however, appear to offer no insight into crosslinguistically unattested word orders (such as those ruled out by the Final-over-Final Constraint, which we turn to in section 4.4, for example), and it is also not so clear that a Head Parameter-only approach to the types of OV languages discussed in section 4.1 will facilitate insight into this instance of attested variation. Taking this into account, it becomes clear that the (in some cases) greater representational simplicity associated with Head Parameter-oriented interpretations of OV/VO word-order variation cannot be taken, in isolation, to signify the superiority of approaches of this type.

4.3 Novel approaches to disharmonic word order

Aside from papers highlighting difficulties with Head Parameter- and Antisymmetry-based analyses, the volume also contains two papers proposing novel analyses of disharmonic word-order phenomena. De Vos (this volume) discusses the various kinds of adpositional phrases attested in Afrikaans and Dutch. Building on previous work by Oosthuizen (2000), Biberauer and Folli (2004) and Biberauer (2007), he shows that, whereas prepositional phrases in these languages receive a locative interpretation, postpositional and circumpositional phrases are always directional, encoding directed motion:

(33) Disharmonic word orders in the Afrikaans adpositional domain

- | | | |
|----|--|-------------------------------|
| a. | Ek loop in die kamer
I walk in the room
'I walk around inside the room' | [head-initial adposition] |
| b. | Ek loop die kamer in
I walk the room in
'I walk into the room' | [head-final adposition] |
| c. | Ek loop in die kamer in
I walk in the room in
'I walk into the room' | [circumpositional adposition] |

He further argues that postpositions unlike prepositions, Agree with the DP which they select. It is this Agreement dependency, he argues, which gives rise to either (i) postpositions or (ii) circumpositions. There is a sense in which de Vos's proposal appears to be a notational variant of existing approaches to movement. Landau (2007) for example, proposes that the EPP-feature is essentially the need to realise a certain narrow syntactic Agree dependency overtly at PF (via displacement of the Goal), and more generally, it is generally assumed that A-movement at least is a PF effect which is parasitic on existing Agreement dependencies. De Vos's account, however, differs from existing approaches in that it proposes that *circumpositional* structures fall out from the same PF requirement. Essentially, faced with the paradoxical need to realise both P→DP (selection) and DP→P (Agree) dependencies linearly, the PF component has two options: (i) DP-P-DP or (ii) P-DP-P. If option (i) is chosen, a language-specific requirement forces deletion of the rightmost DP, yielding a postpositional phrase.²⁹ If option (ii) is chosen, then in Afrikaans, no chain reduction is required and both

²⁹ Exactly why or how this linear deletion operation applies remains unclear, however.

copies of P are retained, yielding a circumpositional phrase. This approach provides an elegant PF account of the variation in Afrikaans, which makes no allusion to the Head Parameter. Despite its elegance, however, it raises certain questions, the most obvious being: given the pervasive existence of agreement dependencies in natural language, for example, why is it that doubling is not more common?

Toyoshima then goes on to develop a graph-theoretic linearization proposal originally made by Kural (2005). In terms of this proposal, the major word orders, defined in relation to S, O and V, all result from PF undertaking different tree traversals of the same underlying structures. In particular, Toyoshima's version of Kural's algorithm derives the three commonest word-order variants (SOV, SOV and VSO) from a single structure. Furthermore, it is also argued to account for the rarity of the other three logically possible variations (VOS, OVS, OSV) and for disharmonic word-order patterns of the type found in Vata and German. The general approach addresses some of the challenges facing Kural's approach, notably its reliance on notions such as 'right' and 'left' at the narrow syntactic level, which Toyoshima replaces with the notions 'consanguineous' (i.e. dominated node of which the label is non-distinct from that of the parent node) and 'adopted' (i.e. dominated node of which the label is distinct from that of the parent node). Challenges to this approach would seem to include its ability to capture *wh*- and head-movement. Of greatest relevance to the concerns in this volume, however, is what needs to be said about disharmonic word orders. In the German case, for example, it is necessary to stipulate a "parametric feature" on phase heads that is visible at PF, specifying the order of traversal for specific phrases. Like Head Parameter- and Antisymmetry-based approaches to disharmonic word orders, the traversal approach, however, seems to fall short when it comes to being able to account for a striking gap in the attestation of such word orders: those ruled out by the Final-over-Final Constraint, to which we now turn.


4.4 The Final-over-Final Constraint

Recently, it has been pointed out in several places that the empirical evidence given in favour of the LCA is incomplete. While Kayne and others have provided strong empirical support for the lack of righthand specifiers, it is claimed that the lack of lefthand complements is less well evidenced (cf. Richards 2004, 2009, Abels and Neeleman 2006, to appear). Some of the data discussed in this volume provide potential evidence of the required kind. Firstly, there is Barrie's claim that *OXVS order is banned, for principled reasons. Unfortunately, it is not clear (i) that this bears on the lack of a Head Parameter or (ii) that this follows necessarily from Antisymmetry. Even if OV order were derived via a Head Parameter, it would be sufficient to ban movement of any constituent larger than VP in order to rule out OXVS, as long as specifiers are always to the left so that OVS order is necessarily derived via movement. The crucial evidence that the order of heads and complements is regulated in some way by the LCA comes only, it seems, from the Final-over-Final Constraint (FOFC; cf. Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts/BHR 2008, 2010), discussed in the final three papers of the volume.

