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1. Introduction

The base order serialization of verbs in relation to their nominal objects partitions the contemporary Germanic languages into two major groups. The VO group consists of the North Germanic languages plus English and their regional varieties. The OV group comprises Afrikaans, Dutch, Frisian, German and their regional varieties.¹ Yiddish is the only Germanic language that does not neatly fit into this partitioning since objects may precede as well as follow a non-finite main verb. The assignment of Yiddish to one of the two base order types is controversial; see the examples (3) below.

With respect to the internal syntax of the verb phrase, the Scandinavian languages and English are fairly uniform. The objects follow the main verb, as exemplified by Swedish (1). For checking the VO characteristics of a given language, the relevant verb positions are the positions of non-finite verbs such as infinitives (1a,c) and supines (1b,d,e). Finite verbs (Vikner, this volume) are subject to superimposed ordering constraints since the Germanic languages, except English, are V2-languages, that is, languages in which finite verbs are fronted in main clauses and in certain embedded contexts in North-Germanic languages.

   I shallPRES buyINF a car / it.
b. Jag har gett mannen boken. (Sw.) Lundquist (2014b).
   I have givenSUP manDEF bookDEF
c.*Jag ska en bil / den köpa. (Sw.)
   I shallPRES buyINF a car / it.
d.*Jag har mannen boken gett. (Sw.)
e.*Jag har mannen gett boken. (Sw.)

In the Germanic OV languages, the non-finite verb follows its nominal objects. The relative order of the objects in VO and OV is identical (1b, 2b). The verb positions are different. The ungrammatical orders of VO, viz. (1c,d), are grammatical orders in OV languages (2a,b,d), except for (1e). The grammatical orders of Swedish are ungrammatical serializations in OV languages.

In the Germanic OV languages, nominal arguments obligatorily precede the VP-final base position of the main verb. The neutral order for two nominal objects of verbs with an experiencer theta-role for the indirect object is IO-DO-V (2b,d). Pronominal objects, however, are subject to a separate ordering template. Their relative order is DO-IO-V (2c, e). In German, this amounts to accusative before dative.

¹ For the purpose of this chapter is not essential to decide whether Swiss German varieties or Luxembourgish, to name just two cases, ought to be filed as different languages or different varieties within the German language continuum since the base order characteristics of a main verb relative to its objects is OV, just like in standard German.
(2) a. Heute wird er das Auto / es kaufen (Ge.)
   today he shall the car / it buy
b. Heute habe ich dem Mann das Buch gegeben (Ge.)
   today have I the manDAT the book AKK given
c. Heute habe ich es ihm gegeben (Ge.)
   today have I it AKK himDAT given
d. Vandaag heeft de man zijn broer een boek gegeven (Du.)
   today has the man his brother IO a book DO given
e. De man heeft het hem niet gegeven (Du.)
   the man has itDO him IO not given

The pattern with the non-finite main verb sandwiched by its objects (1e) is ungrammatical in OV as well as in VO, but not in Yiddish. According to Diesing (1997: 402), this word order is an acceptable order variant (3c, d). This is confirmed by Kroch & Santorini (2016) with corpus data. Given the serialization properties illustrated in (3), Yiddish cannot be unequivocally filed as either VO or OV. In Haider (2014, 2015), it is argued that Yiddish has preserved word order properties common to all older stages of Germanic languages before the diachronic split into an OV and a VO group has become manifest, namely unspecified directionality of the verbal head in the VP.

The following examples are quoted from Diesing (1997: 402). The patterns are grammatically well-formed, but the variants differ with respect to pragmatics, that is, information structure effects. These are the by now familiar preferences for serializing 'given' before 'new', 'background' before (post-verbal) 'focus', 'topic' before 'comment', just as in other languages in which grammar does not strictly constrain serialization and thereby allows for pragmatic factors to get superimposed, taking advantage of the flexibility that syntax admits.

(3) a. Maks hot Rifken dos bukh nit gegeben
   Max has Rebecca the book not given  OV-like order
b. Maks hot nit gegeben Rifken dos bukh
   VO-like order
c. Maks hot Rifken nit gegeben das bukh
   IO-V-DO order
d. Maks hot das bukh nit gegeben Rifken
   DO-V-IO order

These three word-order patterns of Germanic languages, namely VO, OV, and 'unspecified' can be synopsized as parametric variants of VP structuring. In North Germanic and English, the VP is head initial; in the continental West-Germanic languages and in Afrikaans it is head final, while it appears to be flexible in Yiddish.

The Germanic VO languages are head initial across all categories. In the OV group, however, the head positioning co-varies with the lexical category of the head. Verb and adjective phrases are head final, while noun phrases and PPs are head initial. For NPs and VPs it is particularly easy to provide minimal pairs since infinitival verb forms can be converted into nominal forms without any further morphological modifications. The direct object of the verb then turns into the object of the noun, either as a PP object (4b) or as a genitive object (4d). The object precedes

---

2 Based on a Yiddish Corpus of Santorini’s, Kroch & Santorini (2016) report the following figures of a corpus search for double object patterns. The counts have considered only non-finite VPs.
1800-1900: IO-V-DO: 3; DO-V-IO: 1; V-NP-NP: 8; NP-NP-V: 10.
the verb (4a,c) but follows the noun (4b,d) and these are the only licit linearizations.

(4) a. [een container naar Madagaskar *sturen]*_{VP} (Du.)
    a container to Madagascar send

   b. het [*sturen van een container naar Madagaskar]*_{NP} (Du.)
    the send_{INF} of a container to Madagascar

   c. [einen Container nach Madagaskar *transportieren]*_{VP} (Ge.)
    a container to Madagascar transport

   d. das [*Transportieren eines Containers nach Madagaskar]*_{NP} (Ge.)
    the transport_{INF} aGEN containerGEN to Madagascar

Functional lexical heads such as articles\(^3\) (see Roehrs, this volume) and complementizers precede their complements in all Germanic languages. Arguably, there are no functional heads at all that follow their complements, as for instance a clause-final position for the finite verb (s. Haider 2010, chapter 2).

The position of the head in a phrase correlates with a number of syntactic properties that will be reviewed in the following section. Since the VP is a core constituent of a clause, its syntactic properties are reflected in the syntactic properties of clauses.

