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0. Introduction.

In *A Typology of African Languages*, Heine (1976) proposes a new word order category (B) intermediate to ‘purer’ SVO (A) and SOV (D) language types. Givón (1979) criticizes this since it could be “repeated ad infinitum” (p. 200). He proposes instead that the mixed word order qualities Heine accounts for are the results of common historical word order changes, i.e., that these languages were changing from SOV to SVO word order. This is not an extraordinary idea since all synchronic states arc the results of diachronic processes. There are problems with Givón's solution, however, not the least of which is that he sidesteps problems of synchrony by switching to a diachronic perspective. The suggestion that a ‘messy’ language is in transition between two ‘neater’ states may reflect analysts’ need for tidiness more than it reflects detailed observations of language. We also don’t know how long these ‘transitional states’ last, as shown by Jepson (1991), who claims that the word order correlates of Mandarin, another mixed word order language, have remained relatively stable for over 2,000 years. In this paper, I describe a language’s mixed word order characteristics both synchronically and diachronically. The diachronic approach is conventional, but problematic. The synchronic description is novel and simple. This description is an alternative to working with notions such as ‘underlying’ or ‘basic’ word order or stopping, as Givón does, at a diachronic solution.

In Section 1, I describe the mixed word order qualities of Logbara, a Nilo-Saharan language spoken in NE Uganda. In Section 2, I lay out arguments one could make to support the notion that Logbara is undergoing a change from SOV to SVO word order. Finally, in Section 3, I describe the patterns of word order with a simple rule which may be phrased diachronically or synchronically.

All sentences and translations are taken from Crazzolara (1960). Glosses are taken from Weber (1994). Citations refer to Crazzolara’s grammar, and appear in the following format: (page; section.example).

1. Mixed word order in Logbara.

In this section, three kinds of mixed word order are described. The first is the presence of typological correlates of both VO and OV languages. The second is the varying word order between two elements, the object and verb, the genitive and noun, and the clause and subordinator. The third is phrases and clauses which are combinations of OV and VO correlates, some of which are universally ‘dispreferred’ constructions. These include some of the genitive constructions, the comparative construction, and the relative clause.

---

* I gratefully acknowledge the many discussions with and comments from Matthew Dryer and Karin Michelson over the last few years about this and related matters. Thanks also to Patsy Fox and Madeleine Mathiot for their helpful comments on my oral presentation prior to MALC ’94.
1.1 Typological correlates of OV and VO languages in Logbara.

Logbara attests an almost equal number of characteristics typologically correlated with VO and OV languages, with representatives of strong correlates on each side (e.g., Adj + Standard with VO languages, and postpositions with OV languages). These are are listed in Table 1 below. Some elements, such as object and verb, occur in both possible orders. These are described in the following Section 1.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OV</th>
<th>VO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N + Postposition</td>
<td>Adv Subordinator + Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Clause + RC Marker</td>
<td>Verb + Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Comparison + Marker</td>
<td>Noun + Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Verbal Pred + Copula Suffix</td>
<td>V + PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S + Q particle</td>
<td>V + VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause + Adv Subordinator</td>
<td>Noun + Relative Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object + Verb</td>
<td>Adj + Standard of Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen + Noun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP + V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. OV and VO Correlates of Logbara

Examples demonstrating each correlate are given below in (1) - (14).

*N + Postposition*

(1) ndzo mòmbë b r sùkùlù-á 'dàlì ran.away mango with school-LOC there

he ran away to school with a mango (116;500.42)

*Relative Clause + RC Marker*

(2) ‘bá [sù-ípí ni ti fǔ-zò ní] ‘dà person chief-SUBJ cow give-REL.OBL ATTR that

Noun Relative Clause Marker

that is the man to whom the chief gave a cow (60;268.172)

*Standard of Comparison + Marker*

(3) mvá ‘dë ovo mòkë mvá ‘dà li kò child DEM be good child DEM similar NEG

Adj St Comp Marker

this child is not as good/nice as that one (35;159.76)
**Non-Verb Predicate + Copula Suffix**