In basic terms, FOFC as formulated by BHR rules out head-initial phrases dominated by head-final phrases which are part of the same extended projection, where 'extended projection' is understood in essentially the same sense as Grimshaw's original (1991) notion. The relevant definition of 'extended projection' is given in (33), while the basic configuration ruled out by FOFC is schematised in (34):

- (34) X is a *head* of YP, and YP is a *projection* of X iff:

- a. YP dominates X;
- b. the categorial features of YP and X are consistent;
- c. there is no inconsistency in the categorial features of all nodes intervening between X and Y (where a node N *intervenes* between X and YP if YP dominates X and N, N dominates X, and N does not dominate YP.); and
- d. no node intervening between X and YP is lexical.



where X is the head of an extended projection which YP is also part of, by virtue of its bearing the same categorial features as X and its not being a lexical category (i.e. the type of category that defines the bottom of an extended projection)

Among other patterns, FOFC rules out VOAux and VOC orders in the clausal domain. Where ‘Aux’ is an “inflecting” element and C is a subordinating complementiser, the literature – generative and typological – is clear about the fact that these patterns are indeed practically always ruled out (cf. i.a. Greenberg 1963 on VOAux patterns, and Hawkins 1994, Kayne 1994, Dryer 2009 on the VOC gap; Biberauer and Sheehan in press observe that Harar Oromo (Cushitic) and Akkadian (Semitic) superficially appear to constitute counterexamples to the latter generalisation). That the generalisation does not hold of the large inventory of discourse-related C-particles found in languages like Chinese is immediately clear if one considers the data discussed in Chan (this volume; cf. also Paul to appear, and see Biberauer and Sheehan 2011 for more general discussion of C-particles). Similarly, it does not hold for (a class of) auxiliary particles in languages like Chinese, some of the Karen languages (e.g. Bwe-Karen; cf. Dryer 2008) and many Central African VO languages (cf. Dryer 2009). Consideration of even a subset of the apparently FOFC-violating elements suggests that they are unlikely to share a single property that makes them immune to FOFC, a point also highlighted in Sheehan (this volume). If FOFC is really a constraint on headedness within an extended projection, however, it is clear what sorts of properties might allow C- and auxiliary elements to surface finally without violating the constraint: acategorial (or syncategorematic) elements and lexical elements entirely lacking formal features, which cannot therefore project, would be two cases in point (cf. Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts 2009, 2011 for discussion).

The papers in the final section of this volume are all in one way or another concerned with FOFC as a constraint on permissible disharmonic word orders, defined in terms of mixed headedness. Hawkins considers harmonic and disharmonic word orders from a typological, grammatical and processing efficiency perspective. He argues, in keeping with Hawkins (1994, 2004), that the most readily processed structures are the ones that become grammaticalised as components of competence grammars. In relation to FOFC specifically, he argues that (33), viewed from a typological perspective, appears to be both too strong and too weak. It is too strong in that it rules out actually attested structures: as noted above, we do find surface VOAux and VOC structures. It is too weak in that we see patterns involving “cross-projection” structures, like Noun-Possessive PP inside PP (e.g. *with soldiers of the king*) where **both** disharmonic orders appear to be dispreferred equally to the corresponding harmonic orders. Worse, it appears to be the case that postnominal head-final relative clauses (i.e. N [_{CP} TP C]) are unattested; (33), however, addresses neither the relation between XPs

associated with different extended projections nor that between adjuncts and the XPs they modify, thereby apparently missing a significant empirical gap.³⁰ From a processing efficiency perspective, these gaps can be understood as the consequence of structures that constitute a processing challenge being dispreferred. Thus a centre-embedded CP of the type found in [_{VP} [_{CP} C – TP] V] and [_{NP} [_{CP} C – TP] N] is expected to be harder to process than a likewise centre-embedded NP or PossPP. Consequently, we expect to find instances of [_{NP} [_{PossPP} [P NP]] N] and [_{VP} [_{NP} N-PP] V], but not of the above-mentioned CP structures, which is indeed what typological frequency suggests. Ultimately, Hawkins' contention is that the best characterisation of word-order generalisations like FOFC will need to follow from combined consideration of what we know about formal grammatical principles, crosslinguistic surface typology and on-line processing.

