What do you know, if you know that a language has ‘Object Verb’ (OV) structure rather than ‘Verb Object’ (VO)? Answering this question and many others, this book provides an essential guide to the syntactic structure of German. It examines the systematic differences between German and English, which follow from this basic difference in sentence structure, and presents the main results of syntactic research on German. Topics covered include the strict word order in VO vs word order variation in OV, verb clustering, clause union effects, obligatory functional subject position, and subject–object asymmetries for extractions. Through this, a cross-model and cross-linguistic comparison evolves, highlighting the immediate implications for non-Germanic OV languages, and creating a detailed and comprehensive description of the syntactic differences that immediately follow from an OV type in contrast with a VO type like English. It will be of value to all those interested in syntax and Germanic languages.
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In general we look for a new law by the following process. First we guess it. Then we compute the consequences of the guess to see what would be implied if this law that we guessed is right. Then we compare the result of the computation to nature, with experiment or experience, compare it directly with observation, to see if it works. If it disagrees with experiment it is wrong. In that simple statement is the key to science. 

*It does not make any difference how beautiful your guess is. It does not make any difference how smart you are, who made the guess, or what his name is – if it disagrees with experiment it is wrong.*  

Richard Feynman, from a lecture he gave in 1964

What you read, when you read this book, is inspired by the desire to live up to Feynman’s standard in the field of grammar research. (Un)fortunately, this very desire made it inevitable for me to leave the well-trodden mainstream paths more often than not, for a simple reason. The paths lead to reasonable accounts for VO languages, but to questionable analyses of OV languages. I must admit though that I am not sure whether I have put to test my own pet ideas as squarely as I dealt with most of the competing hypotheses. Falsification is just labour, creativity is gift. You will have to find out.

Here is the point of departure: German is a verb-final Germanic language. Germanic languages are V-‘movement’ languages. This means that in a declarative clause, the finite verb is placed at a position following a single, clause-initial constituent. This is the syntactic hallmark of Germanic languages, viz. the so-called verb second property. These two properties – the head-final VP and the ‘movability’ of (finite) verbs – are the core properties that trigger a cascade of implications within a universal grammar framework. It is the major concern of this book to demonstrate in detail how this minimal set of initial conditions is sufficient for a deeper understanding of the major syntactic properties not only of German and its Germanic kin, but also of the systematic contrasts between an OV organisation of sentence structure vis-à-vis a VO organization of sentence structure.
The background understanding of universal grammar (UG) in the domain of syntax endorsed here is this: UG is the mental instantiation of a system of principles and properties that constitutes and guides (the acquisition of) a uniquely human mental capacity, viz. the language faculty. This capacity enables us to efficiently and effectively compute the string-to-structure mapping, and conversely, the structure-to-string mapping in language processing.

Syntax is (in part) an algorithm that projects at least two-dimensional structures on one-dimensional arrays of terminals and compresses two-dimensional structures to one-dimensional strings of terminals. It thereby bridges a dimension gap. It enables the mapping of the one-dimensional representations (strings) of phonetic/phonological structure to the at least two-dimensional hierarchical box-in-box structure of semantic representations, back and forth. The dimension mismatch is an unavoidable consequence of the respective interfaces. Sound structures are organized along the time axis (linear organisation), conceptual representations are timeless, hierarchically organized complex structures (hierarchical, box-in-box organisation).

You should be aware that it is the persuasion of the author that the cognitive capacities underlying the grammar faculty are characterized best in terms of capacities for computing syntactic patterns (as a complex ‘geometric’ capacity, that is, as pattern matching capacity) rather than in terms of computing syntactic derivations (as a complex ‘algebraic’ capacity, that is, pattern construction and derivation capacity). A theory of UG may justly be formulated in terms of principles and rules, but the mentally implemented (core) grammar of a given language as the model of the linguistic capacities of the speaker/listener is not a derivational machinery for tree structures; it is a pattern matching capacity.