Table 1: A synopsis of syntactic correlates of OV/VO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>OV</th>
<th>VO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>particle verbs</td>
<td>particle ( \rightarrow ) V</td>
<td>V ( \rightarrow ) particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>resultatives</td>
<td>resultative ( \rightarrow ) V</td>
<td>V ( \rightarrow ) resultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>order of auxiliaries</td>
<td>( \ldots ) (XP) V ( \rightarrow ) Aux</td>
<td>( \ldots ) Aux ( \rightarrow ) V (XP) ( \ldots )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>VP-medial adverbs</td>
<td>( \checkmark ) [DP adverb V]_{VP}</td>
<td>( \checkmark ) [V adverb DP]_{VP}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>left-joined adjuncts</td>
<td>unconstrained</td>
<td>head-adjacency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>VP-internal scrambling</td>
<td>( \checkmark ) [DP; DP e; V]_{VP}</td>
<td>( \checkmark ) [V DP; DP e;]_{VP}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>V-V-complementation</td>
<td>( \ldots ) [V° V°]<em>{verb cluster}</em>{VP}(^4)</td>
<td>( \ldots ) [V° [V° ...]_{VP}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>expletive or quirky subject</td>
<td>excluded</td>
<td>obligatory expletives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first three properties (i.-iii.) are sub-instances of the directionality property that determines V-O and O-V order, respectively. The arrows symbolize the directionality relation between the head and the element it combines with. 'Particles' refers to those particles of particle verbs that are obligatorily stranded when the finite verb occurs in the fronted position, viz. in V2 and V1 clauses; see also Toivonen (this volume) and Zwarts (this volume).

\(^3\) The suffixed definiteness marker of nouns in Scandinavian is an affix, not an article in a D°-position, such as Swedish *flask-an* (the bottle) or brev-\( \text{et} \) (the letter). The definite article is *den*, *det* (neuter), and *de* (plural).

\(^4\) This two-verb cluster here merely serves as an example. Verb clusters may easily consist of up to five verbs.

i. *da man ihn [liegen bleiben lassen können wird]* (Ge. (Bech 1957/1983:64))
    since one him [lie remain let can will] ('since one shall be entitled to let him stay recumbent')

ii. *dat hij de chauffeur [weten laten blijven wachten had]* (Du. (Augustinus 2015:8))
    that he the driver want let stay wait had ('that he had wanted to keep the driver waiting')
For auxiliaries, the directionality-sensitive property is their selection effect on the form of the dependent verb. A main verb selects category and case of its nominal complements; an auxiliary selects a verbal form\(^5\) of the dependent verb such as a bare infinitive, an infinitive with infinitival particle, a participle or an aspectual form as for instance the English progressive form. Moreover, in VO languages, the relative order of auxiliaries is strict. Germanic OV languages, on the other hand, are known for order variations.

The second triplet (iv. - vi.) lists the effects of syntactic constraints that are unique for head-initial VPs. These restrictions are absent in head-final (verb) phrases. Head-initial VPs (and NPs as well) are 'compact'. There is no room for interveners between the head and the nominal objects, neither for adverbials nor for scrambled arguments. Adjuncts to head-initial VPs that precede the verb are subject to an adjacency constraint. The head of the adjunct must be adjacent to the VP. This constraint is absent in head-final structures. The very same constraints applies to adnominal attributes (for a theoretical account see Haider (in press)).

The final two properties concern follow-up properties of the head-initial vs. head-final structure of VPs. The Germanic languages with head-final VPs employ verb clustering instead of stacking VPs as in VO languages. In verb clusters, the main verb plus the auxiliaries and quasi auxiliaries of a simple clause form a syntactic unit. In VO languages, the auxiliaries and quasi-auxiliaries each select a VP, with the VP of the main verb as the most deeply embedded one.

The final property is the hallmark of the SVO type. There are two types of languages, in which the main verb precedes the objects, namely SVO and VSO. Only in the SVO type, the subject is outside of the directionality domain of the verb. It is assigned to a special position outside of the VP. This position precedes the main verb while the object positions follow the main verb. In OV language, any nominal argument precedes the main verb. In SVO, the structural subject position is obligatory and it is obligatorily lexicalized. In the absence of a subject argument, an expletive element lexicalises this position. In OV languages, there is arguably no VP-external structural subject position and therefore no room for an expletive subject in an otherwise subjectless clause (Haider 2010:36; 2015).

2. Syntactic correlates of the base-ordering types

2.1 Particle verbs

Particle verbs are highly productive combinations of a particle and a verb in Germanic languages (see Dehé 2015; Toivonen, this volume). Particle verbs are syntactic units consisting of two head-level elements, namely a particle and a verb.\(^6\) Most of these particles are homophonous with prepositions of the particular languages. The linearization of the particles relative to the verb matches the OV and VO order, respectively. In VO languages, the particles

\(^5\) The analogy between case government and 'status' government ('Statusrektion') has been emphasized first by Bech (1957; 1983:17): "statusrektion und statuskongruenz [...] in genauer analogie mit der terminologie der kasuslehre" (= status government and status agreement in precise analogy to the terminology of the case systems). The verbal status categories are bare infinitive, supine (past participle), and infinitive with particle 'to'.

\(^6\) Particle verbs are syntactically complex. They must be distinguished from morphologically complex verbs. In German, for instance, 'umfahren' (bypass vs. run sb. down) or 'übersetzen' (ferry across vs. translate) are ambiguous in their written form. Stress disambiguates. If the verb is the particle verb, the particle carries the main stress. If the initial morpheme is a derivational prefix, the verbal root carries the stress. When the verb is finite and gets fronted, the particle is stranded. The prefix could not be stranded since it is part of the word structure of the verb.
follow the verb; in OV languages they precede, unless they are stranded when the finite verb is in a displaced position, such as the V2-position. Here is an illustrative cross-linguistic sample.

(5) look up (VO) 'up-look' (OV)
   a. kig op (Da.) opkyk (Af.)
   b. sláá upp (Far.) opzoeken (Du.)
   c. fletta upp (Icel.) opsykje (Fr.)
   d. slå opp (Norw.) aufschlagen (Ge.)
   e. slå upp (Sw.) oyfzukhn (Yi.)

In VO languages, the verb and the particle may occur in non-adjacent positions within the verb phrase. The Scandinavian languages display several distinct patterns, as illustrated by the examples (7) from Thrafnsson (2007: 34, 142). Faroese, Icelandic, and Norwegian pattern like English (6). The particle may be stranded after an object unless the object is a pronoun. In Danish, the particle must be stranded behind an object (7a), while in Swedish it must not (7d). For more details, see Svenonius (1996), Vikner (in press).

