

Keeping Order at PF*

Marc Richards

Department of Linguistics, University of Cambridge

In this paper, I explore the thesis that notions of linear ordering play no role in the narrow syntactic component of C_{HL} . In particular, I examine two closely related empirical phenomena in the Germanic languages – Object Shift and Scrambling – in order to gain insight into the nature and operation of linearization strategies at the syntax-PF interface. The relocation of Kayne’s *Linear Correspondence Axiom* from the syntax to PF is shown to allow a natural reconciliation of the LCA with a basic VO/OV directionality parameter, which in turn provides a simple solution to the inadequacies of the LCA when adopted into Bare Phrase Structure whilst having the additional effect that linear ‘shape’ is preserved across a derivation. Ultimately, it is proposed that the mapping to PF proceeds according to a phase-based derivation of syntactic structures (cf. Chomsky 1998, 1999, 2001), and that the patterns of Object Shift obey a Phase Integrity Condition that constrains the relation between syntactic and prosodic phrasing.

1 INTRODUCTION

One of the major goals of the Minimalist Program (cf. Chomsky 1995) is the elimination of redundancy, both from the theories we construct (“methodological” minimalism) and, more interestingly (and controversially), from the object of study itself (“substantive” minimalism). From this perspective, the requirement that the terminal elements of a syntactic object be associated with a linear order is an indispensable part of the theory, following by “conceptual necessity” from the legibility conditions imposed at the PF interface if language is to be usable at all (speech unfolds in a temporal sequence and thus involves a linear string of sounds). In reducing the linearization requirement to an interface condition on PF representations, we thereby “explain” why such a requirement should hold; crucially, however, the linear ordering of syntactic structures *before* they reach the PF interface now requires extra motivation, as there is clearly a redundancy in our system if precedence relations are established twice (i.e. in the syntax as well as at PF; cf. Chametzky 2000: 109). In the absence of evidence that order plays a role outside of the PF wing of the grammar (cf. Chomsky 1995: 334), our null assumption is therefore as in (1).

(1) *Nonlinear Syntax*

Syntactic operations/relations make no reference to notions of linear ordering and directionality (cf. Chomsky 1995: 334; Uriagereka 1998: 217-8; Nunes 1999: 222-3)

If linear order is redundant at LF, then we can (and, therefore, should) eliminate it from the syntactic component of C_{HL} . In other words, order should be kept to PF. That being the case, the question arises as to *how* PF ‘keeps order’. In this paper, I attempt to identify the linearization strategies that PF employs and investigate their operation and interaction. To this end, I focus on the core word-order patterns associated with Object Shift and Scrambling constructions in Germanic. Three linearization options are motivated by the data: a version of Kayne’s *Linear Correspondence Axiom* (LCA); a revived and modified head-directionality parameter; and prosodic (re)alignment. Together, the first two provide the default ordering

* The research reported in this paper was supported by the Arts & Humanities Research Board.

© 2004 by Marc Richards

Lluïsa Astruc & Marc Richards (eds.)

Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics 1:183-203.