(4) 'bá 'dá mā bongó ská-rō
man that GEN cloth red-PRED

*Adjective-Copula Suffix*

that man’s cloth is red (67;302.1)

**Sentence + Question Particle**

(5) e sī wárágà de mā yā?
2SG write letter finish AFFIRM Q
Sentence Question Particle

have you finished writing the letter? (83;372.100)

**Clause + Adverbial Subordinator**

(6) ḵkō 'dá fō a’yàrō,
woman DEM become jealousy-PRED
the woman became jealous,

či-nū ámvá 'a-zō ʾri vélé kō n sī
3PL-SUBJ field till-PURP 3SG place.POSS NEG ATTR because
Clause

as they (her man) did not till her field (110;480.108)

**Adverbial Subordinator + Clause**

(7) kānī e st tábā kō, mī ʾle a’dó-mi?
COND 2SG pull tobacco NEG 2SG buy what-FOC
Adv Sub Clause

if you do not smoke tobacco, what do you buy it for? (106;466.62)

**Object + Verb (see also #2 and #14)**

(8) či mōnlō st ʾndrī tāāwī sī
3PL ox give.IM goat five for
Object Verb

they give an ox for five goats (80;361.61)

**Verb + Object**

(9) ā dzi wárágà ‘dārī ᵀpī vō
1SG take letter that chief to
Verb Object

I have taken that letter to the chief (83;372.99)

**Genitive + Noun**

(10) ᵀpī mā mva
chief GEN child
Genitive Noun

the chief’s child (20;95)
To sum, Logbara attests word orders strongly correlated with both VO and OV languages, as well as both possible orders for some elements. The latter are discussed in the following Section 1.2. In Section 1.3, I discuss phrases which contain combinations of OV and VO word orders.

1.2 Varying word order between elements.

This section describes the distribution of the order of object and verb, genitive and noun, and clause and adverbial subordinators. Distributions vary according to clause type, aspectual category and the particular morphemes.

Object and verb. The order of object and verb varies according to aspect, phrase and clause type. The distribution of the two orders is listed in Table 2, on the next page.
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Table 2. Order of Object and Verb in Logbara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb + Object</th>
<th>Object + Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfective Aspect declarative and conditional clauses</td>
<td>Imperfective Aspect declarative and conditional clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative declaratives</td>
<td>Dependant VP's:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Following a 'main' verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperatives</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortatives</td>
<td>Gerundive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP's in relative clauses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only declarative and conditional clauses exhibit aspectual distinction; other clause types do not. Declarative and conditional clauses in Perfective Aspect occur in the order Verb + Object. Examples of a declarative and a conditional clause in the unmarked Perfective Aspect are given in (9) and (7) above, respectively. Other clause types, questions, negative declaratives, imperatives and hortatives, do not attest an aspectual contrast, and occur only in Verb + Object order. An example of a question is given in (5) above. Examples of other clause types are given in (15) - (17) below.

(15) fe ndri 'bä azni kö
give goat person some NEG
Verb Object
he did not give a goat to anybody (66;298.275)

(16) mï e'da tï-ï póstá mà dz5, f5!
2SG show 3SG-to Post GEN hut please
Verb Object
please show him the Post Office! (119;511.115)

(17) drä mà sô mï rä!
death HORT overtake 2SG AFFIRM
Verb Object
may death come upon you! (curse) (90;404.178)

Compared to the Perfective Aspect, the Imperfective Aspect is formally and distributionally marked in Logbara. The verb undergoes tonal changes and the subject occurs in obligatorily longer forms. Examples of a declarative and a conditional clause in the Imperfective Aspect is given in (8) above, and below in (18), respectively. The object precedes the verb in these clauses.