(6) a. He looked something/it up
    b. he looked up something/*it
    c. Hann gjordi upp snøri/*ta. (Fa.)
       he made up fishing-line-DEF/*it
       ‘He wound up the fishing line.’
    d. Hann gjordi snøri/ta upp.
    e. Ég skrifaði niður símanúmerið/*það. (Ic.)
       I wrote down phone-number-DEF/*it
    f. Ég skrifaði símanúmeriðniður/*það niður.
    g. Han spiste opp tørrfisken/*den. (No.)
       he ate up dryfish-DEF/*it
    h. Hann spiste tørrfisken/den opp.

(7) a. Jeg skrev nummeret/det op.
    I wrote number-DEF/it down
    b. Jeg skrev op *nummeret/*det. (Da.)
       I wrote up *number-DEF/*it
    c. Hon kastade ut Johan/honum. (Sw.)
       she threw out J./him
    d. *Hon kastade Johan/honom ut.

In VO languages with optional particle stranding, but not in OV language, particles may appear in a position between two objects (8a,b). Such a particle position is ungrammatical in any OV language. Only within a verbal cluster could a particle be separated from its verb, as in Dutch (8c) in comparison with (8d,e). In this case, the only intervening items are verbs of the same verbal cluster.

---

7 This example with an indefinite object is documented in the British National Corpus. For full noun phrases, superimposed information structure effects result in a preference for definite noun phrases preceding the particle, but big corpora contain entries of the pattern with an indefinite preceding a particle, too, for this and other particle verbs, but more than twice as many with definite noun phrases.
2.2 Resultatives

In all Germanic languages, particles, adjectives as well as PPs are employed for resultative readings, that is, for denoting a property of the resulting state. What Broekhuis (2013:135-136) affirms for Dutch is true for all Germanic OV languages: "Both resultatives and particles must be left-adjacent to the verbs in clause-final position."

(9) a. als er es aufmachte
   when he it up-made ('up-make' = open)

b. als er es sauber machte
   when he it clean made

c. als er es zu einem Problem machte
   when he it to a problem made
   'when he turned it into a problem'

Broekhuis' statement applies not only to the base position of these items. Just like particles (10a), resultative PPs (10b,c), unlike locative PPs (10d) or prepositional objects (10e) do not extrapose and they cannot be stranded by V(P) topicalization (11).

(10) a. dat Jan het boek {neer} legde {*neer} (Du.; Broekhuis 2013: 136)
   that Jan the book down put

b. dat Jan het boek {op de tafel} legde {*op de tafel}.8
   that Jan the book on the table put

c. Jan hat alles {in kleine Stücke} geschnitten {*in kleine Stücke}  
   inkleine Stückecut

d. Jan heeft op zijn vader gewacht op het station.  
   Jan has for his father waited at the station

e. Jan heeft op het station gewacht op zijn vader.

Participles or infinitival verbs may be topicalized (11a), but topicalization of the verb must not strand a directional or resultative PP (11b). These expressions are pied-piped (11c).

---

8 In (i), the extraposed PP is not directional but locative. In German, this is reflected by dative (locative) instead of accusative (directional) case assigned by the preposition 'auf' (on).

i. dat Jan het boek {op de tafel} neer legde {op de tafel}.  
   Du.
   that Jan the book on the table down put

ii. dass Jan das Buch auf dem Tisch legte - dass Jan das Buch [auf dem Tisch] ablegte {auf dem Tisch}
   that Jan the book on the table put - that Jan the book on the table down-put
In VO languages, resultatives of any category – particles, adjectives, PPs – follow the verb.

(12) a. He wiped it (*yesterday) up
   b. He wiped it (*yesterday) clean
   c. He wiped it (*yesterday) under the door handle
   d. Then they cut {loose} the craft {loose}
   e. Vi vaska {reint} golvet {reint} (No.; Åfarli 1985: 97)
      we washed clean floor
   f. Þeir dældu hana fulla af lyfjum (Ic.; Whelpton 2007)
      they pumped her-fem-ACC-sg full-fem-ACC-sg of drugs

2.3 The order of auxiliaries

In all Germanic VO languages, the relative order of auxiliaries and quasi-auxiliaries is uniform and invariant. The dependent verb follows the verb it is dependent on in terms of status selection (see fn. 5). In (13a), 'skulle' selects an infinitival form which in turn selects a supine. The auxiliary order in (13a,b) is representative of the Germanic VO languages; see Thraínsson (2007: 459), Bentzen (2005:156). Frisian (13c) illustrates the OV order of verbs, which is a mirror image of the VO order. The most frequent order of verbs in a cluster in Dutch (13d) is the inverted order of the Frisian example. The German example (13e) appears like a mixture of the Dutch and the Frisian order. The first two verbs follow the Dutch order while the other four verbs are serialized as in Frisian. This is the effect of a special constraint that is operative in (13e), namely the IPP⁹ constraint discussed below (see also Wurmbrand & Christopoulos (this volume)). In general, the verbs in German are serialized in the OV order, that is, the order illustrated be Frisian (13c).

(13) a. Du skulle ha kunnet temme løver nå. (No. (Hauge 2003:63)
    you should have canSUP tame lions now
   b. Það munu aldrei margir hafa lokð verkefninu (Ic.; Thraínsson 2007:56)
      there will never many haveINF finishedSUP the assignment-DEF

---

⁹ IPP (Infinitivus pro participio = infinitive for a participle; “Ersatzinfinitiv”) refers to the following phenomenon: An auxiliary that selects a participial form on the dependent verb is fronted across the verb in the verb cluster and the verb switches into the infinitival form. In German, IPP is triggered by modal verbs and other quasi-auxiliaries like ‘lassen’ (let), ‘brauchen’ (need) and perceptions verbs like sehen (‘see’) and hören (‘hear’). In Dutch and Afrikaans, the set of IPP triggers comprises more kinds of verbs than in German.

i. *dass er es essen gemusst hat =IPP dass er es hat essen müssen / dass er das essen hat müssen
   that he it eat must_{Participle} has =IPP that he it has eat must_{INF} / that he it eat has must_{INF} (= ‘that he had to eat it’)

c. omdat ik dy dêr wol ris stean bliuwen sjen willen hawwe soe
   that I you there MP stand stay see want PARTICiple have would
Fr. (Hoekstra 1998:155)
d. dat ik je daar wel eens zou hebben willen zien blijven staan
   that I you there MP would have want see stay stand
Du. (Hoekstra 1998:155)
e. dass ich dich da ja würde haben stehen bleiben sehen wollen
   that I you there MP would have stand stay see want
Ge.

