


Bracketing Paradoxes Resolved

“Morphological/syntactic structure and phonological structure are independent levels of analysis subject to independent constraints and principles. If this conclusion is correct, “lexical phonology”, in which phonological rules and morphological affixation work in tandem, is deeply wrong.” (Marantz 1987)

1. The Problem with Bracketing Paradoxes

This paper has as its central concern the proposition in Marantz (1987) that Bracketing Paradoxes (BP) have deep implications for the (in)correctness of certain proposals within the domain of generative phonology. Where it differs from Marantz’ account, and from every previous account of BPs, is in the absence of an appeal to ad-hoc tools to eliminate these paradoxical derivations. It is argued that a theory wherein phonological representations are limited to (operations over) linear strings, and where phonological operations must be triggered via phonological means (no Level-specific morphological diacritics or operations) that Bracketing Paradoxes cease to emerge.

The problem posed by Bracketing Paradoxes for an appropriate analysis of both morpho-syntax and morpho-phonology is well known. Assuming a compositional semantic module, the morpho-syntactic structure of a BP must conform with its attested semantic interpretation (1a). Assuming that the phonological proximity or distance of an affix to/from its base is due to its interpretation in the same or in a different morpho-phonological cycle (as in Lexical Phonology’s Level 1/2 distinction (Kiparsky 1982a, Mohanan 1982), phonological stratum (Kiparsky 2000, Bermúdez-Otero 2017), or phase (Chomsky 2001, Marantz 2007) the structure of a BP must also conform to its surface phonological representation (1b).



The structure in (1a) conforms to the compositional semantic interpretation of *modular grammarian*; a scholar who adheres to the principles of (Fodorian) *modular grammar*, and the structure in (1b) conforms to the phonological requirements that *-ian* be within the phonological domain of *grammar* (as evidenced by stress shift) and that *modular* be outside of the phonological domain of *grammarian* (as evidenced by its independent stress).¹

Since the 1970s, Bracketing Paradoxes have been subject to numerous analyses (among which are Allen 1979; Pesetsky 1979; Lieber 1980; Nash 1980; Williams 1981; Strauss 1982; Kiparsky 1982; Selkirk 1982; Speas 1984; Pesetsky 1985; Marantz 1984a/b, 1987, 1989; Sproat 1984, 1985, 1988; Nespor & Vogel 1986; Beard 1991; Carnie 1991; Lieber 1992; Booij & Lieber 1993; Merchant 1995; Newell 2005a/b, 2008, 2018; Haugen & Siddiqi 2016; and Bermúdez-Otero 2016, 2019).

Acknowledgements

¹ It will be argued in §3.3, following Bermúdez-Otero (2016, 2019) that BPs involving relational adjectives, as in (1), are not true paradoxes. But, for expositional purposes, (1) represents the traditional characteristics of a BP.

See Newell (2019) for a historical overview of the research on BPs. Each previous analysis of the BP problem has required the proposal of a BP-specific mechanism, such as special LF rules for prefixes (Pesetsky 1979; Williams 1981), rebracketing at PF (Williams 1981; Nespor & Vogel 1986; Marantz 1984a/b, 1987, 1989; Sproat 1984, 1985, 1988), quantifier raising of non-quantifiers (Pesetsky 1985), or suspension of Bracket Erasure (Kiparsky 1982), to account for derivations like that in (1). Another commonality of all previous analyses is that they assume hierarchical (bracketed) structure in both the syntax and the phonology. In this article I take it as given that hierarchical structure is necessary for syntactic analyses, but it is proposed here to be unnecessary in the phonology (see also Lowenstamm 1996; Scheer 2004; Newell 2017a, 2017b, 2017c; Newell & Scheer 2017). The current, standardly assumed, hierarchical theory of phonological structure, Prosodic Phonology (Selkirk (1981 [1978]), 1982, 2011; Nespor and Vogel 1986, and seq.) proposes that phonological domain formation is regulated by the Prosodic Hierarchy (PH). This PH was proposed as a replacement for the undesirable boundary symbols found in SPE (Chomsky & Halle 1968), whose function was to explain the application or non-application of phonological rules within a particular portion of a phonological string (see Scheer 2011 for an overview of arguments against these boundary symbols). Interestingly, a consequence of this modification of phonological theory (from linear to hierarchical phonological structure) evidenced the birth of Bracketing Paradoxes. It is clear that BPs are only possible in a system wherein phonological representations are hierarchical.

