

inadequate generalisation (e.g. Philip 2013). However, these accounts cannot explain the various patterns that follow from FOFC (such as the universal ban on inflected head-final auxiliaries in VO languages), even though not all patterns do so.

IV. In this paper we argue that the existence of certain FOFC-patterns as well as their apparent counterexamples are actually predicted once Abels & Neeleman's account of linearization (partly based on Cinque 1996 and Ackema & Neeleman 2002) is generalized. Abels & Neeleman argue that complements can either be linearized before or after the head, but that movement outside a particular phrase must always be leftward. Concretely, we take this to imply that FOFC-violating word orders as in (1a) are grammatical, *unless G is a potential movement target*, which follows directly from the ban on rightward movement. Being a potential movement target means that G may contain material that is raised into this position, but it does not always have to. Only in languages where no material at all can move into G, is (1a) a possible linearization pattern. Under this explanation, the presented evidence in favour of FOFC (such as the ban on V-O-Aux_{infl} and the absence of V-O-C orders) as well as its counterexamples (involving particles) and its restriction to extended projections, follow directly.

The ban on V-O-Aux_{infl} follows straightforwardly from the standard assumption that inflectional elements are required to be adjacent to their host at PF (known as the *Stray-affix-filter*, cf. Lasnik 1981, 1995, Baker 1988). This means that in [Aux [V O]] and [Aux [O V]] orders the verb undergoes leftward movement into Aux^o, where it adjoins to the inflectional affix (and if the inflectional affixes are prefixes, in [Aux [V O]] constructions, head movement might even be absent). In [[O V] Aux], constructions, the verb is already in the correct position, so no verb movement is required to make the derivation converge at PF. So, the three orders, [Aux [V O]], [Aux [O V]] and [[O-V] Aux] are all predicted to be possible orders. However, the order [[V O] Aux] cannot be derived. The reason is that in order to have the verb adjoined to the affix, the verb has to undergo rightward movement into Aux^o, which is a forbidden operation. Hence our proposal correctly derives the absence of [[V O] Aux] orders.

As for the ban on [[V O] C] orders, in languages with overt complementizers, the C-position is restricted to complementizers in subordinate clauses only. In main clauses it remains available as a target for verbal or other movement, e.g. in the formation of questions (or imperatives). Hence, if a VO-language had a clause-final C head, questions (or imperatives) would require rightward V-C movement, which would again be forbidden. Hence the absence of [[V O] C] orders is explained as well. Naturally, the other orders [C [V O]], [C [O V]], and [[O V] C] are possible; the first two might require leftward verbal movement, the third one no movement at all, since V and C already end up string-adjacent at PF.

However, one may argue that in languages where verbs remain in situ and don't undergo movement the explanation above does not hold. That is indeed the case, but observe that in languages where questions are not marked by verbal movement, separate questions particles appear in C in order to mark the sentence for being an interrogative. Hence, in such a language, [[VO] C] orders can only exist if C hosts a morpho-phonologically independent particle. But these constructions are indeed known counterexamples to FOFC, as the example in (2) from Mandarin shows: in languages where C is occupied by a *particle* and where verb movement is not triggered, FOFC is not valid, a problematic counterexample for previous FOFC-explanations, but a straightforward prediction by our proposal.

Finally, note that the restriction of FOFC to extended projections immediately follows as well. As functional or lexical heads never raise out of extended projections, our explanation predicts that FOFC-effects may only occur within an extended projection.