Compared to the invariant relative order of auxiliaries in VO, the grammar of auxiliaries is more complex in the Germanic OV languages. First, there is order variation within a given language (14a,c), and second, there is cross-linguistic order variation (14c,d). In Dutch, there is a slight North-South gradient for the order (14a) over (14c), but both orders are frequent in The Netherlands and in Belgium.10

(14)  a. dat niemand iets gedaan heeft
      that nobody anything done has
      Du.
b. dass niemand etwas getan hat
      that nobody anything done has
      Ge.
c. dat niemand iets heeft gedaan
      that nobody anything done has
      Du.
d.*dass niemand etwas hat getan
      Ge.
e. dat hy later sou/moet gekom het
      that he later would/must come have
      Af. (Donaldson 1993: 366)
f. of hy miskien sou kan kom help
      whether he perhaps would can come help
      Af.

A complicating factor is the IPP phenomenon. In German (15a), 'würde haben' (would have) precedes the main verb in the verbal cluster because of the IPP effect triggered by 'können'. In Dutch, (15b), all auxiliaries are in the inverted order, which would be ungrammatical in German. Afrikaans11 optionally allows an in situ switch to the infinitival form (15c,d).

(15)a. dass er jetzt Löwen würde haben zähmen können
      that he now lions would have tame CANINF (= be able to)
      Ge.
b. dat hij nu leeuwen zou hebben kunnen temmen
      that he now lions woul have CANINF tame
      Du.
c. Ons het kom kuier.
      we have comeINF visitINF
      Af. (Augustinus & Dirix 2013:221)
d. 'n vragmotor wat aangery gekom PARTICiple het
      a lorry which driving-along come has
      Af.

But even without IPP, there is variation in the order of verbs in the cluster as (16) illustrates for Dutch and (17) for German four-verb clusters. The numbers are the google hits with the filter

10 A google search for "gedaan heeft" produced 662.000 hits, and 13.700 for news sites; "heeft gedaan" 565.000 and 43.800, respectively.
11 An in-situ switch is characteristic of Eastern Austrian vernacular (i). The standard versions are as in (ii).
   i. dass sie nicht nachgeben müssen/dürfen hätt
      that she not give-in must/may had
   ii. dass sie nicht hätt nachgeben müssen/dürfen - dass sie nicht nachgeben hätten müssen/dürfen
'News' followed by the number of google hits in toto. The variant (16d) is ungrammatical in Dutch. All variants are synonymous.

(16) a. gebeurd zou kunnen zijn (111; 24,000)
   happenedParticiple would canINF beINF
   'would be possible to have happened'
b. zou kunnen gebeurd zijn (32; 3,000)
c. zou kunnen zijn gebeurd (4; 60,000)
d. *zou gebeurd zijn kunnen (0; 0)

(17a) is ungrammatical, because the modal is a trigger of IPP. Therefore, the auxiliary 'have' gets fronted, but there are several alternative positions, namely (17b-d).

(17) a.*passiert sein gekonnt hätte (0; 0)
   happened be canParticiple hadPast-SUBJ
   'could have had happened'
b. passiert sein hätte können (0; 508)
c. passiert hätte sein können (2; 1030)
d. hätte passiert sein können (8; 2350)

2.4 VP-medial adverbs

The positioning of adverbs sharply differentiates between VO and OV. In VO, adverbs either precede the VP or follow the verb plus its nominal arguments, but they do not intervene. The pattern (18a), which Engdahl et al. (2003:43) provide for Swedish, is representative of North Germanic languages and English, modulo V2. The Icelandic example (18c) illustrates the general pattern (Traínsson 2007:37). In OV, however, adverbs may intervene between the verb and nominal objects (18d, e).

(18) a. XP V FIN Subj S-ADV V NON-FIN ObjIND ObjDIR ADV

   b. She had {often} read {*often} the instructions {often}.
   c. Hún hafði {oft}lesið {*oft} leiðbeiningarnar {oft}.
   d. wenn man jemandem absichtlich etwas mehrmals erklärt
      if one somebodyDAT intentionally somethingACC repeatedly explains
   e. of iemand {toevallig} iets {toevallig} gezien heeft
      whether someone {accidentally} something {accidentally} seen has

If an adverb appears to intervene between nominal objects in a North Germanic language, this is the effect of an interfering condition, namely 'object shift'; for details see Thráinsson (2010) and Broekhuis (this volume). Object shift applies only if the VP is headless, that is, the verb is in a fronted position (19a,b). In addition, no lexical material must precede the shifted item in the VP, that is neither verb (19c) nor a stranded particle nor any other VP-internal item. Fronting a pronominal object across an adverbial or a negation particle is ungrammatical in all these instances; see Engdahl et al. (2003:45) on Swedish.

(19) a. Bo gav, hendej aldrig [e; e] bogen]VP
   Bo gave her never bookDEF
b. Eva gave him förmodligen inte [e, några pengar]VP
   Eva gave him ACC probably not any money

c. *Eva har honom förmodligen inte [gett e, några pengar]VP
   Eva has him probably not [given any money]

In OV, the availability of the VP-medial positions as in (18d,e) for adverbs is a cross-linguistically valid property. It is available in a language with DP scrambling such as German but also in Dutch, which forbids the scrambling of a DP object across another object but scrambles PP objects.

### 2.5 A constraint on phrases left-adjoined to head-initial phrases

Adjunction to head-initial phrases is constrained in a way that adjunction to head-final phrases is not. The head of the adjunct must be adjacent to the phrase the adjunct is adjoined to. This is true for adjunction to VPs as well as for adjunction to NPs. English is representative of the Germanic VO languages in this respect. Since VP and NP are head initial, the effect shows in each case, as (20) exemplifies.

(20) a. They [[much more often (*than the controls)] guessed the result correctly]VP
   b. an [[extremely happy (*with his score)] candidate]NP

In the Germanic OV languages, the VP is head final and the NP head initial. So, adjunction to the VP is unconstrained (21a,b), while adjunction the NP (21c,d) is subject to the very same adjacency constraint as in English and the North-Germanic languages.

(21) a. als hij [verder dan vijf kilometer] had moeten rijden
   when he [more-far than five kilometres] had have-to ride
   b. So kann man Züge [viel genauere als bisher] lokalisieren
   that-way can one trains [much more-precisely than to-date] localize
   c. eine [viel genauere (*als bisher)]AP Lokalisierung
   a much more-precise (than to-date) localisation
   d. een [minder intelligente (*dan/als Els)]AP persoon
   a less intelligent (than Els) person

This phenomenon has an immediate impact on the theoretical modelling of structures with adverbal or attribute phrases. It is a genuine effect of adjunction and it is absent with phrases in spec positions, be it a subject or a phrase fronted to the clause initial-position. Hence, any claim that situates adverbal phrases or attributive APs in spec-positions of functional heads fails to capture this effect (Haider (2015) and (in press)).