(2) ##modul+ar##grammar+ian## → (módʒə)<ləɪ> gɪə(mé.ɪ)<ən>

In the SPE-style representation in (2) stress rules ignore the phonological segment + but are blocked by ##, ensuring that a phonological division emerges only between the two words. Morpho-syntactic constituency in SPE was translated into these phonological [-segmental] primes inserted into the linear string. As no hierarchical structure was built in representations such as (2), constituency was not at issue. Consequently, these representations were incapable of introducing Bracketing Paradoxes. Although the arguments in the literature against boundary symbols are clear and convincing (Pyle 1972; Rotenberg 1978; Devine and Stephens 1976; Kenstowicz and Kisseberth 1977; Hyman 1978, among others), the BPs introduced by Prosodic Phonology are argued here to indicate that such a theory is(was) not the correct replacement for an SPE-style linear phonological system. The emergence of BPs is directly due to the hierarchical representations of the Prosodic Hierarchy, and therefore indicative of problems inherent to these representations. In the following sections I will discuss the syntactic derivations of all classes of word-level BP in the literature (and one phrasal example) and will demonstrate how their syntactic derivations, in combination with a non-diacritic linear phonological system (following Scheer 2008), capture the data in a uniquely satisfying way. This analysis highlights modifications that I will argue must be made to our theories of phonological representations.

Specifically, I will argue that the timing of spell-out of each morpheme in a derivation, along with the edge-marking of phonological domains by an empty CV (following Lowenstamm 1999, Scheer 2009a) can account for derivations traditionally labeled BPs without ever giving rise to phonosyntactic paradoxes.

2. The Phonological and Morphosyntactic Frameworks

Newell (2016a,b, 2017c) introduces a liaison account of English Level 1/Level 2 morpho-phonology (3,4). Level 1/Level 2 will henceforth be referred to as cohering/non-cohering, following Raffelsiefen (1999), in order to abstract away from the theoretical implications of the former labels. The latter imply that an affix is treated as interior/exterior to the domain of footing and stress assignment of its base. The liaison analysis is argued to be a better account of morphological class-membership than the classic analyses in Lexical Morphology and Phonology type frameworks where affixes are either assigned to specific levels, or subcategorize for certain types of bases (Classic LMP: Mohanan 1982; Kiparsky 1982; Giegerich 1999, LMP-OT: Kiparsky 2000, Stratal OT: Bermúdez-Otero 2017), Affix-specific phonologies (Benua 1995; Orgun 1996; Inkelas 1998; Raffelsiefen 1999, 2015; Plag 1999; Steriade 2000; Pater 2000, among others), and Output-Output/Paradigm-based correspondence models (McCarthy 1995; Steriade 2000; Downing et. al 2005; Kiparsky, 2005) for the following reasons. First, it is fully modular (Fodor 1983. See Reiss 2007 and Scheer 2011 for discussion); the phonological structures proposed make no reference to either morphological classes or to morpho-phonological constraints like Alignment or Correspondence. Second, it accounts for the fact that all cohering affixes in English are vowel-initial (following Raffelsiefen 1999, 2015, van Oostendoorp 1994). It is generally stated that lexical morphological classes cannot be uniformly distinguished based on their phonological shape. Although this may be true for some languages (necessitating further research to incorporate them into the modular theory argued for here), it is not strictly correct for English; there is, on the surface, a one-way correlation between the first segment of a cohering affix and its phonological behavior (vowel-initial). Newell (2017c) argues that this one-way correlation can actually be represented as a two-way correlation; all and only cohering affixes begin with a *floating* vowel. Third, it has been shown clearly that many English affixes may have both cohering and non-cohering variants (Giegerich 1999; Bermúdez-Otero 2011b). The liaison proposal accounts for the fact that affixes that are variably cohering and non-cohering do not display cohering behaviour when merged outside of another affix. Among the affixes that switch classes, their cohering variant is always root-attaching, while their non-cohering variant is always affixed to a complex base. Given that cohering affixes are not restricted to root-attachment (ex. *-al* in *govern-ment₂-al₁*) this pattern is unexpected in any system where class-membership is determined lexically.

The analysis in Newell (2017c) is represented in (3) and (4). Floating vowels link to a final empty V slot on the CV tier of their base (3). This analysis presupposes a Strict-CV (CVCV) linear phonology (Scheer 2004), where the timing tier is a uniform sequence of Cs and Vs. Ca and Vs may remain unpronounced; these are indicated with a \emptyset . Affixes normally proposed to be non-cohering have a fully linked melodic tier as in (4).

(3)	<table style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td>C</td><td>V</td><td>C</td><td>V</td><td>C</td><td>V</td><td>C</td><td>V</td><td></td><td>C</td><td>V</td><td>C</td><td>V</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td>.....</td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>g</td><td>\emptyset</td><td>ɪ</td><td>ə</td><td>m</td><td>e</td><td>ɪ</td><td></td><td></td><td>ɪ</td><td>j</td><td>ə</td><td>n</td><td>\emptyset</td> </tr> </table>	C	V	C	V	C	V	C	V		C	V	C	V													g	\emptyset	ɪ	ə	m	e	ɪ			ɪ	j	ə	n	\emptyset	‘grammarian’
C	V	C	V	C	V	C	V		C	V	C	V																														
																																									