Sheehan's paper specifically aims to compare and contrast the success with which Hawkins' (1994) processing efficiency proposal can account for attested skewings and gaps in the disharmonic domain with how a formal, phonological (PF) interface account like that of Sheehan (in press) would fare. Like Hawkins, she adopts a definition of FOFC in terms of which any head-final XP dominating a head-initial XP is ruled out, regardless of extended-projection considerations (cf. Holmberg 2000). In terms of the PF interface account, such structures are ruled out because they cannot be linearised on the basis of the linearization algorithm that Sheehan argues usually to be in play, namely (35):

(36) **Revised LCA**

- (i) If a category A c-selects a category B, then A PRECEDES/FOLLOWS B at PF
- (ii) If no order is specified between A and B by the sum of all precedence pairs defined by (i), then A PRECEDES B at PF if A asymmetrically c-commands B.

In terms of (35), Kayne's LCA emerges as a Last Resort linearization mechanism in only those cases where c-selection-based ordering, as outlined in (i), cannot be established. That asymmetric c-command should, as Kayne has always stipulated, result in precedence rather than subsequence is justified on the grounds that the choice between the two actually amounts to what Biberauer, Holmberg, Roberts and Sheehan (2010) designate a 'no-choice parameter', one which is always set to PRECEDE on account of processing considerations not dissimilar to those considered by Hawkins in his contribution. More specifically, the proposal is that parsing preferences such as i.a. Filler precedes Gap (cf. Ackema and Neeleman 2002, Wagers and Phillips 2009) favor the precedence setting in relation to less local ordering phenomena. The same pressure arguably does not come into play in the local Head-Complement domain because, as Hawkins has convincingly shown in this volume and also in earlier work, head-final and head-initial orders are equally optimal in parsing terms. Importantly, then, Sheehan's proposed PF account of linearization generally and FOFC specifically follows from a combination of the asymmetry imposed by Narrow Syntax (the fact that asymmetric c-command relations exist between elements in a hierarchically constructed phrase-structure tree) and, crucially, processing pressures.

Her chapter shows that a Hawkins-style processing efficiency account and the PF interface account which she proposes are, in many cases, equally capable of accounting for

³⁰ Hawkins also highlights the absence of head-final postverbal complement clauses (i.e. V [_{CP} TP C]) in relation to the inventory of structures that cannot be accounted for by (33). As Biberauer and Sheehan (in press) and Sheehan (this volume: 10) note, however, this structure is in fact ruled out by (33) for cases where any XP dominated by final C is head-initial; as Bayer (1999, 2001) observes, cases where a consistently head-final CP surfaces in postverbal position do seem to be marginally possible in languages like Bengali. Crucially, structures in these languages in which C is head-initial (i.e. where C is derived from a *wh*-element) cannot surface preverbally, however, i.e. [_{CP} C TP] V is ruled out, as predicted by (33).

attested empirical skewing in the disharmonic domain. A major prediction made by the former, but not the latter, however, relates to contexts in which there is harmony between two categories and a FOFC effect obtains: as the principle which gives rise to harmony for Hawkins (Early Immediate Constituents (EIC) in Hawkins 1994 or **Minimize Domains** (MiD) in Hawkins 2004) is also the one that underlies FOFC, the prediction is that FOFC effects should always affect the same categories that exhibit a preference for harmony, with these effects correspondingly being absent where categories do not exhibit a harmony preference. As Sheehan shows, this does not, however, seem to be straightforwardly true: articles are verb-patterners (cf. Dryer 1992), meaning that there is harmony between V and (simplifying somewhat³¹) D, but there does not appear to be any FOFC effect between V and D; similarly, looking at the bidirectional implication of Hawkins' approach from the opposite perspective, it appears that Polarity Heads and C-complementizers respect FOFC (cf. Biberauer, Sheehan and Newton 2010, Sheehan this volume), whereas it does not seem to be the case that they exhibit any preference for harmony (see again Sheehan, this volume: 41ff). What emerges from both Sheehan and Hawkins' papers, then, is the need to look very closely – much more so than has been possible at present – at attested disharmonic word-order data: a suitably detailed, grammatically informed characterisation of the data is clearly essential to facilitate insight into the merits and demerits of analyses proposed to date.

Sheehan's paper ends with consideration of the particle question highlighted above, which is also the sole focus of Chan's contribution. Sheehan highlights the need for an explicit characterisation of the notion 'particle', proposing one possibility, namely that these elements be thought of as functional heads lacking uninterpretable formal features other than c-selection features which therefore have to be merged with an atomized phrase (as noted above, alternative characterisations are also suggested in Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts 2009, 2011). The Chinese and, in particular, Cantonese particles considered by Chan have previously been said to behave in the manner suggested by Sheehan (cf. Hsieh and Sybesma 2007), but this is not the approach Chan himself endorses. Instead, he questions the mainstream view that sentence-final particles (SFPs) in Chinese varieties are C-heads which are merged with TP. Distributional considerations constitute the key argument in favour of this proposal as it is so strikingly the case that canonical C-heads, instantiated by *that*-type complementisers, cannot occur in VOC structures (cf. the references cited at the start of this section). To further support his argument, Chan considers a specific context in Cantonese which is compatible with a range of SFPs: the Dislocation Focus Construction. In relation to Cantonese SFPs, he observes (p. 28) that they are often polysemous, a property that we typically associate with lexical (in the sense of contentful, open-class) elements rather than functional categories; functional polysemy might best be thought of as entailing radical semantic and possibly also syntactic underspecification, with the result that the element in question is able to surface in a range of contexts, with its very general meaning interacting with the specific meanings of other sentence components in such a way that the particle appears to have a range of slightly differing meanings. Both hypotheses seem plausible in relation to the data discussed by Chan; as noted at the beginning of this section, both can also potentially provide an explanation as to why (superficial) FOFC-compliance is not required. Chan's own interpretation of the Cantonese data is that the SFPs in question are affixed to focused constituents in the Dislocation and Clause-Internal Focus Constructions respectively and, as such, do not represent Cs.³² If it is more generally the case that SFPs may combine