### 2.6 VP-internal scrambling

Variable ordering of argumental DPs (viz. 'scrambling') is a property of the containing phrases, namely head-final phrases. This is a necessary but not sufficient property. In addition, the scrambled DPs must be morphologically identifiable, either by case or by relational particles. German meets both preconditions. As a consequence, the order of nominal arguments, subject included, is variable in head-final phrases, that is, in VPs (22a,b) and APs. On the other hand,
head-initial phrases such as NPs (22c,d) are as rigidly serialized as in all Germanic VO languages.

(22) a. [Sieger\textsubscript{DAT} Pokale\textsubscript{AKK} übertreichen]\textsubscript{VP} winners cups hand-over
b. [Pokale\textsubscript{AKK} Sieger\textsubscript{DAT} übertreichen]\textsubscript{VP}
c. das [Überreichen von Pokalen/der Pokale\textsubscript{GEN} an Sieger]\textsubscript{NP} the hand-over\textsubscript{INF} of cups/the cups' to winners
d.*das [Überreichen an Sieger der Pokale\textsubscript{GEN}/von Pokalen]\textsubscript{NP} the hand-over\textsubscript{INF} to winners of cups/the cups'

In Dutch, non-pronominal DPs are morphologically indistinct with respect to subject vs. object case and so they do not scramble. Unlike German, neither the nouns nor the head of the attributes nor the articles signal case distinctions and unlike in German "direct objects must appear to the right of indirect objects, while both of them must appear to the right of the subject" (Neeleman 1994a:416). The German counterparts of (23b,c) are fully grammatical.

(23) a. dat Jan de mannen deze film toont
b. ??dat Jan deze film de mannen toont
c.*Dat de mannen Jan deze film toont

The only distinctly marked arguments in Dutch are prepositional objects and these objects may be scrambled, as ANS (Geerts et al. 1984: 989f.), the standard grammar of Dutch, witnesses (24c). This is an essential difference between OV and VO in languages without morphological case-marking. In VO languages, prepositional objects cannot be scrambled (24d) although their grammatical function would be easily detectable.

(24) a.*Toen hebben de autoriteiten \textit{het kind} de moeder teruggegeven. then have the authorities the child the mother back-given
b. Toen hebben de autoriteiten \textit{het kind} aan de moeder teruggegeven then have the authorities the child to the mother back-given
c. Toen hebben de autoriteiten aan de moeder \textit{het kind} teruggegeven
d.*Then, the authorities returned to the mother the child

Icelandic and Faroese are testimonies for the rigidity of word order in VO even in the presence of morphologically clearly distinguishable objects. The Germanic languages provide immediate counterevidence for a popular generalization, namely the direct correlation between explicit case-marking and 'free' word order. Icelandic confirms insights already gained from German NP-internal word order (23d): The word order in head-initial phrases is strict and this is independent of rich case marking, which would guarantee clearly recoverable grammatical relations under any order.

Dehé (2004) sums up her experimental study\textsuperscript{14} as follows: "The order of the objects in Icelandic double object constructions is much more restricted than one would expect. The unmarked order is by far the preferred one even in contexts where the inverted order is expected to be equally acceptable."

\textsuperscript{14} 18 participants; 36 target items plus 25 filler items; acceptability judgements on a 1-4 scale.
Thráínsson (2007:98) indicates "For a relatively small number of ditransitive verbs it is possible to reverse the ordering of the indirect and direct object" and these verbs "correspond roughly to the English variants where the goal follows the direct object, except that in English the goal would be prepositional (to the king, to the parents)."

The last observation is particularly instructive since there exists a corresponding set of facts in German. For a small class of double-object verbs in German, ACC-DAT is the neutral order. The dative object of these verbs is a goal relation and not an experiencer relation as with the majority class of DAT-ACC verbs, and in addition, this goal-relation cannot be alternatively expressed by means of a PP object. However, in the majority class of DAT-ACC verbs, there is a subset of verbs whose dative object can be construed as an experiencer or a goal relation (25c-e).

(25) a. Sie setzten Kandidaten\textsubscript{ACC} Temperatur\textsubscript{DAT} über 45° aus Ge.  
they exposed candidates temperatures above 45°  
They exposed candidates to temperatures above 45°
b.?Sie setzten Temperaturen über 45° Kandidaten aus  
c. Er übergab alle Dokumente an die Polizei  
he over-gave all documents to the police
d. Er übergab alle Dokumente\textsubscript{ACC} der Polizei\textsubscript{DAT}  
he over-gave all documents the police
e. Er übergab der Polizei\textsubscript{DAT} alle Dokumente\textsubscript{ACC}  

The prepositional object variant (25c) is reserved for pure goal relations. The Dative alternates with the PP option when the relation can be construed either as goal or experiencer-like relation. If the verb provides only an experiencer relation (26a), the PP option is not available (26b).

(26) a. Sie erklärte ihm\textsubscript{DAT} das Problem\textsubscript{ACC} Ge.  
she explained him the problem  
She explained the problem to him  
b.*Sie erklärte das Problem\textsubscript{ACC} an ihn\textsubscript{ACC}  

In Dutch, however, the alternation between indirect object and a prepositional object with 'aan' (to) is available for a much large class of verbs than in German, as the contrast between (26b) and (27) illustrates. This larger class of double-object verbs is congruent with the English class of verbs that display the so-called dative-alternation, viz. an alternation between the indirect object variant and a prepositional object with the preposition 'to'.

(27) Hij verklaarde het aan Constantijn Huygens.  
he explained it to C. H.

In Icelandic, the class of verbs that allow an ACC-DAT order is highly restricted. It is worthwhile pointing out that Dehé's (2004) findings call for a reassessment of frequently cited examples for a DO\textsubscript{ACC}-IO\textsubscript{DAT} order in Icelandic. Thráínsson (2007:131) approvingly follows Rögnvaldsson's (1990) judgements of (28a,b): "Some double object verbs in Icelandic allow a DO–IO order of their arguments in addition to the normal IO–DO order." Dehé (2004:94), however, reports for the very same stimuli (28a,b) that "the inverted order was rejected" by all her informants.
(28) a. Hann gaf konunginum ambáttina.
    He gave king-DEF-DAT maidservant-DEF-ACC

b. Þau sýndu foreldrunum krakkana.
    They showed parents-DEF-DAT kids-DEF-ACC

In sum, even distinctly case-marked objects do not scramble in head-initial languages such as in Icelandic while morphologically poorly case-marked arguments may be scrambled in OV languages such as German. In the following example, only the dative of the indirect object is morphologically coded. The other two arguments in (29) can only be identified as non-datives. In principle, they could either be nominative or accusative. Nevertheless, scrambling is available.