g	\emptyset	ɪ	ə	m	e	ɪ			ɪ	j	ə	n	\emptyset																													
(4)	<table style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td>C</td><td>V</td><td>C</td><td>V</td><td>C</td><td>V</td><td>C</td><td>V</td><td></td><td>C</td><td>V</td><td>C</td><td>V</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td></td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>g</td><td>\emptyset</td><td>ɪ</td><td>æ</td><td>m</td><td>e</td><td>ɪ</td><td>\emptyset</td><td></td><td>l</td><td>ə</td><td>s</td><td>\emptyset</td> </tr> </table>	C	V	C	V	C	V	C	V		C	V	C	V														g	\emptyset	ɪ	æ	m	e	ɪ	\emptyset		l	ə	s	\emptyset	‘grammarless’	
C	V	C	V	C	V	C	V		C	V	C	V																														
g	\emptyset	ɪ	æ	m	e	ɪ	\emptyset		l	ə	s	\emptyset																														

The association of the floating [i] in (3) forces a cohering analysis of the syllabification and stress of *grammari-ian* as the phonological system sees a single unified string of timing slots on the CV tier after liaison is effected. Affixes with an initial floating vowel must merge inside of the domain to their left, as the vowel needs to link to the CV tier in order to be pronounced. This analysis is directly akin to the generally-accepted phenomenon of liaison in French (ex. *peti[ʔ] garçon* vs. *peti[t] ami*) (Encrevé 1988). In (4), however, *grammar* and *-less* are not syllabified as a single uninterrupted string. *-less* leans on the phonological string to its left (it is suffixal/clitic-like), explaining its lack of independent stress. Importantly for the discussion of BPs here is the fact that, under Newell’s analysis, whether an item will be an independent word or an affix (either cohering or non-cohering) is not predictable based on syntactic structure. Both *-less* and *-ian* are affixes, regardless of how much morpho-syntactic structure separates them from *grammar*.

This non-isomorphism between morpho-syntactic and phonological domains was one of the motivations for Prosodic Phonology, but this divergence is not taken to be the norm. Typically, non-isomorphism is seen as an occasional deviation from complete isomorphism, as in Selkirk’s Match Theory (2011), and that *words* are generally the phonological interpretation of (complex) X⁰s. Therefore, within a theory of the Prosodic Hierarchy the difference between (3) and (4) must be that the former is a complex X⁰ interpreted as a single PWd, and the latter is a complex X⁰ interpreted as a nested PWd structure or a Composite Group (Vogel 2009). Unfortunately for such a theory, it is evident from the cross-linguistic variation in wordhood that words are not restricted to the phonological interpretation of X⁰s (Julien 2002, Haspelmath 2011, Svenonius 2016, Newell 2017a, Newell et al 2017). Regardless, the difference between the phonological structures of (3) and (4) is clear. In (3) the phonology is sensitive to the procedure of liaison. In (4) liaison does not occur. Why *-less* is an affix and not a separate word may be due to distributional factors (ex. Julien 2002), or lexical marking of affix-status (ex. Svenonius 2016), but a coherent theory of wordhood vs. affixhood is beyond the scope of this paper and is not crucial to the analysis of BPs.

An additional tool to be employed in the following pages is one proposed within the theory of Strict-CV phonology to delimit phonological domains; the cycle-initial empty CV proposed by Lowenstamm (1999) and elaborated on by (Scheer 2009a and subsequent work, including Newell & Scheer 2017).² Scheer proposes an empty initial CV as a modular replacement for SPE’s # and for the PWd of the Prosodic Hierarchy. He argues that the CV, unlike the PWd, is a native phonological object, making predictions in the phonology. An initial CV is (i) an interface-visible object (both phonological rules and rules of allomorphy must have access to the CV tier), and (ii) a non-diacritic boundary marker (see Scheer 2009b). We will see that this initial CV (in grey) can block phonological rules from treating (for example) modifiers as part of a single phonological domain with their base (5).



² Note that the grammatical insertion of syllabic space is not a proposal specific to CVCV phonology. (e.g. Chierchia 1986; Larsen 1998, have proposed the insertion of syllables or morae for similar reasons. The form of the syllabic space inserted, a CV sequence, is specific to the theory assumed here.


The empty CVs in (5) are inserted upon interpretation of *modular* and *grammar*, assuming a phase-based morpho-syntax as in much work in Distributed Morphology (Arad 2003; Marantz 2007; 2013, Marvin 2001, 2013; Newell 2008; Embick 2014 etc.). In this type of framework, categorizing adjectival, nominal, and verbal heads trigger spell out ([[modul-ar]_a [grammar-Ø]_n]_n), in addition to the ‘phrase-sized’ vP, CP, PP, and DP phases (as in Chomsky 2001 and subsequent work in the field). In this way, cycles for the application of phonological rules are determined by the syntax. The insertion of phase-initial empty CVs is restricted phonologically, as we will discuss further in §3.5 when we examine particle verbs in Slavic languages.