³¹ That elements functioning as articles do not always instantiate D-heads is, of course, well known (cf. i.a. Alexiadou, Haegeman and Stavrou 2009 for overview discussion).

³² Interestingly, Chan's discussion of Cantonese focus constructions appears to highlight the existence of two left-peripheral focus domains in this system: one at the vP-edge (Clause-Internal Focus) and the other at the CP-edge (Dislocation Focus). This calls to mind the phasal peripheries discussed in Cognola's contribution, and,

with a range of constituents, in the manner of focus particles more generally (cf. i.a. Barbiers 2010 for recent discussion), for example, then we may understand these elements as syncategorematic elements, which do not violate FOFC on account of the fact that they either do not project at all (Chan's proposal here and the interpretation would could extend to particles with very specific lexical content; cf. Cardinaletti 2011 for one formal account of the syntax of particles of this type) or because they project category-neutral structure (cf. Biberauer 2009 and Bayer and Obenauer 2011 for two recent proposals along these lines). More than anything, what is evident from Chan's discussion, however, is how much we still have to learn about particles as a crosslinguistically seemingly particularly disharmonic category.

5. Conclusion

Word order has become of interest in the generative paradigm only fairly recently (cf. Hawkins 1980, Kayne 1994) and even now its theoretical status remains somewhat controversial (cf. Berwick and Chomsky 2011 for an apparently extreme view, relegating word order to the PF interface). The reason for this is fairly clear: the word orders of different languages vary in puzzling and complicated ways, so much so that it is often claimed that word order tracks syntax only in arbitrary and language-specific ways (see even Chomsky 2001:7). Relegating word order to the PF component or 'externalisation' more generally is permissible inasmuch as we have an elaborated theory of PF/externalisation which can account for word-order correlations, asymmetries and gaps, or inasmuch as some other third factor pressure can be shown to account for these skewings. The papers in this volume make a valuable contribution to this complex issue and introduce new relevant data to the debate, which, it is hoped, will instruct future research. What will hopefully become clear during the following pages is the extent to which disharmonic word orders specifically deserve to be the focus of intensive research in the years to come.

6. References

References

- Abels, K. 2003. *Successive Cyclicity, Anti-locality, and Adposition Stranding*. University of Connecticut: Ph.D. thesis.
- Abels, K. 2007. Towards a restrictive theory of (remnant) movement. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 7: 57 - 120.
- Abels, A. & A. Neeleman. 2009. Universal 20 without the LCA. In: J. Brucart, A. Gavarro & J. Solà (eds). *Merging Features: Computation, Interpretation, and Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 60-79.
- Abels, A. & A. Neeleman. To appear. Linear Asymmetries and the LCA. To appear in *Syntax*.
- Ackema, P. & A. Neeleman, 2002. Effects of Short-Term Storage in Processing Rightward Movement. *Studies in Theoretical Psycholinguistics* 30: 219-256.
- Abney, S. 1987. *The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspect*. MIT: Ph.D. thesis.

more generally, adds to the growing body of literature highlighting the variously information-structure-related nature of phasal peripheries. Given the well-established link between information structure and word-order variation, with the former typically being seen to perturb aspects of basic word order, this considerations is clearly an important one in the context of studies of disharmonic word order.

Introduction to appear in Biberauer, T. & Sheehan, M. (submitted) *Theoretical Approaches to Disharmonic Word Order*. (this is a draft only)