(18) è kà 'tí gbà rä, ëri mu cvö mákë tõ
2SG if this strike.IM AFFIRM 3SG go stay nice very
Object Verb
if you strike this (typewriter key), it (script) will come out very nicely (105;464.55)

Object + Verb is also the order for dependant verb phrases which occur after a 'main' verb. The 'main' verb may be a verb which contributes tense or aspectual information as in (19) below or a verb contributing lexical meaning such as motion or desire, as in (14) above.
Dependant verb phrases which occur with gerundive or purposive suffixes also occur in the Object + Verb order, as in (20) and (21) below.

(20) à 1i mì dri pàti li-rūa
1SG cut 1SG.POSS hand wood cut-GER
Object Verb
I cut my hand/finger while cutting wood (146;576.80)

(21) 'ba ći azī nga tdri-zū
person 3PL rise work live-PURP
Object Verb
people work for a living (111;482.129)

Finally, verb phrases in relative clauses occur in the order Object + Verb, as in (2) above.

Genitive and noun. The order of genitive and noun varies according to the way in which their relation is expressed and according to which postposition is used. There are three ways to indicate a genitive relation between two nouns in Logbara. These are juxtaposition, the use of possessive pronouns, and the use of postpositions. Four postpositions are used to express genitive relations. The distribution of the two orders of genitive and noun are given in Table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Genitive + Noun</th>
<th>Noun + Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressed</td>
<td>Juxtaposition</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via</td>
<td>Possessive Pronoun</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pronoun + low tone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postpositions:</td>
<td>Postpositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mà</td>
<td>dri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vēlē</td>
<td>vēlē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'nī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Order of Genitives in Logbara

When two nouns in a genitive relation are juxtaposed, the order is Gen N, as in (22) below.

(22) àma apī andzi (-nī or 'ī)
1PL chief children (FOC)
Genitive Noun
we are children of the chief (44;189.15)

Similarly, possessive pronouns which are personal pronouns with a final low tone precede the noun, as in (23) below.
The order for genitive nouns when their case is marked by a postposition varies according to which postposition is used. When marked by the postposition *má*, the order is Gen N, as in (10), repeated below.

(10) apí má mvá
    chief GEN child
    Genitive Noun
    the chief's child (20;95)

The genitive postposition *vé* occurs in genitive noun phrases of both orders, Gen N and N Gen, as seen in (24) and (24') below.

(24a) 'dî má  ámbi vé dzó-nil 'i
    this 1SG.POSS father GEN hut-ATTR-FOC
    Genitive Noun
    this is my father's hut (20;96.1)

(24b) 'dî dzó má ámbi vé dzó
    this hut 1SG.POSS father GEN
    Noun Genitive
    this is my father's hut (20;96.1)

The other two postpositions used to indicate a noun is genitive, *drí* and *ñi* occur in the order N Gen as in (25) below and (11), repeated below.

(25) kání 'du àfá 'bá àžídrí dí rá
    COND take thing person some GEN AFFIRM
    Noun Genitive
    if someone has taken away somebody's things ... (23;113.22)

(11) bōngó ('dî) mvá 'dî nù
    cloth (DEM) child this GEN
    Noun Genitive
    the cloth of this child (23;109)

Clausal subordinators. The final class of items discussed in this section are clausal subordinators. Logbara does not attest many clausal subordinators, but there is at least one example each of a clause-initial and clause-final subordinator. Whether they occur before or after the clause depends on the particular subordinator used. Logbara attests medial subordinators, but since these are not correlated with only VO or OV languages, they are not discussed.

Example (7) of a clause-initial subordinator and example (6) of a clause-final subordinator are repeated below.

1 Many of the examples Crazzolara (1960) gives of genitive noun phrases were functioning as predicates. The particle 'I is a focus particle that often occurs with non-verbal predicates.
1.3 Combinations of OV and VO correlates.

This section describes and gives examples of phrases which combine OV and VO correlates, including some genitive constructions, the relative clause, and the comparative construction.