(29) dass solche SpielennOM/ACC KinderenDAT alle ElternnOM/ACC verbieten sollten Ge.
    that such games children all parents forbid should
    'that all parents should forbid children such games'

The crucial difference between German and Dutch seems to be the following. In Dutch, the Grammar does not provide any case distinctions for non-pronominal subjects. In German, there are morphologically coded case distinctions in all four cases, especially for articles and the heads of attributes. Even if these distinctions are morphologically neutralized in quite a few contexts, this does not preclude scrambling. What seems to bar scrambling is the principled morphological indistinctness of DPs in an OV language with respect to their grammatical functions, as in Afrikaans or Dutch.

That scrambling must not change the linear order of object noun phrases in Dutch is standard wisdom. Nevertheless, 'scrambling' has been invoked for Dutch in another respect, namely the serialization of adverbials relative to objects. The analysis rests on a doubtful premise, though, namely the premise of an exact parallel between adverbial placement in VO and OV. This parallel is arguably mistaken (see property iv. in Table 1). Adverbials are assumed to either precede or follow the VP.

If the adverbial 'gisteren' in (30) has to precede (or follow) the VP just like in English, the objects have to be assigned to positions outside of the VP, as indicated in (30b). This is 'Dutch scrambling'. This analysis has originally been proposed by Kerstens (1975). It has gained broad reception in Generative accounts of Dutch clause structuring, but it has not reached full acceptance. Substantive counterarguments have been put forward in Neeleman & Van de Koot (2008), Neeleman & Weerman (1999), and Neeleman (1994a,b). In the analysis they argue for, the objects in (30a,b) are in their base-positions and the adverb in (30b) intervenes. This pattern is typical of OV structures, universally.

(30) a. dat Jan de mannen de film gisteren toonde
    that Jan the men the movie yesterday showed

b. dat Jan de mannen, de film, gisteren [e1, e2 toonde]

The fact that the relative order of nominal arguments is rigid in Dutch prompted researchers to equate the Dutch phenomenon with Scandinavian object shift, as for instance Broekhuis (2008) and in this volume. Vikner (2007: 411) has listed several independent syntactic contexts in which scrambling and Scandinavian object shift differ. The overarching difference is the fact that object shift must not cross any VP-internal material such as a verb, a stranded particle or a
co-argument. "Only object shift requires verb movement, and only object shift is restricted to DPs." (Vikner 2007: 393). This is not true of the OV-kind of scrambling, and it is not true for the alleged equation of scrambling and object shifting in Dutch.

A clear case of scrambling in Dutch that plainly differs from Object shift is the scrambling of PP objects. As noted by standard grammars, PP objects may be scrambled across an object in Dutch, just like in German, but they cannot be object-shifted in Scandinavian languages Thráinsson (2007:64) and they cannot be scrambled within a head-initial VP, as exemplified by English (Haider 2010:14) or in a head-initial NP, as illustrated in (22). Finally, in every OV language, and therefore in Dutch, too, adverbs may be placed in between objects that precede an adverb. This distribution is incompatible with object shift but it straightforwardly follows from the non-compactness property of head-final phrases (see section 2.4).

2.7 Verbal clusters in OV - stacked VPs in VO

If in a VO-language a single clause contains more than one verb, then each verb heads a VP and so the VPs are stacked (31a). Each auxiliary is head of a VP, with another VP serving as its complement (31a). Stacking is the source of the rigid relative order of the auxiliaries in VO. In the Germanic OV-languages, the verbs of a simple clause form a verb cluster (31b), as illustrated by Frisian (13c, in sect. 2.3) or German; see Haider (2010 chapter 7.2), Wurmbrand (2017) and Wurmbrand & Christopoulos (this volume). The variable verb order in verb clusters is the topic of section 2.3, above. The verb order variations as well as the impenetrability for non-verbal material are characteristic properties of verbal clusters.

(31) a. ... [VP-1 V1 [VP-2 V2 [VP-3 V3 ...]]] e.g. 'shallv1 havev2 answeredv3'
b. ... [VP ... [V-cluster V3 V2 V1 ]] e.g. 'beantwortetv3 habenv2 wirtv1' Ge.

The following example (32a) with an adverbal left-adjointed to each VP illustrates the stacked V-VP complementation structure of English. The Dutch examples (32b,c) illustrate the clustering phenomenon and one of its order variations; see section 2.3. for verb order variation.

(32) a. It [certainly [vp may [possibly [vp have [indeed [vp been [badly [vp formulated]]]]]]]]
   (Quirk et al. 1985: § 8.20, 495)
   b. Hij zei dat hij de chauffeur [had willen laten blijven wachten]
      'He said that he the driver has want-INF laten-INF blijven-INF wachten'
      (Augustinus 2015:8)
   c. Hij zei dat hij de chauffeur [willen laten blijven wachten had]
      (Augustinus 2015:8)

Clustering is not restricted to auxiliaries and quasi-auxiliaries. For a subset of control verbs, a clustering variant (33a,b) optionally alternates with the clausal infinitival complementation (33c). A serialization as in (33b) is a particularly unequivocal indication of a cluster since the

---

15 i. Toen hebben de autoriteiten aan de moeder: het kind e. teruggegeven (Geerts et als. 1984: 989)
   then have the authorities to the mother the child back-given.
16 In (i), with a scrambled PP-object, the "%' sign marks positions for adverbials.
   i. voor het slapengaan % aan kinderen % griezelige verhaaltjes % vertellen
      before the sleep-going % to children % creepy fairy-tales % tell
17 The term 'verbal material' includes particles of particle verbs (i) and resultative adjectives as in (ii.):
   i. dat hij haar had op moeten bellen. (Haeseryn et al. 1997: 1357)
      that he her had up must ring - 'that he had to ring her up' (opbellen = ring up)
   ii. dat hij zich niet [zal laten bang maken]
      that he himself not will let afraid make - 'that he will not let (somebody/something) frighten him'
infinitival main verb that otherwise heads the VP of the infinitival complement clause (33c) is flanked by the main verb and the auxiliary of the finite clause. The clustering variants (33a,b) entail clause union. The clause structure in the clustering variant is mono-clausal while the control construction is bi-clausal, that is, it consists of a matrix clause with an embedded infinitival clause (33c). Obviously, this structural difference is the source of numerous predictable follow-up effects. As for German, Haider (2010: 211-213) lists and discusses sixteen syntactic collateral effects of clustering, confirming the structural difference.