We have in this paper, therefore, a framework where spell-out domains are determined in the morpho-syntax (phases). In the phonology, strings computed in the same phase will be treated as single domains for the application of phonological operations. Inter-cyclic phonological communication is blocked by the non-interaction of melodic structure in separate cycles, sometimes with the aid of an initial empty syllable/CV. Inter-cyclic communication will, however, be forced by phonological means in the case of liaison, or any similar case of Phonological Merger (Newell & Piggott 2014) where a phonological operation is triggered, forcing the insertion of a phonological object (ex. floating feature, floating segment, unfooted syllable, tone) into a previously computed domain and triggering resyllabification (among other processes) if necessary (as in (3)). We will see below that such an analysis, when combined with the independently supported morpho-syntax of the constructions at issue, eliminates both Bracketing Paradoxes and the need to appeal to the Prosodic Hierarchy.³

3. Kinds of Bracketing Paradoxes

Newell (2019) summarizes the literature on Bracketing Paradoxes, and notes that cross-linguistically BPs have been split into 5 types. The comparative BP is specific to English (6a) and gets its own entry due to the amount of publicity it has received, including two LI squibs: Sproat’s (1992) *Unhappier is not a “Bracketing Paradox”* followed by Kang’s (1993) *Unhappier really is a “Bracketing Paradox”*) (§3.1). An example of Level-Ordered paradoxes, where a Level 1 affix is merged outside of a Level 2 affix can be seen in (6b) (§3.2). Compound and Phrasal paradoxes are generally considered sub-categories of Level-Ordered paradoxes (6c) but in these the ‘prefix’ is the left-hand member of a phrase or compound. The distinct behaviours of the sub-types of (6c) will be teased apart in sections 3.3 and 3.4.

³ This analysis also represents the beginning of a linear phonological account of the cross-linguistic pattern whereby prefixes are much more likely to be phonologically independent from their base than suffixes (ex. Newell and Scheer 2017).




Additional categories of BP are prefixed verbs (ex. Warlpiri, Nash 1980 in (6d)) (§3.5), and reduplicative structures (ex. Kihehe, Marantz 1987 in (6e)) (§3.6).

The reader may note, as Kiparsky (1982), Newell (2005a,b, 2008), and others have, that all BPs contain one component (affix or modifier) that does not project in the syntax. While this characteristic is crucial in the accounts to follow, it will be shown that the non-projection of (prefixed) elements in the morpho-syntax may come about via different means.

3.1 Level-ordered Bracketing Paradoxes

What the above phonological analysis in Newell (2017c) entails for Level-Ordered Bracketing Paradoxes in particular is that it is only linear order, and not the Prosodic Hierarchy or spell-out in a particular phase/cycle, that determines the phonological behaviour of the relevant cohering affixes. Just like infixation (*absobloodylutely*) and Phonological Merger of unfootable material (see Newell & Piggott 2014 and Newell & Scheer 2017 on Ojibwe), liaison obscures the boundaries between phases/cycles for the simple reason that the phonology does not contain, and therefore cannot be sensitive to, a representation of hierarchical structure. In BP derivations like *ungrammaticality* there is no issue with the phonological output being non-isomorphic with the morpho-syntactic representation. The morpho-syntax is sent to spell-out in phases, and in line with the requirements of a compositional semantic module the interpretation of *ungrammaticality* is ‘the property of being ungrammatical’ (7); an interpretation that is consistent with the morpho-syntactic structure required by the selectional restrictions of the respective affixes. The output of phonological computation is strictly linear as in (8a-d) where the phases of interpretation in this derivation are represented. Only the PF output is discussed for each. These phases follow the proposals that (i) category-defining heads (little *a*, *n*, and *v*) are phase heads that are spelled out with their complements (see Arad 2003; Embick 2010; Marantz 2013 and previous work; Marvin 2002, 2013; Newell 2008), and (ii) that left-branches (adjuncts and specifiers) are interpreted (both phonologically and semantically) separately from the larger tree into which they are merged (Uriagereka 1999, Johnson 2004, Svenonius 2016, Starke 2018, among others).



Beginning with the phases in (8a,b), we must note that they are derived in parallel, in that neither one syntactically contains the other, and therefore neither can be said to be processed prior to the other. The prefix *un-* has been analysed in the literature as either a morphological adjunct (Newell 2005, 2008) or as the specifier of NegP (ex. De Clercq 2013).⁴ Studies of adjunct/specifier left-branches in the syntax contend with the fact that these are islands for movement, and that they evidence prosodic and semantic separateness from their bases of attachment. I will assume in the representations here that *un-* is an adjunct, although nothing crucial hinges on this. Uriagereka (1999) proposes to account for the particular nature of syntactic left-branches by proposing that they are interpreted in a separate but parallel syntactic and phonological computation, and then merged post-spell out. Similar analyses are also assumed in a Spanning framework (Svenonius 2016), or a Nanosyntactic framework (Starke 2018). According to such proposals, both *un-* and *grammatical* (a phase itself, triggered by the category-defining head *-al*) are interpreted separately before merger to one another. This independent interpretation will endow each of these domains with an initial CV in English, separating them phonologically even under affixation (8c). This