N + N + Genitive Postposition. Some of the postpositions in Logbara which mark a noun as genitive may occur, or always occur, with a noun which follows the possessed noun. N Gen is one of two possible orders for the postposition vêlê; it is the only attested order for drî and nî. Postpositions are strongly correlated with OV languages; N Gen order is associated with VO languages. The result is a cross-linguistically rare combination since the genitive marker does not appear between the two nouns, but instead occurs after the second of the two nouns as in (24'), (25), and (11) above. This order may be cross-linguistically rare because it violates an iconic principle that a marker should occur between the two nouns whose genitive relation it denotes (Dryer, p.c.). English is an example of a language which attests both possible genitive orders, but in each case, the marker indicating a genitive relation occurs between the two nouns, as in "my mother’s house" and "the house of my mother".

N + [RC] + RC Marker (+ Postposition). Clause-final relative clause markers are correlated with OV languages. While a relative clause which precedes the noun it modifies is a strong correlate of OV languages, it is not uncommon to find postposed relative clauses in OV languages. An example of a relative clause in Logbara is given above in (2). When a noun is followed by a relative clause, and is modified by a postposition (another OV correlate) the result is a construction that may pose parsing problems. The clause in (26), below, is an example of center-embedding, which Kuno (1974) describes as a universally dispreferred phenomena.

(26) ‘bá mu [zâã, [‘bâ-nî lê dzt-ri] mà] átíí vô people go daughter.DIM people-SUBJ like.REL.OBJ marry-ATTR GEN father to Noun Relative Clause RC Marker Gen people go to the father of the girl whom they are about to marry (149;592.114)

Adjective + Standard of Comparison + Marker. In comparative constructions in Logbara, the adjective precedes the standard of comparison. This order is a correlate of VO languages. The standard of comparison, however, precedes the marker. This is a correlate of OV languages. An example of a comparative construction is given in the clause above in (3).
2. The diachronic perspective: Logbara is changing from SOV to SVO.

Table 1 above lists the following VO correlates: Verb + Object; Noun + Gen; Adv Subord + Clause; V + PP; V + VP; N + Relative Clause; and Adjective + Standard of Comparison. If one assumes Logbara's word order used to be more consistent with SOV languages, these constructions may have changed from a SOV order to the order associated with SVO languages. Note that the first three VO correlates listed above have an OV counterpart, but the last three constructions occur only in the VO order. I present arguments about each construction according to the type and strength of evidence, beginning with the most formal, empirical evidence to more theoretical rationalizations to a weak claim that a word order is not counter-evidence to my general claim. Adjective + Standard of Comparison is not discussed, due to a lack of literature.

Gen N—>N Gen. Dryer (1991) shows that Gen N is correlated with SOV languages in the world, and that in Africa, N Gen is correlated with SVO languages (there is not a universal correlation between N Gen word order and SVO languages). Logbara attests both possible genitive orders. The Gen N constructions in Logbara include the formally shortest and simplest possible (juxtaposition, and tone marking). This is also the word order for compound nouns, which Givón (1979) suggests tend to be frozen expressions which represent earlier word orders. The N Gen constructions in Logbara are longer and more complex than their Gen N counterparts. In addition, the N Gen constructions described in Section 1.3 are cross-linguistically rare combinations; if such combinations are rare, they may be unstable over time, which in turn, suggests they are relatively young (see Hawkins, 1983, for a discussion of stability, mobility and the relative age of word orders). The formal length and complexity, and the cross-linguistic rarity of the N Gen constructions suggest that they are an innovation associated with a change from OV to VO word order.

Final—>Init Adv Subordinators. Logbara attests both clause-initial and clause-final adverbial subordinators. Dryer (1992a) documents a universal preference for initial adverbial subordinators (and likens this to the cross-linguistic preference for post-nominal relative clauses). Only one of his 60 VO languages have clause-final adverbial subordinators. Thus, cross-linguistic evidence strongly suggests that if a language attests clause-final adverbial subordinators, it is or has been an OV language; conversely, an innovation of initial adverbial subordinators would not be extraordinary during a change from OV to VO word order.