In Dutch, the IPP effect applies to these clustering control verbs as well,\(^\text{18}\) whence the infinitive 'proberen' in the clustering variant instead of the participle 'geprobeerd' in the clausal complementation variant (33c), that is, the familiar infinitival control construction.

\[(33)\]
\[
a. \text{dat Jan Marie [heeft proberen te kussen]}_\text{cluster} \quad \text{(Augustinus 2015:25)} \quad \text{Du.}
\]
\[
\text{that Jan Marie has try\text{INF} to kiss}
\]
\[
\text{b. dat Jan Marie [proberen te kussen heeft]}_\text{cluster} \quad \text{(Augustinus 2015:25)}
\]
\[
\text{c. dat Jan geprobeerd}_\text{Participle} \text{heeft [Marie te kussen]}_\text{clause}
\]

The clustering variant is restricted to a subclass of control verbs in the Germanic OV language. (34a,b) illustrates the parallel construction in Frisian and German. In the cluster (34b) the infinitival main verb of the clausal variant (34c) is sandwiched in the cluster, similar to Dutch (33b), due to the IPP effect triggered by the modal 'können' (can).

\[(34)\]
\[
a. \text{omdat er har mei har wurk [besocht te helpen]}_\text{cluster} \quad \text{(Hoekstra 2016)} \quad \text{Fr.}
\]
\[
\text{because he her with her work tried to help}
\]
\[
\text{b. dass Jan Marie [hätte zu küssen versuchen können]}_\text{cluster} \quad \text{Ge.}
\]
\[
\text{that Jan Marie had to kiss try\text{INF} can\text{INF}}
\]
\[
\text{‘that Jan could have tried to kiss Marie’}
\]
\[
\text{c. dass Jan hätte versuchen können [Marie zu küssen]}_\text{clause} \quad \text{Ge.}
\]
\[
\text{that Jan had try\text{INF} can\text{INF} Marie to kiss}
\]

### 2.8 Subject expletives and quirky subjects

The following examples (35) of passivized intransitive verbs illustrate a crucial contrast between Germanic OV and VO languages with respect to subjectless clauses. In the VO group, in the absence of a subject argument, the subject position is obligatorily lexicalized by means of an expletive element (Vikner 1995:209). The Germanic OV languages do not require or admit an expletive subject.

\[(35)\]
\[
a. \text{at der er blevet danset} \quad \text{Da.}
\]
\[
\text{that EXPL has been danced}
\]
\[
\text{b. att det arbetades} \quad \text{Sw.}
\]
\[
\text{that EXPL work\text{SPass}}
\]
\[
\text{c. dat wordt gewerkt} \quad \text{Du.}
\]
\[
\text{that is worked}
\]

\(^\text{18}\) In German, the domain of IPP effects is more restricted than in Dutch. For instance, IPP does not affect these alternatively clustering control verbs.
d. dass gearbeitet wird  
that worked is  

Ge.

Without an expletive, (35a,b) would be ungrammatical. German, on the other hand, clearly demonstrates that an expletive is not admitted. The candidate for serving as expletive is ’es’ (it), which is homophonous with the third person neuter pronoun. (36a) is unacceptable. The appreciation of Dutch is complicated by the fact that the candidate for the very same expletive function is ’er’, which is homophonous with the locative adverbial particle, corresponding to English ’there’. So, ’er’ in (36b) could be an expletive or an adverbial.

(36)  
a.* dass es getanzt/gearbeitet wird  
that it danced/worked is  

Ge.

b. dat er wordt gewerkt  
that there is worked  

Du.

The test case is obvious. If it is an adverbial, it may be absent. If it is an expletive subject, it must be present, just as in (35a,b). The research literature on this issue is controversial. For Dutch syntacticians such as Hoekstra & Mulder (1990), Neeleman and Weerman (1999: 210-213) or Koeneman (2000:192), ’er’ in (36b) does not qualify as an expletive subject. Nowadays, such judgements are easy to confirm by corpus searches. A Google search for the strings in (37), restricted to news sites, produced the following results. The numbers in brackets are the results for the unrestricted search.19

(37)  
a. "dat wordt gewerkt"  
that it is worked  

594 (345.000)

b. "dat er wordt gewerkt"  
that there is worked  

1780 (819.000)

c. "dat wordt gesproken over"  
that is talked about  

176 (162.900)20

d. "dat er wordt gesproken over"  
that there is talked about  

800 (312.000)

Backed by such easily reproducible results, it is safe to agree with the above-mentioned grammarians and arrive at the following generalization, which is not restricted to Germanic languages. Germanic VO languages obligatorily lexicalize a VP-external structural subject position. No such requirement holds in the Germanic OV languages. Arguably, there is no VP-external subject position in OV languages, for principled reasons (see sect. 3), because of the following structural difference.

In the SOV clause structure (38a), the head of the VP follows all of its arguments. They are allocated within the same directionality domain. In SVO, there is a mismatch (38b). One argument of the verb is not within the canonical directionality of the verbal head, namely the would-be subject. This argument gets re-assigned to the pre-VP functional subject position, which is obligatory. Expletive subjects are a reflex of the need of lexicalizing it. The arrows in

---

19 A search for the following German string on news sites produced the following results; the unrestricted search hits (Feb 21, 2017) are in brackets.

i. "dass gearbeitet wird"  
that worked is  

77 (4.780)

ii.* "dass es gearbeitet wird"  
that it worked is  

0 (7)

iii. "dass *da* gearbeitet wird"  
that there is worked  

1 (3.000)

20 Note that Dutch does not strand prepositions except for combinations of er+P°. So, the examples without ’er’ are genuine cases of subjectless clauses:

i. dat wordt gesproken over een nieuwe crisis  
that is talked about a new crisis  

ii. de eerste keer dat wordt gesproken over een fusie  
the first time that is talked about a fusion
(38) indicate the directional licensing requirement that holds between a head and its dependents; see section 3; for sufficient details, you may want to consult Haider (2010:36; 2015:86).

(38) a. \([V_P \text{XP}_{\text{Subj}} \leftarrow [V' \text{ZP} \leftarrow V^0]]\)
   b. \([F_P \text{XP}_{F} \leftarrow [F' F^0 \rightarrow [V^0 \rightarrow \text{ZP}]]]\)

If, as in the case of Icelandic, a non-nominative DP may occur in the VP-external subject position, viz. the position of XP in (38b), it gains the subject properties that are correlated with this position (Thraínsson 2007:161-165). Typical instances involve verbs whose highest-ranking argument in the argument structure is a dative (39a). Passive is another source for an argument structures in which a dative argument is ranked higher than the derived nominative candidate (39b).