⁴ Newell (2005a/b, 2008) argues that *un-* (i) does not project, (ii) merges with multiple syntactic categories, and (iii) adds only compositional meaning to its base of attachment, and therefore it can be concluded that *un-* is an adjunct. Note that this analysis of verbal (*undo*), nominal (*unBirthday*), and adjectival (*unhappy*) *un-* as a single object has no bearing on the analysis of Bracketing Paradoxes herein, as each *un-* displays adjunct-like behaviour independently. This is also consistent with an analysis of *un-* as the Specifier of NegP, as in De Clercq (2013) and subsequent work, if NegP can select for verbal, adjectival, and nominal complements.

derivation offers two potential motivations for the non-assimilation of the nasal consonant in the prefix to the place of articulation of the following consonant; (i) the nasal is interpreted before affixing to the base, and therefore default place is assigned to it, bleeding assimilation, or (ii) the intervening empty CV causes the nasal to be non-local to the following consonant.

Affixation of *-ity* leads to the spell-out of *n* in (7). As the head *n* contains (c-commands) the head *a*, *grammatical* will be visible to the floating vowel of *-ity* at phonological interpretation. Its floating vowel will link to the final empty vowel position to its left. This linking creates a phonological structure identical to one that would have been created were *grammatical* and *-ity* to have been spelled-out in the same phase. Resyllabification (or the re-analysis of Government and Licensing relations in Government Phonology (GP)) and stress shift therefore occur, but do not affect *un-*, as it remains insulated by empty syllabic space from the domain of syllabification of *grammatical*. What is clear in this proposed derivation of *ungrammaticality*, and of similar BPs, is that there is no paradoxical output at any point. The phonology never contains any hierarchical representation. No matter the morpho-syntactic distance of the liaison affix from its base, it must be syllabified inside the domain to its left, and the prefix in these constructions can be shown to have the characteristics of any other syntactic left-branch, ensuring its interpretation in an independent phonological cycle.⁵



3.2 Comparative Bracketing Paradoxes

The derivation of comparative BPs is analogous to the above, but here the left-branch nature of *un-* insulates it from conditioning the allomorphy of the comparative (or superlative) suffix, as well as ensuring that it is not in the domain of main stress assignment. The base of attachment of the comparative morpheme that conditions its allomorphy as synthetic (*-er/-est*) or analytic (*more, most*) is the phonological domain to its left.⁶ As *un-* is never syllabified within the domain of its base of affixation, it is invisible to (or unimportant to) the phonologically-conditioned Vocabulary Insertion of the comparative suffix. The structure in (9), necessary for the correct semantic interpretation of *unhappier* ('more unhappy', rather than 'not more happy') is compatible with a linear phonological representation where the comparative is sensitive to the size of its domain of attachment, a domain that excludes *un-*.⁷

⁵ What must also be made clear here is that this is not a direct-access account of the interface. I am not proposing that phases or syntactic structure have any influence within the Phonological Domain. Phases determine which chunks of syntactic structure will undergo spell-out. After Vocabulary Insertion (Halle and Marantz 1994) the phonological form of each morpheme and any empty phonological structure (either morphological, e.g. a reduplicative morpheme, or grammatically/cyclically determined, e.g. left-edge CVs) are the only objects that are considered during the phonological derivation.

⁶ More complex degree derivations may evidence the effects of syntactic locality on this allomorphy in way that is not relevant to the analysis here (see Svenonius 2016 for a recent discussion).

⁷ A reviewer brings up examples like **punch-drunker* or **house-prouder*, originally discussed in (Spencer 1988). The left-members of these compounds bleed the insertion of *-er*, in opposition to *un-*. These examples will be discussed in §3.4.



The stages of interpretation of (9/10) are analogous to those of *ungrammaticality*. *un-* and *happy* will be interpreted separately and then linearized after they have been merged. The degree head is then sensitive to the domain to its left; a domain that excludes *un-*. Scheer (2016) demonstrates that allomorphy may be sensitive to the CV/skeletal structure it merges with (but not to melody). The invisibility of *un-* to *-er/more* allomorphy is consequently unsurprising.

Note that this analysis does not imply that *-er/-est* need be cohering affixes; they never induce stress shift and therefore plausibly do not contain initial floating vowels. Bermúdez-Otero (2013) demonstrates that the comparative suffix is outside of the first phase/phonological cycle in Belfast English *except* when it conditions allomorphy of its base of attachment. He shows that in this dialect coronal stops are dentalised before /(*ə*)ɪ/ (11a), except when that /(*ə*)ɪ/ is the exponent of a non-cohering affix (11b). Importantly, in suppletive comparatives /(*ə*)ɪ/ triggers dentalization (11c).

