Contemporary work on the evolution of syntax can be roughly divided into two perspectives, the incremental view and the saltational view. The incremental view claims that the evolution of syntax involved multiple stages between the noncombinatorial communication system of our last common ancestor with chimpanzees and full-blown modern human syntax. The saltational view claims that syntax was the result of just a single evolutionary development. What is the relationship between contemporary theories of syntax and these two perspectives on the evolution of syntax? Jackendoff (2010) argues that there is a dependency between theories of language and theories of language evolution: "Your theory of language evolution depends on your theory of language." For example, he claims that most work within the Minimalist Program (for background, Chomsky 1995) is forced to the saltational view. My focus in this talk is the evolution of syntax, and, in particular, the relation between syntactic theory and perspectives on the evolution of syntax. I argue that there is not a simple dependency relation between theories of syntax and theories of syntactic evolution. The parallel architecture (Jackendoff 2002) is consistent with a saltational theory of syntactic evolution. The architecture assumed in most minimalist work is compatible with an incremental theory.