OV —> VO for main verbs in main clauses. Verb phrases in Imperfective Aspect occur in OV order, and verb phrases in Perfective Aspect. Sentences which are neither conditional nor declarative occur in VO order only. Hopper and Thompson (1980) associate low transitivity with imperfective aspect. Another quality they associate with low transitivity are direct objects which are semantically non-individuated and less affected than those of higher transitivity clauses. Since imperfective verbs often denote a continuous or habitual activity, the object tends to denote part of an activity, rather than an affected argument of a verb denoting a single event. They argue that this semantic coalescence is reflected in morphosyntactic coalescence between objects and verbs in imperfective aspect. In Logbara, no morphemes occur between the direct object and its verb in Imperfective Aspect. This is not true of other verbs and objects. If there is a general rightward movement of direct objects in Logbara, Hopper and Thompson provide a motivation for the non-movement, or resistance to movement, of objects of verbs in the Imperfective Aspect.

OV in dependent verb phrases and relative clauses. Objects precede verbs in dependent verb phrases and relative clauses. Campbell (1986) examines the claim that subordinate clauses tend to reflect older word orders. He shows this is true for Finnish. Parker (1982) does the same
for German.\footnote{This notion was questioned recently by Stockwell and Minkova (1991), Jucker (1990) and earlier by Gerritsen (1979).} If it is true that subordinate clauses reflect older word orders, and we extend this to dependent verb phrases, then Logbara's OV word orders are older, and the VO word orders are innovative.

\textit{VP+V$\rightarrow$V+VP.} Using evidence from a varied sample of languages, Hock (1983), Cowan (1984), and Garber (1982) argue there is an association between a change from SOV/Aux to SAux OV and a more general change from SOV to SVO. Logbara has an SV-OV construction where the first verb functions as an auxiliary, i.e., it contributes tense or aspectual information, and so fits generally with these theorists' scenario of word order change.

\textit{PP+V$\rightarrow$V+PP.} Hyman (1975) claims that in a shift in word order from SOV to SVO, PP's are one of the likely elements to move rightward. Givón (1979) claims that in a shift from SOV to SVO, indirect objects will move rightward before direct objects move. Logbara attests few instances of PP+V and many V+PP, whereas pre-verbal direct objects are common. This distribution seems to fit with the profile Givón and Hyman give of a language changing from SOV to SVO.

\textit{RC+N$\rightarrow$N+RC.} Dryer (1992a) documents a universal preference for post-nominal relative clauses, even in OV languages. This contradicts assumptions in the word order literature that pre-nominal relative clauses are correlated with OV languages just as post-nominal relative clauses are correlated with VO languages (e.g., see Kuno, 1974). Antinucci, et al (1979) and Parker (1982) conclude that while pre-nominal relative clauses might be structurally desirable, there are perceptual reasons why post-nominal relative clauses are common in OV languages. Since post-nominal relative clauses are attested in many OV languages, the presence of a post-nominal relative clause is not counter-evidence to the claim that Logbara was earlier a more consistent OV language.

The approach in this section relies on a grab-bag of evidence, varying in type and the degree to which it adds to a convincing argument that Logbara is undergoing change from SOV to SVO word order. The suggestion for the split between GenN/NGen is supported by the principle that if something is formally shorter and simpler than a like element, it may be older. The account for the adverbial subordinators is supported by arguments of typological likeliness. Hopper and Thompson (1980) supply a theoretical/semantic perspective which motivates the split between VO and OV. Campbell (1986) and Parker (1982) give language-specific support to the notion that subordinate clauses preserve older word orders, which, if applied to Logbara, supports the argument made herein. The order N+Relative Clause, reviewed from a typological perspective, is presented as a not uncommon order in OV languages, and therefore, not counter-evidence to the main argument. Finally, the accounts given by Hock (1983) and others for the order V+VP and by Hyman (1985) for the order V+PP associate particular word orders with a general change from SOV to SVO. These arguments may be the weakest evidence for they hint of circularity. Each of these authors discuss languages with mixed word order which they describe as undergoing a transition from SOV to SVO. The word order correlates they associate with such a shift, at least some of them, are probably the same ones which caused the creation of such a hypothesis in the first place.