- (11)
- a. Peter ['pɪt̪ə], ladder ['lɑd̪ə], dinner ['dɪn̪ə], pillar ['pɪl̪ə]
 - b. fa[t]er, lou[d]er, fi[n]er, coo[l]er
 - c. better ['bet̪ə] ‘good.comparative’ (cf. better ['betə] ‘one who bets’)
- (Bermúdez-Otero 2011b:2022)

The distinct behaviour of *better* ‘good-comparative’ is open to more than one explanation. First, though the adjectival head (a phase head) between the root and Deg in (10) will normally induce spell-out of its complement separately from *-er/-est*, when the complement contains a listed allomorph (good/bet) *Domain Suspension* (Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2013) will prevent the aP from undergoing spell-out until the Deg head is merged. Bobaljik & Wurmbrand argue that morphemes that evidence outward-in allomorphy (allomorphy conditioned by an outer morpheme) will delay Vocabulary Insertion until a subsequent head is merged into the tree, allowing for the suspension of spell-out just in case allomorphic selection will be triggered by this outer head. In this case, the comparative morpheme will be included in the spell-out domain of the root, allowing for dentalization to apply. DegP will undergo spell-out in the same cycle as aP (still excluding the independently spelled-out *un-*). A second option, pointed out by a reviewer, is that *better* is simply monomorphemic. Bruening (2017) argues this to be the case due the unique behaviour of *better/best* as achievement verbs (*to better/best X*); an environment where comparative/superlative affixes are generally not permitted (**to wider(en)/*to widest(en)*). In either case, the data in (11) show that regular degree affixes are outside of the phonological domain to which they attach, but may still be sensitive to the phonological properties of their base; a pattern that is completely in


keeping with a phonologically realizational analysis of the morpho-syntax (ex. Bobaljik 2000). Importantly for our purposes, this type of derivation is compatible with a linear representation of the phonology, avoiding the need to appeal to readjustment rules to account for the phonological separateness of *un-*. As in §3.1, an appeal to hierarchical structure to account for the phonological domains in the comparative derivation is unnecessary, and its inclusion would therefore be more complicated than the one that assumes only linear phonological representations.

3.3 Phrasal Bracketing Paradoxes


This section presents two potential analyses of Phrasal BPs, such as *nuclear physicist*, either of which is compatible with the proposal herein that the phonological interpretation of spell-out domains is linear rather than hierarchical. The first, presented in §3.3.1 obviates the need for any discussion of these BPs as BPs; the syntactico-semantic derivation of these constructions being isomorphic with the phonological interpretation under any account. The second, in §3.3.2, supposes, following Tyler (2019), a the traditionally argued-for structure for phrasal BPs; one that is non-isomorphic with the surface phonological domains. In §3.4 I will argue that the second option presented in §3.3.2 cannot be the correct analysis of Phrasal BPs, but that the difference in the position of stress in compounds and phrases that argues for the necessity of this structure for Compound BPs. The conclusion of this section aligns with the conclusions presented for comparative and Level-Ordering BPs above; if the correct syntax for each construction is paired with a linear phonological representation, no paradoxes emerge.

3.3.1 High Syntactic attachment of relational and qualifying modifiers

The structure normally assumed for Phrasal BPs is as in (12), where the modifier is merged below the nominalizing suffix. Here we assume a structure where the modifier, following Steddy (2019), is merged directly to the root of its modifyee.



This is proposed to be the necessary structure for such constructions as the semantics of the modifier and its base (*modular grammar*) has idiomatic properties that must be negotiated prior to the interpretation of the suffix. In other words, a *modular grammarian* is ‘a practitioner of *modular grammar*’ and not ‘a *modular* practitioner of *grammar*’; the latter being the proposed compositional semantics for a structure where *modular* is merged outside of *-ian*, as in (13).



There are at least two reasons to believe, however, that the structure in (13) is more appropriate for both interpretations of *modular grammarian*. Bermúdez-Otero (2016, 2019) notes that the structure in (13) is not justified by the semantics of these constructions. This becomes clear when one examines how the nominal suffix may compose with its base. He points to constructions where it is not only the combination of modifier and base that triggers idiomatic interpretation, but also the combination of the base with the suffix. Consider the following pair:

- (14) a. nuclear physicist
 b. nuclear physician (Bermudéz-Otero 2019:16)


If the semantics of [nuclear physic] in both of the cases above were to be negotiated before the interpretation of the suffixes *-ian/-ist* we would expect both to have an identical core meaning. This is not the case. (14a) refers to a practitioner of *nuclear physics* and (14b) refers to a practitioner of *nuclear medicine*. The semantics of *physicist* and *physician* therefore must be negotiated independently of the interpretation of *nuclear*, as expected from a structure such as (13).