(39) a. Öllum líkar þessi forseti. Ic. (Thraínsson 2007:258)
   everybody-DAT-PL likes-3-SG president-DEF-NOM-SG
   b. Hafa hemni verið sendir peningarnir? (Thraínsson 2007:162)
   have-PL her-DAT been sent-NOM-PL-m money-DEF-NOM-PL-m
   ‘Has the money been sent to her?’

In (39b), passive turns the direct object into nominative in situ. This shows that nominative assignment is not restricted to the VP-external subject position. The dative argument as the highest ranking argument is placed into the XP position of (38b).

In German, the closest OV-counterpart of Icelandic, the relative order of arguments is the same as in Icelandic, but the preceding dative does not acquire any unequivocal subject properties. (40a) illustrates verbs with a Dative-Nominative base order. (40b) shows that the passive nominative stays in situ, which is confirmed by VP-topicalization (40c).

(40) a. dass Journalisten dieser Präsident gefällt/missfällt Ge.
   that journalists-DAT this president-NOM pleases/displeases
   b. dass dem Angestellten das Geld überwiesen wurde
   that the employee-DAT the money-NOM sent was
   c. [Gelder überwiesen]VP wurden dem Angestellten.
   money-NOM-PL transferred were-PL the employee-DAT

The grammatical contrast between Icelandic and German with respect to non-nominative subjects is an immediate collateral effect of the OV- vs. VO-based clause structure. Only in the VO-clause structure (38b), there is a VP-external structural subject position which awards subject properties to any phrase in this position.  

3. Coming to a theoretical end

What are the regulating grammatical principles responsible for the contrasting patterns reviewed above? The first subset - 2.1 to 2.3 - merely reflects the directional implementation of the head-dependent relation. Any dependent element of the head has to appear in the canonical direction. Therefore, in the base order, nominal objects, particles, resultatives, and

---

21 Even English displays specimens of non-nominative subjects. The absence of do-support in locative-inversion constructions such as (ii) indicates that the PP 'into the valley' occupies the structural position of the XP in (38b).
   i. Into the valley of death rode the six hundred - The six hundred rode into the valley of death.
   ii. Into which valley rode the six hundred? - Into which valley did the six hundred ride?
dependent verbal projections either precede (OV) or follow (VO) the verbal head they depend on.

The second subset - 2.4 to 2.6 plus 2.8 - is the challenging set for any theoretical modelling. Why should these properties cluster in correlation with the canonical head-complement order? Space limitations forbid a broader discussion. Here is a directionality-based account of licensing based on Haider (2010, 2013, 2015, in press). This account covers the compactness properties of head-initial structures as well as the mandatory raising of a subject to the VP-external structural subject position in SVO languages. The theoretical core assumptions are as follows (Haider 2010:26; 2013:3f.).

(41) a. Projection lines are universally right-branching and endocentric.
    b. A dependent phrase is licensed in the canonical direction.
    c. The position of a dependent phrase P is licensed =Def. a (projection of the) phrase head h and P minimally and mutually c-command each other.

It is the minimal & mutual c-command condition (41c) that is directly causal for compactness, scrambling, and the need of a functional subject position in VO. In order to directionally license YP in (42b), the verb must be re-instantiated. Note that the empty verb position between YP and ZP is a position for a stranded particle. The resulting shell structure is compact (42c), because of the minimality condition (41c). Any intervening item, be it an adjunct or a scrambled object, would destroy the minimality requirement of the licensing relation (41c).

(42) a. … [YP [v·V° → ZP]vP
    b. … [Vi ↦ [YP [v·ei → ZP]]]
    c. … [Vi → [(*π) [YP [(π) [v·ei → ZP]]]]]

In OV, the situation is different because the canonical directionality of licensing is congruent with the directionality of merger (43). Hence not only the head but any projection node on the projection line can serve as a licensing node. As a consequence, interveners do not matter. This opens rooms for VP-internal adverbs and for scrambled objects.

(43) a. … […] [YP ↦ [v·ZP ↦ V°]]
    b. … […] [YP ↦ [v·π ↦ [v·ZP ↦ V°]]]]

The hallmark of SVO languages is the VP-external functional subject position. In SVO, the highest argument in the VP is not in the directionality domain of the verbal head. Neither the verb nor a projection node can provide directional licensing. Therefore, a functional head has to do it. The mutual c-command condition (41c) is the trigger for raising the subject to the spec position. The functional head c-commands the position of the trace of the subject, and the raised subject c-commands the functional head, so mutual c-command is effected.

The adjacency effect of adjuncts on the left side of a head-initial phrase is directionality-triggered, too. A pre-VP adjunct is not directionally licensed in VO since the canonical directionality of the verbal head in VO is to the right. Pre-NP attributes are not licensed directionally since in any Germanic language, NPs are head-initial, that is, N° licenses to the right. In OV Germanic, on the other hand, the pre-head adjuncts of VPs and APs are within the licensing domain of either the verbal head or the adjectival head or its projection. Adjuncts that

22 In other words, the direction of merger within a phrase is universally to the left.
are not canonically licensed by the head of the host phrase must be 'properly attached', which entails that each node on the projection line of the adjoined phrase is adjacent to the host phrase (see Haider (in press)). The result is an overall adjacency effect.

The final property – verb clustering in OV – is an indirect effect of directionality. In OV, embedding by VP-stacking in the canonical direction would result in central embedding, which is strongly disfavoured by any parser (44a). Grammars are parser friendly. Clustering opens an alternative way of structuring and reduces the unbounded domain of unwanted left-branching structures to a local domain of clustered verbs (44b). Even in this domain, left-branching structures tend to get reordered into right-branching ones (44c). In VO (44d), the stacked VPs yield a right-branching structure right away, which does not pose the parsing problems the unpredictable number of opening brackets in (44a) would create.

(44) a.*... [VP [VP [VP XP V₃] V₂] V₁]
   b. ... [VP XP [[V₃ V₂]V° V₁]V°-cluster] e.g. Frisian, German
   c. ... [VP XP [V₁ [V₂ V₃]V°]V°-cluster] e.g. Dutch
   d. ... [VP V₁ [VP V₂ [VP V₃ XP]]] e.g. English

In sum, the set of contrasting grammatical properties between OV and VO can be reduced to a single major factor, namely the directionality of the head within a universally right-branching phrasal architecture.
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