BACKGROUND: One of the fundamental assumptions of the Minimalist Program is that the linear order of the syntactic objects emerges from a computational process of flattening their hierarchical grouping. This process is assumed to be induced by legibility condition at the PF interface (Chomsky 1995c), motivated by the physics of speech (Higginbotham 1983b) and executed through some version of the Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA-Kayne (1994), Chomsky (1995c) and Uriagereka (2002)). This paper studies two syntactic constructions from Berber, viz., constructions with multiple copy pronunciations of preverbal particles (Cf.1.a-c) and constructions with clitics copying in interpolation contexts (Cf.2.a and b) and proposes an approach wherein the linearization of the syntactic objects is an integral part of the narrow syntax.

PROBLEM: In (1.a-c), the derivational system can spell out and linearize the preverbal past tense particle “dža” through pronouncing the higher copy of the chain, the lower copy of the chain or both. (2.a-b) is a syntactic context of object clitics interpolation (Martins 1994). In this context, object clitics exhibit hallmarks of prosodic autonomy and extra syntactic mobility. What the syntactic objects in (1.a-c) and (2.a-b) have in common is that they cannot be anchored to a specific clausal position in the IP and the CP clausal layers. They are instances of syntactic objects’ re-orderings that unexpectedly occur in the higher phase if characterized in terms of the Cyclic Linearization proposal of Fox and Pesetsky (2005). As such, they raise non-trivial questions about the Syntax-PF interface and the locus of the linearizing algorithm. For one, why chain reduction fails in (1.c)? Second how does the LCA linearize sub-word copies (clitics) without morphologically fusing them with their hosts (2.a-b)? And thirdly is the linearization of the syntactic objects a PF-internal process, a Syntax-PF interface process or a Syntax-internal process?

PROPOSAL: I argue that linearization is Syntax-internal and it is an integral part of Narrow Syntax. I assume that it is the order of the application of MERGE, the input data-structure that MERGE applies to and Spell Out points that yield the linear orders of the syntactic objects (Epstein et al. 1998, supra; Epstein and Seely 2006). The existence of an intervening syntactic element between the two copies of the same syntactic object occurring in the same clausal domain in (1.c) is reminiscent of the fact that these two copies are not assembled through MERGE within the same c-command domain (Command Unit-Uriagereka (2002)); hence they are instances of separate Spell Out cycles. Some of the empirical evidence to support this includes the fact that the IP-internal structural position which separates the two instances of the copy of “dža” is an edge position that can be targeted by A-bar movement. This position can host a preverbal lexical subject (Cf. 4.a) or a dislocated lexical object (Cf. 4.b). This same reasoning extends to the linear properties of the object clitics in (2.a and b). If these two syntactic objects are not assembled through MERGE within the same c-command domain, they are not expected to be part of the same derivational cascade and Spell Out point.

EXTENSION OF THE PROPOSAL: The proposal above readily extends to the linear properties of WH-words in the left branch of the derivation in genetically unrelated languages. The cluster of WH-words in Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian and Macedonian systematically exhibits strict structural adjacency across a range of syntactic contexts. However, in the left branch of the derivation, a closed set of parenthetical and adverbial elements can intervene to break the cluster (Cf. 4.a-b, 5.a-b and 6.a-b) and WH-words in Serbo-Croatian (Cf.7.a-b) can be freely ordered at the left branch of the derivation. This makes the linear properties of these constructions distributionally and computationally similar to the ones of (1.a-c) and (2.a-b) and hence amenable to the same treatment as (1) and (2). The syntactic objects in the left branch of the derivation in (7.a-b) and (4.a-b through 6.a-b) are assembled through MERGE within different c-commanding domains and hence are not part of the same derivational cascade and Spell Out domains. The exclusivity of their left branch derivational domains and the optionality of their positional anchoring follows naturally once we assume that MERGE is invariably to the edge (left) and that Spell Out occurs incrementally over the course of the entire derivation, resulting in a linearization procedure which is implemented derivationally and in parallel with the building of the syntactic structure.

CONCLUSION: Empirically, the approach: (i) derives the linear order of the word and sub-word level syntactic objects in a unified way and without recourse to computational processes beyond the ones independently required by syntax (MERGE) and (ii) it collapses the interpolation effects observed with the object clitics constructions in Berber to akin interpolation patterns observed with the WH-constructions in some Slavic languages and derives the similarities and differences from a single grammar mechanism, viz., MERGE. Conceptually, the proposal is fundamentally compatible with a dynamic derivational view of phases and syntax, and MERGE is assumed to be the optimal way to meet interface requirements without being reducible into these same requirements.
DATA

(1) a. ċamas dżawat y-ssgi w-a’yaz
   Never PTP CLACC3S 3S.M-buy.NEG.PERF CS-man
   ‘The man did never buy it.’ [Tarifity Berber]

b. dżawat ċamas y-ssgi w-a’yaz
   PTP CLACC3S y-ssgi w-a’yaz
   ‘The man did never buy it.’ [Tarifity Berber]

c. dżawat ċamas dżawat y-ssgi w-a’yaz
   PTP CLACC3S 3S.M-buy.NEG.PERF CS-man
   ‘The man did never buy it.’ [Tarifity Berber]

(2) a. w ġa s t y-ssg-n ?
   Who FUT CLDAT CLACC PART-buy.IMPERF-PART
   ‘Who will buy it for him?’ [Tarifity Berber]

b. w s t ġa y-ssg-n ?
   Who CLDAT CLACC FUT PART-buy.IMPERF-PART
   ‘Who will buy it for him?’ [Tarifity Berber]

(3) a. dżawant y-ssgi
   man.this almost PTP 3S.M-buy.NEG.PERF
   ‘This man almost did not buy it.’ [Tarifity Berber]

b. dżawant y-ssgi
   book.this almost PTP 3S.M-buy.NEG.PERF
   ‘This book he almost did not buy it.’ [Tarifity Berber]

(4) a. Ko šta pije?
   Who what drink-PRES.3SG
   ‘Who is drinking what?’

b. Ko, po tebi, šta pije?
   Who according to you what drink-PRES.3SG
   ‘Who, according to you, drinks what?’ [Serbo-Croatian]

(5) a. Koj kakvo pie?
   Who what drinking

b. Koj, spored tebe, kakvo pie?
   Who according to you, what drinking
   ‘Who, according to you, is drinking what?’ [Bulgarian]

(6) a. Koj što kupuva?
   Who what buying

b. Koj, spored tebe, što kupuva?
   Who according to you, what buying
   ‘Who, according to you, is buying what?’ [Macedonian]

(7) a. Ko je koga vidjeo?
   Who Aux whom saw
   ‘Who saw whom?’

b. Koga je ko vidjeo?
   Whom Aux who saw
   ‘Who saw whom?’ [Source: Williams, 2005:232 (e.g. 6a&b)] [Serbo-Croatian]
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