- Aghaei, B. 2006. *The Syntax of ke-clauses and Clausal Extraposition in Modern Persian*, University of Texas: Ph.D. thesis.
- Alexiadou, A. & E. Anagnostopoulou. 2001. The Subject-in-Situ Generalization and the role of Case in driving computations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 193-231.
- Alexiadou, A. & E. Anagnostopoulou. 2007. [The Subject-in-Situ Generalization revisited](#). In: H.-M. Gärtner & U. Sauerland (eds). *Interfaces + Recursion = Language?* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 31-60.
- Alexiadou, A., L. Haegeman & M. Stavrou. 2007. *The Noun Phrase in Generative Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Baker, M. 2005. On verb-initial and verb-final word orders in Lokaa. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 26: 125-164.
- Barbiers, S. 2010. *Syntactic Doubling and Deletion as a Source of Variation*. Unpublished ms: Meertens Instituut.
- [<https://www.meertens.knaw.nl/cms/files/Syntactic%20Doubling%20and%20Variation-paper.pdf>; last accessed: 5 March 2012]
- Bayer, J. & H-G. Obenauer. 2011. Discourse particles, clause structure, and question types. *The Linguistic Review* 28, 449-491.
- Belletti, A. 2004. Aspects of the low IP area. In: L. Rizzi (ed.). *The Structure of CP and IP*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 16-51.
- Bernstein, J. 1997. Demonstratives and reinforcers in Romance and Germanic languages. *Lingua* 102: 87-113.
- Bernstein, J. 2008. Reformulating the Determiner Phrase analysis. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2: 1-25.
- Berwick, R. & N. Chomsky. 2011. The Biolinguistic Program: the current state of its evolution and development. In: A-M. Di Sciullo & C. Boeckx (eds). *The Biolinguistic Enterprise*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 19-41.
- den Besten, H. 1977. On the interaction of Root Transformations and Lexical Deletive Rules. Unpublished ms: University of Amsterdam.
- den Besten, H. 1983. On the interaction of Root Transformations and Lexical Deletive Rules. In: W. Abraham (ed.). *On the Formal Syntax of the West Germanic*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 47-131.
- Biberauer, T. 2003. *Verb Second (V2) in Afrikaans: a Minimalist Investigation*. Ph.D. thesis: University of Cambridge.
- Biberauer, T. 2007. Doubling and omission: insights from Afrikaans. *Papers from the Workshop on Doubling in the Dialects of Europe*. Amsterdam: Meertens on-line publications.
- [<http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/projecten/edisyn/>; last accessed 5 March 2012]
- Biberauer, T. 2008. A “third factor”-imposed typology of (dis)harmonic languages? Paper presented at the Cambridge-Delhi-Hyderabad-Nanzan Workshop. (Hyderabad, January 2008).
- Biberauer, T. & R. Folli. 2004. Goals of Motion in Afrikaans. *Journées d'Études Linguistiques (Actes des JEL 2004/Proceedings of JEL 2004 - [DOMAIN_{EJ}S])*: 19 – 26.
- Biberauer, T., A. Holmberg & I. Roberts (2008). Disharmonic word-order systems and the Final-over-Final-Constraint (FOFC). In Bisetto, A. & F. Barbieri (eds). *Proceedings of XXXIII Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*.
- [http://amsacta.cib.unibo.it/archive/00002397/01/PROCEEDINGS_IGG33.pdf; last accessed 5 March 2012]
- Biberauer, T., A. Holmberg & I. Roberts (2009). Linearization and the Architecture of Grammar: a view from the Final-over-Final Constraint. In: V. Moscati & E. Servidio

Introduction to appear in Biberauer, T. & Sheehan, M. (submitted) *Theoretical Approaches to Disharmonic Word Order*. (this is a draft only)

- (eds). *StiL - Studies in Linguistics (Proceedings of XXXV Incontro di Grammatica Generativa)*: 78-91.
- Biberauer, T., A. Holmberg & I. G. Roberts. 2011. *A Syntactic Universal and its Consequences*. Unpublished ms: Universities of Cambridge and Newcastle.
- Biberauer, T., A. Holmberg, I. Roberts & M. Sheehan, 2010. Reconciling formalism and functionalism: A Minimalist perspective. Paper presented at Linguistics Association of Great Britain Annual Conference (Leeds, September 2010).
- Biberauer, T. & I. Roberts. 2008. Phases, word order and types of clausal complements in West Germanic languages. Paper presented at the Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop 23 (Edinburgh, June 2008).
- Biberauer, T. & M. Sheehan. 2011. Introduction: particles through a modern syntactic lens. *The Linguistic Review* 28:387-410.
- Biberauer, T., M. Sheehan & G. Newton. 2010. Impossible Changes and Impossible Borrowings: the Final-over-Final Constraint. In: A. Breitbarth, C. Lucas, S. Watts & D. Willis (eds.). *Continuity and Change in Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 35-60.
- Biberauer, T. & M. Sheehan. In press. Disharmony, Antisymmetry, and the Final-over-Final Constraint. In: M. Uribe-Etxebarria & V. Valmala (eds). *Ways of Structure Building*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bion, R., B. Höhle & M. Schmitz. 2007. The role of prosody on the perception of word-order differences by 14-month-old German infants. *Proceedings of ICPhS 2007* (Saarbrücken, Germany): 1537-1540.
- Bloom, L. 1970. *Language development: form and function in emerging grammars*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Bresnan, J. 1973. Syntax of the Comparative Clause Construction in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4(3): 275-343.
- Brown, R. 1973. *A first language: the early stages*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Cable, S. 2010. *The Grammar of Q: Q-Particles, Wh-Movement and Pied-Piping*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cardinaletti, A. 2011. German and Italian modal particles and clause structure. *The Linguistic Review* 28(4): 493-532.
- Carstens, V. 2002. Antisymmetry and word order in serial verb constructions. *Language* 78:3-50.
- Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1970. Remarks on Nominalization. In: R. Jacobs. & P. Rosenbaum (eds). *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn, 184-221.
- Chomsky, N. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In: K.Hale & S. Keyser (eds). *A View from Building 20*. Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press, 1-52.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. Bare phrase structure. In: G. Webelhuth (ed.). *Government and Binding Theory and the Minimalist Program: Principles and Parameters in Syntactic Theory*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 383-439.
- Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist inquiries. In: R. Martin, D. Michaels & J. Uriagereka (eds). *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 89-155.
- Chomsky, N. 2005. Three factors in language design. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:1-22.
- Christophe, A., M. Nespore, M.-T. Guasti & B. van Ooyen. 2003. Prosodic structure and syntactic acquisition: the case of the Head-Direction Parameter. *Developmental Science* 6: 211-220.