How then, is the idiomatic reading of *nuclear physics* or *modular grammar* derived if the adjectival modifiers are merged outside of the nominalizing head? It must be the case that this type of interpretation is negotiated later in the derivation (as is the case for phrasal idioms such as *kick the bucket*)⁸. Fábregas (in press) argues convincingly that qualitative and relational adjectives inhabit distinct morpho-syntactic positions, but that both are merged outside of the nominalizing head, as in (15).⁹ He argues that (among other distinctions) relational adjectives must be merged as specifiers of a functional head (F₁) in the nominal domain that is lower than the functional head (F₂) that hosts qualitative adjectives. Relational adjectives are argued to be KPs (case phrases), and therefore too small to exhibit scalar modification (e.g. they cannot be modified by *very*). Qualitative adjectives will be interpreted as predicational modifiers and may be scalar (e.g. modifiable by *very*). (15) is the structure of a *(very) nuclear nuclear physicist*; ‘a nuclear physicist who is (very) central a particular project’.

⁸ Note that this negotiation of special meaning with a sub-part of the domain it modifies is not specific to morphologically complex constructions like *nuclear physicist*. Nominal modifiers may negotiate an idiomatic interpretation with a sub-part of the semantics of the base noun to which they are merged even in cases where the part of the semantics of the noun that is crucial to the idiomatic interpretation is not morphologically distinguishable (and hence not the locus of adjunction of the modifier in the syntax). This is exemplified by constructions such as *beautiful chef*, which can mean either ‘someone who cooks beautifully’ or ‘a chef who is beautiful’. In this type of example there is no possible locus for low adjunction of the modifier directly to a sub-part of the monomorphemic *chef*, but the two readings (relational and qualitative) are nonetheless available. Note, however, that this type of morpheme-internal modification has been proposed to not be possible (e.g. Postal 1969). Thank you to an anonymous reviewer and XXXX (to be added in the final version) for this example.

⁹ See Fábregas (in Press) and references therein for detailed discussions of the syntactic properties and positions of different classes of adjectives. An in-depth discussion of these data would take us too far afield from the discussion at hand.

(15)




(modified from Fábregas, in press)

This type of analysis also easily allows for cross-linguistic variation of morpheme order in these constructions. Consider the French translation of FP₁; *physicien(ne) nucléaire* (16). Here the nominalizing suffix (and its concomitant gender suffix) intervenes linearly between the base (*physic*) and its modifier (*nucléaire*). This would be unexpected if *nuclear* were to modify the root directly, as linearization of a higher suffix (either *n* or gender) should not target the left-edge of *physic* in such a structure. In a Fábregas-style analysis, however, *physic* in French raises up over its modifier to the nominal head.

- (16) a. physicien(ne) nucléaire ‘nuclear physicist(F)’
 physic-ien-(ne)
 physic-ist-(F) nuclé-aire
 nucle-ar

b.




This type of evidence suggests that all adjectival modifiers are merged outside of the domain of the nominalizing suffixes in purported Phrasal BPs. There is therefore no expectation for paradoxes to arise in these derivations. The nominalizing suffix (e.g. *-ian*) in a Phrasal BP is interpreted with its base before the modifier is merged. Relational adjectives are interpreted


distinctly from qualitative adjectives due to their position of merger, but this position is nonetheless exterior to the derived nominal, explaining their phonological independence from the noun they modify.

3.3.2 Another potential solution to Phrasal Bracketing Paradoxes

Let us assume, for a moment, that the analysis in Fábregas is incorrect, that we are unconvinced by the discussion of *nuclear physicist* vs *nuclear physician*, and that the classically-proposed position of the adjectival modifier is below the nominal affix, as in (12). Such a structure, following the argumentation in §3.1 and the analysis in Steddy (2019) does not require any paradoxical domain creation. The first phase of interpretation of a phrase like *modular grammarian* will be the *aP modular* (17).



The root *grammar* will then merge to *modular*. Subsequently the nominalizing head will merge (18a) and trigger interpretation of the *nP* (18b). *Grammar* and *-ian* will be interpreted in the same cycle, and therefore *-ian* will be able to attract stress.



The output in (18b) presumes that the stress assigned within the first (*aP*) cycle is maintained as no segment of *grammarian* interacts with the structure of *modular* (Linearization does not entail phonological interaction but may allow it.). This is a purely procedural account of the separation of *modular* and *grammarian*, without any representational marking; in the above derivation no empty CV may emerge at the left edge of *grammarian*, as it is not leftmost in its domain at the moment it is spelled out (*modular* is within the scope of *grammarian* and is therefore visible to the linearization algorithm at the moment the *nP* is interpreted by the phonology). We will return to this point in §3.3.3.

