



position of Neg, which may then raise to clause-initial C, usually for negative commands. I was able to find one instance of negation collocated with a verbal auxiliary complex:

- (3) *teṃ yiknesa weweñu mā tākaṃ*  
 this way spoken not be.3SG.SUBJ  
 “(If) he has not spoken in this way” (331b3/4<sup>L</sup>)

Note that the negation appears precisely between the participle and the copula. With our posited right-headed TP domain, we would expect a right-headed NegP to be located between the TP and vP layers, and that’s exactly where we find it.

Looking elsewhere in ancient Indo-European, it appears that the story is much the same. For Sanskrit, Hock (1984) notes that 97% of Vedic prose texts are verb-final, compared to 65% of poetic texts. The periphrastic constructions we see appearing in later Vedic constitute further evidence for right-headedness within TP, as the auxiliaries appear overwhelmingly clause-finally, after the participle. In Latin too, auxiliaries usually follow their participles. Finally, according to Taylor (1994), Homeric Greek is primarily OV, and, per Bentein (2012), the oldest periphrastic constructions are auxiliary-final as well. And, in addition to all this evidence for right-headedness in TP, all of these languages also show the wh-question movement, second position clitic behavior, and initial complementizers in embedded CPs that provide evidence for left-headedness in CP.

I argue, based on my Tocharian data and the other old IE language data, that left-headedness in CP and right-headedness in TP should be reconstructed for PIE, and that this clause structure was inherited by all of the earliest-attested IE daughter languages. Given the thousands of years that separate these languages from each other, the similarity of their overall clause structures is too remarkable to be chance; not to mention the fact that *not* reconstructing left-C and right-T for PIE would require multiple parallel innovations instead. Further, although these functional categories were disharmonic, at no stage of development did a right-headed projection dominate a left-headed one. As a result, I note also that the Final-Over-Final Constraint (Holmberg 2000), which states that a right-headed projection may not dominate a left-headed one, is indeed borne out within the oldest IE languages both synchronically by the data and diachronically by reconstruction, as predicted by Biberauer *et al.* (2014).

## References

- A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts*. <http://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/>. Retrieved: April 11, 2017.
- Adams, Douglas Q. 2015. *Tocharian B: a Grammar of Syntax and Word-formation*. Inst. für Sprachen und Literaturen der Univ. Innsbruck, Bereich Sprachwiss.
- Biberauer, Theresa, Holmberg, Anders, & Roberts, Ian. 2014. A syntactic universal and its consequences. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 45(2), 169–225.
- Bresnan, Joan W. 1972. *Theory of complementation in English syntax*. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2000. Deriving OV order in Finnish. *The Derivation of VO and OV*, 123–152.
- Lehmann, Winfred Philipp. 1974. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. University of Texas Press.
- Sideltsev, Andrej. 2014. Wh-in-situ in Hittite. *Pages 199–222 of: Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters. Proceedings of the International Conference Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters*.
- Weiss, Michael. in press. Tocharian and the West. *Andreas Opferrman (ed.) Festschrift for Gerhard Meiser*.