Introduction to appear in Biberauer, T. & Sheehan, M. (submitted) *Theoretical Approaches to Disharmonic Word Order*. (this is a draft only)

- Cinque, G. 1993. A null theory of phrase and compound stress. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 239-297.
- Cinque, G. 1995. *Italian Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cinque, G. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, G. 2005. Deriving Greenberg's Universal 20 and its exceptions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:315-332.
- Cinque, G. 2009. The Fundamental Left-Right Asymmetry of Natural Languages. In: S. Scalise, E. Magni & A. Bisetto (eds). *Universals of Language Today*. Dordrecht: Springer, 165-184.
- Collins, C. 2005. A smuggling approach to the passive in English. *Syntax* 8: 85-120.
- Corver, N. 1997. The Internal Syntax of the Dutch Extended Adjectival Projection. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15: 289-368.
- Crain, S. & M. Nakayama. 1987. Structure dependence in grammar formation. *Language* 63: 522-543.
- Davidson, D. 1967. The logical form of action sentences. In: N. Rescher (ed.). *The Logic of Decision and Action*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 104-112.
- Dryer, M. 2008. Word order in Tibeto-Burman languages. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 31: 1-88.
- Dryer, M. 1992. The Greenbergian word order correlations. *Language* 68: 81-138.
- Dryer, M. 2009. The branching direction theory revisited. In: S. Scalise, E. Magni and A. Bisetto (eds.), *Universals of Language Today*. Berlin: Springer, 185-207.
- Epstein, S., E. Groat, R. Kawashima & H. Kitahara. 1998. *A Derivational Approach to Syntactic Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ernst, T. 2002. *The Syntax of Adjuncts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fitch, T. 2010. *The Evolution of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gervain, J., M. Nespore, R. Mazuka, R. Horie & J. Mehler. 2008. Bootstrapping word order in prelexical infants: a Japanese-Italian cross-linguistic study. *Cognitive Psychology* 57: 56-74.
- Giusti, G. 2002. The Functional Structure of Noun Phrases: A Bare Phrase Structure Approach. In: G. Cinque (ed.). *Functional Structure in DP and IP*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 54-90.
- Graffi, G. 2001. *200 Years of Syntax: a Critical Survey*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Greenberg, J. 1963. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In: J. Greenberg (ed.). *Universals of Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 73-113.
- Grimshaw, J. 1991. *Extended Projection*. Unpublished ms: Brandeis.
- Guasti, M-T. 2000. An excursion into interrogatives in early English and Italian. In: M-A. Friedemann & L. Rizzi (eds.). *The Acquisition of Syntax*. London: Longman, 105-128.
- Guimarães, M. 2004. *Derivation and Representation of Syntactic Amalgams*. Ph.D. thesis: University of Maryland.
- Haegeman, L. 1998. V-positions and the Middle Field in West Flemish. *Syntax* 1: 259-299.
- Haddican, W. 2004. Sentence Polarity and Word Order in Basque. *The Linguistic Review* 21(2): 81-124.
- Haider, H. 2000. OV is more basic than VO. In: P. Svenonius (ed.). *The Derivation of VO and OV*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 45-67.
- Halle, M. & K.P. Mohanan. 1995. Segmental phonology of Modern English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16: 57-116.