There is reason, then, to attempt a synchronic approach to the problem of mixed word order. Compared to the diachronic arguments given in this section, the synchronic discussion in Section 3 is brief; and simple, though it begs for psycholinguistic explanation. An obvious consideration not taken up presently is the relationship between synchronic and diachronic approaches. Is one more compelling than the other? Are they compatible alternatives? I do not
present answers to any of these, though they are needed. The purpose of the following section is
to point out simple patterns of word order correlates, and thus, suggest a new avenue of
investigation of mixed word order languages.

3. Synchronic patterns of mixed word order in Logbara.

Table 1 is repeated below as Table 4, with the addition of boxes outlining some of the OV
correlates and some of the VO correlates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OV</th>
<th>VO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N + Postposition</td>
<td>Adv Subordinators + Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Clause + RC Marker</td>
<td>Verb + Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Comparison + Marker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copula Suffix</td>
<td>Noun + Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S + Q particle</td>
<td>V + PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause + Adv Subordinators</td>
<td>V + VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object + Verb</td>
<td>Noun + Relative Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen + Noun</td>
<td>Adj + Standard of Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP + V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Patterns of OV and VO Correlates in Logbara

An examination of the VO correlates contained in the box reveals a pattern. Each element
on the left is a single word (Noun, Verb and Adjective) and each element on the right is potentially
phrasal (Genitive, PP, VP, Relative Clause and Standard of Comparison). Hawkins' (1983)
'heaviness principle' could motivate such a pattern where single words in relation to larger phrasal
elements occur first, and are followed by the longer element. The OV correlates enclosed in the
box display an opposite pattern, i.e., the morpheme occurring last is formally light (Postposition, Relative
Clause Marker, Comparative Marker, Copula Suffix, Question Particle and Adv Subordinator) while the preceding element (Noun, Relative Clause, Standard of Comparison, Non-Verbal Predicate, Sentence and Clause) is at least equal in length and formal complexity, if
not greater. There is a sharp distinction between the 'light' elements in each of these lists however.
The words in the VO correlates (Noun, Verb, and Adjective) belong to classes of words which are
semantically referential or 'content' words and, except for adjectives, which appear to be limited in
number, are open word classes. The morphemes in the OV correlates (Postposition, Relative
Clause Marker, Comparative Marker, Copula Suffix, Question Particle and Adv Subordinator) have primarily grammatical functions and belong to closed word classes. If one wants to explain
the list of VO correlates with a principle of heaviness, the morphemes in the OV correlates could be
an exception to the principle on the basis of their grammatical status, which in turn could be
motivated from a psycholinguistic perspective. Again, the point made herein is not to explain the
distribution as much as to point out distinct patterning of word order, thus normalizing what can
also be described as typologically anomalous word order.

The rule of tendency of distribution of correlates is below. This rule may be phrased either
synchronically or diachronically. The diachronic wording in brackets replaces the synchronic
word "occur". While I've positioned the proposal in this section as an alternative to an historical argument, it may in fact be a different kind of diachronic description.

For two elements ordered with respect to one another, heavier or more complex phrases tend to occur after single words or morphemes, provided the words belong to semantically referential, open word classes, e.g., nouns or verbs; when the lighter element belongs to a closed word class and has grammatical function, the heavy element occurs before the lighter element.

4. Conclusion.

In this paper, I describe the mixed word order characteristics of Logbara. Assuming Logbara was earlier a more consistent OV language, I discuss changes Logbara might have undergone to account for its current VO correlates. The evidence given ranges in type (e.g., typological likeliness, internal formal evidence, or theoretical motivation) and the degree to which it convinces. While the arguments made are common in the word order literature, some may be circular. As an alternative or complement, I approach the problem synchronically. The distribution of OV and VO correlates is describable with a rule which relies on categories of formal weight and complexity, and word class. While the distribution in Logbara may be true for only a few languages, the fact that it is so distinctly and simply patterned suggests that other mixed word order languages can be investigated for the patterns they exhibit and share with other languages.
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