This conviction is bolstered by findings in other cognitive domains. Human vision is the solution for a dimension management problem, too. Three-dimensional relations must be reliably projected (i.e. mentally reconstructed) from two-dimensional retinal reception patterns (Hoffmann 1998). The UG of vision as a system of rules and principles for 3D-projections is not the blueprint for a derivational system. It characterizes a system that is applied instantaneously, not sequentially.

Be that as it may, the general approach in this book is a representational, and not a derivational, one. A convergent syntactic representation for an array of terminal elements is seen as nothing else but the well-formed syntactic structure of the given array, and not, in addition, as the endpoint of a cascade of derivations (that are even taken to bifurcate into a spell-out structure and a hidden post-spell-out representation). Derivational terminology (e.g. ‘movement’) is used without restraint, though, in this book, just for expository and familiarity reasons, without ontological commitments.
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The agreed objective for me as a contributor to the Cambridge Syntax Guides series has been to produce a comprehensive survey of German syntax while keeping a low profile on the technical apparatus, but nevertheless following a theory-inspired road map. The focus will be on data and argumentation at a primarily descriptive level. If you nevertheless come to think that there are still too many technical details in some chapter, and not enough data in another, blame it on the author.
Any substantive piece of work of a researcher is much like a mushroom. It looks like an individually grown thing, but in fact it is just the surface appearance of the activity of a huge underground mycelium which the researcher is but a part of. By the way, mycelia love trees, and so do some syntacticians.

It is impossible for me to figure out a complete inventory of all my influential co-mycelians. So I apologize to those who fed my mushroom but have fallen victim to my mediocre source memory. After all, my concern with OV and VO took shape in the early nineties, presented first at the 1991 Utrecht conference, whose proceedings took their time (Haider 1992, in Coopmans, Everaert and Grimshaw 2000).
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My reminiscence gratefully retrieves that valuable input came from the audiences that were willing to pay attention to my ideas. Thanks to the syntax class at the 2002 DGfS summer school in Düsseldorf and to Dieter Stein for inviting me. Thanks to the 2004 syntax seminar group at U.Mass, Amherst, and to Ellen Woolford, Lisa Selkirk and Angelika Kratzer for the invitation to South College. Thanks to Masayuki Oishi for providing me with an interested audience in the syntax seminar at Sendai’s Tohoku Gakuin in 2005.

Marga Reis and Gisbert Fanselow invested time and effort in reading (parts of) an earlier version and not only pointed out deficits and problems but supplied highly valuable suggestions, due scepticism and welcome encouragement. My special gratitude goes to them. Whatever blunders are still lurking for you in the present version are to be exclusively blamed on the author, of course.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>absolute cartography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANS</td>
<td><em>Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst</em> ('grammar of standard Dutch'); abbreviation for the title of Geerts et al. (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB</td>
<td>arbitrary (PRO\textsubscript{ARB})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC</td>
<td>basic branching constraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Burzio's generalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>copy construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CED</td>
<td>condition on extraction domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>convergent structuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUS</td>
<td>clause union syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>direct object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>exceptional case marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECP</td>
<td>Empty Category Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>extended projection principle $=_{\text{def}}$ ‘clauses have subjects’ (Chomsky 1982: 9–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>focus fronting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>finite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRANS</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPP</td>
<td><em>infinitivus pro participio</em>, Latin for ‘infinitive instead of participle’, in German: <em>Ersatzinfinitiv</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>information structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>left-dislocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>logical form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LFG Lexical Functional Grammar
LOC locative
MAC minimal argument complex
masc masculine
MLC Minimal Link Condition
neut neutrum, neuter
NOM nominative
OBJ object
OV type of language with head-final VP, that is, ‘object–verb’ order
P&P Principles & Parameter Model (Chomsky 1981)
Part Participle
PASS passive
PDI Principle of Directional Identification
PF phonetic form
pg parasitic gap
PRO silent subject in clausal infinitival constructions
PRT particle
REFL reflexive
SUBJ subject
TP tense phrase
TRANS transitive
UG Universal Grammar
VC verb cluster
VO type of language with head-initial VP, that is, ‘verb–object’ order
WC was (what) construction
XP phrase of an arbitrary category (x serves as a variable for the head category)
< Read ‘A < B’ as ‘A precedes B’