Introduction to appear in Biberauer, T. & Sheehan, M. (submitted) *Theoretical Approaches to Disharmonic Word Order*. (this is a draft only)

- Hawkins, J. 1980. On implicational and distributional universals of word order. *Journal of Linguistics* 16: 193-235.
- Hawkins, J. 1982. Cross-category harmony, X-bar and the predictions of markedness. *Journal of Linguistics* 18: 1-35.
- Hawkins, J. 1994. *A Performance Theory of Order and Constituency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hawkins, J. 2004. *Efficiency and Complexity in Grammars*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hinterhölzl, R. 2005. *Scrambling, Remnant Movement, and Restructuring in West Germanic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoeksema, J. 1985. *Categorical Morphology*. Garland Press: New York.
- Hoeksema, J. 1992. The Head Parameter in Morphology and Syntax. In: D. Gilbers & S. Looyenga (eds). *Language and Cognition* 2: 119-132.
- Holmberg, A. 2000. Deriving OV order in Finnish. In: P. Svenonius (ed.). *The Derivation of VO and OV*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 123-152.
- Holmberg, A. & C. Platzack. 1995. *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hsieh, F. & R. Sybesma. 2007. *On the linearization of Chinese sentence final particles: Max Spell Out and why CP moves*. Unpublished ms: MIT and Leiden University.
- Huang, C.-T. J. 1982. *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*. Ph.D. thesis: MIT.
- Huang, C.-T. J., A. Li & Y. Li. 2009. *The Syntax of Chinese*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackendoff, R. 1977. *X-bar Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Jellinek, M. H. 1913-1914. *Geschichte der neuhochdeutschen Grammatik von den Anfängen bis auf Adelung*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Kandybowicz, J. & M. Baker. 2003. On directionality and the structure of the verb phrase: evidence from Nupe. *Syntax* 6: 115-155.
- Karimi, S. 2005. *A Minimalist Approach to Scrambling: Evidence from Persian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kayne, R. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. 2004. Antisymmetry and Japanese. In: L. Jenkins (ed.). *Variation and Universals in Biolinguistics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 3-37.
- Kiparsky, P. 2008. Universals constrain change; change results in typological generalizations. In: J. Good (ed.). *Language Universals and Language Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 23-53.
- Koopman, H. 1984. *The Syntax of Verbs: from Verb Movement Rules in the Kru Languages to Universal Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Koster, J. 1975. Dutch as an SOV Language. *Linguistic Analysis* 1: 111-136.
- Kural, M. 1997. Postverbal constituents in Turkish and the Linear Correspondence Axiom. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 498-519.
- Kural, M. 2005. Tree traversal and word order. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36: 367-388.
- Landau, I. 2007. EPP extensions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 485-523.
- Li, A. 1990. *Order and Constituency in Mandarin Chinese*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Lieber, R. 1992. *Deconstructing Morphology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Luhtala, A. 1994. Early medieval grammar. *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* 1. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1461-1468.
- Mahajan, A. 1990. *The A/A-bar Movement Distinction and Movement Theory*. Ph.D. thesis: MIT.

Introduction to appear in Biberauer, T. & Sheehan, M. (submitted) *Theoretical Approaches to Disharmonic Word Order*. (this is a draft only)

- Massam, D. 2000. VSO is VOS: Aspects of Niuean word order. In: A. Carnie & E. Guilfoyle (eds). *The Syntax of Verb Initial Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 97-117.
- Massam, D. 2001. On predication and the status of subjects in Niuean. In: W. Davies & S. Dubinsky (eds). *Objects and Other Subjects* Amsterdam: Kluwer, 225-246.
- Massam, D. 2005. Predicate fronting and lexical category in Niuean. In: A. Carnie, H. Harley & S. Dooley-Colburg (eds). *Verb First: Studies in Predicate Initial Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 227-242.
- McCawley, J. 1992. Justifying part-of speech assignments in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 20(2): 211-245.
- Mobbs, I. 2008. *Functionalism', the design of the language faculty, and (disharmonic) typology*. M. Phil. thesis: University of Cambridge.
- Mobbs, I. In progress. *Minimalism and the Design of the Language Faculty*. Ph.D. thesis: University of Cambridge.
- Moro, A. 2000. *Dynamic Antisymmetry*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Mous, M. 1993. *A Grammar of Iraqw*. Hamburg: H. Buske.
- Nash, L. & A. Rouveret. 2002. Cliticization as Unselective Attract. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 1: 157-199.
- Nespor, M., M. T. Guasti, & A. Christophe. 1996. Selecting word order: The rhythmic activation principle. In: U. Kleinhenz (ed.). *Interfaces in Phonology*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1-26.
- Nespor, M. & I. Vogel, 1982. Prosodic domains of external sandhi rules. In: H. van der Hulst & N. Smith (eds.). *The Structure of Phonological Representations*. Dordrecht: Foris, 225-256.
- Nespor, M. & I. Vogel. 1986. *Prosodic Phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Newmeyer, F. 2003. Grammar Is Grammar and Usage Is Usage. *Language* 79: 682-707.
- Newmeyer, F. 2005a. A Reply to the critiques of 'Grammar is grammar and usage is usage'. *Language* 81: 229-236.
- Newmeyer, F. 2005b. *Possible and Probable Languages. A Generative Perspective on Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oosthuizen, J. 2000. Prepositions left and right in Afrikaans. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics (SPiL)* 33: 67-90.
- Paul, W. To appear. Why particles are not particular: sentence-final particles in Chinese as heads of a split CP. To appear in *Studia Linguistica*.
- Pinker, S. & P. Bloom. 1990. Natural language and natural selection. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 13(4): 707-784
- Pollock, J.-Y. 1989. Verb movement, Universal Grammar and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 365-424.
- Richards, M. 2004. *Object Shift and Scrambling in North and West Germanic: A Case Study in Symmetrical Syntax*. Ph.D thesis: University of Cambridge.
- Richards, M. 2007. On feature-inheritance: an argument from the Phase Impenetrability Condition. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 563-572.
- Richards, M. 2008. Desymmetrization: parametric variation at the PF-Interface. *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics/La revue canadienne de linguistique* 53: 275-300.
- Rizzi, L. 1993/1994. Some notes on linguistic theory and language development: the case of root infinitives. *Language Acquisition* 3: 341-393.
- Roberts, I. G. 2007a. Introduction. In: I. Roberts (ed.), *Comparative Grammar: Critical Concepts in Linguistics. Volume III*. London: Routledge, 1-40.
- Roberts, I. 2007b. *Diachronic Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, J. R. 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. MIT: Ph.D Thesis.
- Sapir, E. 1921. *Language*. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co.

