

understanding of the semantic type(s) of the constituents they combine with could deliver the required ordering and interpretation *without* the extra Cinquean functional heads (see e.g. Ernst 2002 for such an attempt). In this paper we present a concrete analysis of English auxiliary ordering that is designed specifically to motivate a particular CFH for the verbal extended projection, and show how the richer ordering evidence from Cinque can nevertheless be reconciled with it.

3 Ontology and Category. The CFH, we argue, has its basis in a semantic ontology of ‘sorts’ which is finer-grained than commonly assumed. One important part of this is a three-way distinction among events, situations, and propositions, building on work by Kratzer, Giorgi & Pianesi, Hacquard, and others in our theory of the semantics of the clause. The semantic ontology, we argue, has its roots in turn in extralinguistic cognition. Language constructs categories which are compatible with this extralinguistic component in their organization, for example a VP is an event description, a TP is a situation description, and a CP is a proposition, and as a result of the containment relation among those entities, $C > T > V$.

Consider in the light of our English example given in (1) above which exemplifies $\text{Epist} > \text{Perf} > \text{Prog} > \text{Pass}$. Epist [emic modality] must dominate the others because it is only defined at the propositional level. Perf [ective aspect] must be in the situational domain, below the propositional domain, because it involves temporal precedence, only statable at the level of the situation, according to our assumptions (as motivated by Barwise & Perry and other previous work). Prog [ressive aspect] could in principle be part of the situational or eventive domain, depending on whether it is essentially an aspect or essentially an Aktionsart. We show that in English, it interacts with event semantics, and hence must be in the VP-domain, below Perf . Pass [ive] involves argument structure, and hence is also clearly part of the VP.

A certain subset of ordering properties is built on this substrate. However, elements within the same sortal domain can be shown to exhibit ordering flexibilities with attendant semantic differences which can be attributed to scope. We analyze examples of adverbial ordering which we argue feed off the rigidity of sortal embedding, and contrast them with other cases where adverbial ordering flexibilities derive from scopal interactions within sort. Thus, for example, a manner adverb like *quickly* names an attribute of an event, hence attaches at the VP level, while an aspectual adverb like *already* is part of a description of a situation and hence can only attach at the TP level. This captures and in fact derives the basic intuition behind the category-based orderings discussed by Jackendoff, McConnell-Ginet, and Ernst, among others.

The finer-grained orderings seen in the RFH are captured in this model without the need to postulate as many semantic categories as there are positions in the RFH; in other words the RFH has a distinct source from the CFH. We show that the positions in the RFH are not as universal as they have been made out to be. Some of the orderings of the RFH are due to scope or polarity, as mentioned above, and others we ascribe to selection. We argue that category selection is part of how language organizes categories, with the effect that essentially functional considerations may lead to rigid language-specific orders (along the lines discussed by Horn 1989 for modals and negation).

3 Consequences. The reconciliation that we propose of Chomsky’s MUG with Cinque’s RFH has important consequences. Work which adheres closely to the Minimalist C-T-*v*-V template for the clause can explain only a tiny part of the observed hierarchy, e.g. $\{\text{Epist}, \text{Perf}\} > \{\text{Prog}, \text{Pass}\}$ (by $C > v$); Chomsky argues that all syntactically relevant features come from the phase heads and are distributed within the phases by Inheritance. There is no motivation for ordering within either of the two phasal domains. Cartographic work, on the other hand, places no limits on the stipulated hierarchy but cannot provide a phylogenetic source for it. By distinguishing CFH from RFH, our compromise retains the austere and conceptually attractive MUG assumption without forcing us to say that most of grammar is a matter of ‘externalization’ or ‘usage’ or simply relegating it to unspecified ‘interface conditions.’