



not always have to. Only in languages where no material at all can move into G, is (1a) a possible linearization pattern. The presented evidence in favour of FOFC, such as the ban on V-O-Aux<sub>infl</sub> and the absence of V-O-C orders follow directly; the ban on V-O-Aux<sub>infl</sub> follows straightforwardly from the standard assumption that inflectional elements are required to be adjacent to their host at PF. In V-O-Aux<sub>infl</sub> constructions, this can only be derived by rightward movement of the auxiliary into the position where the agreement is realized, and therefore these constructions must be ruled out. Similarly, 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. (Note that in languages where C can be occupied by a *particle* and where verb movement is not triggered, FOFC is not valid). At the same time, the counterexamples of FOFC are predicted as well: particles, by definition, are independent elements that do not trigger any verbal or other element to attach to them. Consequently, they can occupy head positions that are never the target of any instance of head movement, and are thus not subject to the FOFC generalisation in (1). Finally, the restriction of FOFC to extended projections immediately follows, as heads never raise out of them.

**V.** However, apart from getting the distribution of FOFC configurations correct, our proposal also predicts the more general ban on the (almost) universal left-ness of specifiers. For example, whereas the distribution between VO and OV orders is almost 50-50, only very few languages (less than 3%) are VOS or VSO languages (cf. Dryer 2011). Such languages are generally analysed as either V- or VP-fronting languages (cf. Massam 2002, Coon 2010), suggesting that no language has underived orders with sentence-final subjects. Apart from the LCA, which trivially derives spec-initial orders, no other account in the functional or the formal literature has been able to derive this. However, if one inspects the behaviour of specifiers more closely, it turns out that they all share two properties: first, their presence is obligatory; second, they must immediately c-command the merger of the head and its complement (i.e. they must be (re)merged immediately after the head has been merged). Both properties follow once the presence of the specifier needs to fulfil a featural need of the head. Under standard Chomskyan Agree this is guaranteed by assigning a probing head an EPP-feature that makes some lower XP immediately raise when it Agrees with this head. Other Agree-frameworks yield the same result (e.g. Boskovic 2007, Zeijlstra 2012). However, if the obligatory presence of specifiers and the fact that they must immediately c-command the merger of their head and its complement follow from the fact that they have to *raise* into this specifier position, the fact that they always appear in front of their head (unless any of the two undergoes subsequent movement) follows directly from the ban on rightward movement. The claim that specifiers always raise into some position has been well attested for subjects (raised into Spec,TP from either vP or VP; raised into vP from VP in cases of unaccusatives or passives), *wh*-elements (raised into Spec,CP) and many more. By contrast, any phrasal element that may optionally or not immediately merge with the merger of a head and its complement does not have to be a raised element and can therefore be base-generated in this position. Consequently, no universal constraints on their word order position apply. Such elements, which go by the name of adjuncts, are indeed known to have a freer distribution and may easily appear to the right of their sister.

**VI.** To conclude, two important and well-known left-right asymmetries in natural language (FOFC, to the extent that it applies, and the ban on rightward specifiers) follow directly as a result of the ban on rightward movement. As a consequence, they no longer form an argument to adopt the LCA as a linguistic axiom. In fact, given that any explanation of FOFC in terms of the LCA is both empirically and theoretically flawed, this alternative to the LCA fares better and thus forms a strong argument against the LCA.