Introduction to appear in Biberauer, T. & Sheehan, M. (submitted) *Theoretical Approaches to Disharmonic Word Order*. (this is a draft only)

Scalise, S. 1988. Inflection and Derivation. *Linguistics* 26: 561-581

Schaeffer, J. 1997. *Direct Object Scrambling in Dutch and Italian Child Language*. Ph.D. thesis: UCLA.

Schaeffer, J. 2000. *The Acquisition of Direct Object Scrambling and Clitic Placement: Syntax and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Seuren, P. A. M. 1998. *Western Linguistics: an Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sheehan, M. 2010. Extraposition and Antisymmetry. In: J. Van Craenenbroeck (ed.), *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 203-225.

Sheehan, M. in press. Some implications of a copy theory of labeling. *Syntax*.

Stowell, T. 1981. *Origins of Phrase Structure*. Ph.D. dissertation: MIT.

Svenonius, P. 1993. Selection, adjunction, and concord in the DP. *Studia Linguistica* 47: 198-220.

Travis, L. 1984. *Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation*. MIT: Ph.D Thesis.

Vennemann, T. 1972. Analogy in generative grammar: the origin of word order. Paper read at the 11th Congress of Linguists. Bologna. Published in: L. Heilmann (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress of Linguistics, Bologna-Florence, Aug. 28 – Sept. 2, 1972* (volume II). Bologna: Mulino, 79-83.

Vennemann, T. 1974a. Topics, subjects, and word order: from SXV to SVX via TVX. In: J. Anderson & C. Jones (eds). *Historical Linguistics*. Edinburgh: North-Holland, 339-376.

Vennemann, T. 1974. Theoretical word order studies: results and problems. *Papier zur Linguistik* 7: 5-25.

Vennemann, T. 1975. An explanation of drift. In: C. Li & S. Thompson (eds). *Word Order and Word Order Change*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 269-305.

Vennemann, T. 1976. Categorical grammar and the order of meaningful elements. In: A. Juillard (ed.). *Linguistic Studies Offered to Joseph Greenberg on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*. Saratoga, Ca.: Anna Libri, 615-634.

Vennemann, T. & R. Harlow. 1977. Categorical grammar and consistent basic VX serialization. *Theoretical Linguistics* 4: 227-254.

Wagers, M. & C. Phillips. 2009. Multiple dependencies and the role of the grammar in real-time comprehension. *Journal of Linguistics* 45: 395-433.

Wagner, M. 2005. *Prosody and recursion*. Ph.D. dissertation: MIT.

Weil, H. 1879. *De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparees aux langues modernes*. Paris: Joubert, Libraire-Éditeur.

Westergaard, M. 2009. *The Acquisition of Word Order: Input Cues, Information Structure and Economy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wexler, K. 1998. Very Early Parameter Setting and the Unique Checking Constraint: a new explanation of the optional infinitive stage. *Lingua* 106: 23-79.

Whitman, J. 2008. The Classification of constituent order generalizations and diachronic explanation. In: J. Good (ed.). *Linguistic Universals and Language Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 233-253.

Williams, E. 1981. On the notions 'Lexically Related' and 'Head of a Word'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12: 245-274.

Wurmbrand, S. 2001. *Infinitives. Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Zwart, J-W. 1997. *Morphosyntax of verb movement: a minimalist approach to the syntax of Dutch*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Zwart, J-W. 2009a. Relevance of typology to minimalist inquiry. *Lingua* 119: 1589-1606.

Zwart, J-W. 2009b. The FOFC asymmetry: a layered derivation perspective. Paper presented at the Theoretical Approaches to Disharmonic Word Order conference (Newcastle).

Introduction to appear in Biberauer, T. & Sheehan, M. (submitted) *Theoretical Approaches to Disharmonic Word Order*. (this is a draft only)

[Available on-line at: <http://www.let.rug.nl/zwart/> - see *Presentations*]