Note that affixes in Compound and Phrasal BP derivations may also trigger allomorphy of the root, as seen in *nuclear physi[k]s~physi[s]ist* or *baroque flute~flautist*. Following the above Steddy-style analysis, this is unproblematic as the root is local to the affixal trigger of allomorphy (They are in the same cycle of interpretation, and there are no intervening morphemes that may act as blockers of allomorphic conditioning).¹⁰ Vocabulary Insertion will occur in the same cycle for PHYSIC or FLUTE and *-ist*, giving *physicist/flautist*. The final phonological structure of *nuclear physicist* under these assumptions will be as in (19).¹¹

(19) C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 ∅ ∅ n u k ∅ l i j ə ɪ ∅ f ɪ z ɪ s ɪ s ∅ t ∅

No BPs arise in (18) or (19), as in §3.3.1. The syntactic structure of these derivations ensures that the nouns are interpreted in separate cycles from their modifiers. In this account, the concerns of Bermudez-Otero (2016) are also assuaged, as the semantics of the root may be sensitive simultaneously to its complement (inside-out sensitivity) and the nominalizing head that selects it (outside-in sensitivity), allowing for the distinction between *nuclear physicist* and *nuclear physician*. In the following section, however, we will offer an argument that this analysis is inappropriate for phrasal compounds such as *modular grammarian* or *nuclear physicist*, but, following Steddy (2019) and Harley (2009), remains a valid contender for the analysis of primary and synthetic compounds such as *particle physicist* or *truck driver*.

3.4 Compound Bracketing Paradoxes

In this section I offer evidence that compound BPs (such as *particle physicist*) argue for a low-attachment of their left-hand members, following Harley (2009) and Steddy (2019), but will argue contra the latter that in Phrasal BPs (such as *nuclear physicist*), the modifier is not adjoined to the root. In other words, the solution above in §3.3.2 is the correct analysis for Compound BPs, but not for Phrasal BPs. The structure for phrasal BPs is as described in §3.3.1, for the reasons put forth in Fábregas (in press). Discussions of BPs, including the recent overview in Newell (2019), have often amalgamated analyses of Phrasal and Compound Paradoxes. The most recent example of this is Steddy (2019). As discussed in the previous section, Steddy follows the analysis of compounding proposed in Harley (2009) and he argues that the allomorphy evidenced in *physicist* is unproblematic if both adjectival modifiers like *nuclear* and nominal modifiers like *particle* are the first items merged to the root PHYSIC. First-merged items then incorporate into the head of the compound, giving the structures as in (20).


¹⁰ The reader will note that this is also true for the derivations in §3.3.1.

¹¹ This derivation also deals easily with paradoxes such as *rewritten* discussed in Haugen and Siddiqi (2016). Haugen and Siddiqi propose to capture paradoxes like *rewritten* via post-spell-out linear spanning. For evidence of why their account cannot capture all instances of allomorphy see the Korean data in Chung (2007) (also discussed in Caha 2018 and Newell & Noonan 2018). In Korean NEG+verb root allomorphy is blocked by an intervening CAUSE head. Importantly, this caus head intervenes hierarchically, but not linearly.


(i) NEG +know = molu- (*mos/an(i)-al)
 (ii) NEG +know+CAUSE = mos/an(i)-al-li (*molu-li)

The Korean data can be captured neatly under a Domain-Suspension account (Newell & Noonan 2018).

(20) a.



b.



(Steddy 2019:14)

A reviewer correctly points out, however, that there is a well-known distinction in stress patterns between modifier-noun derivations and compound-noun derivations. In *nuclear physicist*, the dominant stress falls on *physicist*, while in *particle physicist* (a primary compound in the terminology of Harley 2009) the dominant stress falls on *particle*, just as it does in synthetic compounds like *truck-driver*.¹³ If we take this distinction to be due to the position of Nuclear Stress, and following Cinque (1993), propose that Nuclear Stress is assigned to the most embedded word, then the stress in (20b) is consistent with the left-hand member being more embedded than its head noun, but the stress of (20a) is not. The correct derivation for *nuclear physicist* is therefore not (20a), but (15). In (15) neither *nuclear* nor *physicist* contain one another structurally. Each will therefore be sent to PF upon merger of their category-defining heads, and each will be endowed with a Left-Edge CV. Nuclear Stress will be assigned to each word. After *nuclear* has been merged into the specifier of the functional structure above *physicist* the two words will be linearized, but phrasal Nuclear Stress will fall on *physicist*, as it is structurally lower than its modifier. The final linear phonological structure of *nuclear physicist* is therefore as in (21).

(21) C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 Ø Ø n u k Ø l i j ə ɪ Ø Ø Ø f i z i s i s Ø t Ø

In the derivation of *particle physicist*, the distinct determination of stress is predicted by the derivation where the left member of the compound is incorporated into the head noun, as in (20b). In this derivation, *particle* is contained within the structure of *physicist* and therefore will be sent to spell-out prior to interpretation of the head noun. In this cycle, *particle* will receive word and Nuclear Stress, as well as a Left-edge CV. In the subsequent cycle of interpretation, *physicist* will be interpreted. As *particle* is c-commanded by (or contained within) *physicist*, the latter will neither be the most embedded element at spellout, nor the leftmost in its domain. It will therefore receive word stress (it will be footed), but will receive neither Nuclear Stress nor a Left-Edge CV. The linear representation of *particle physicist* is therefore as in (22).

(22) C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V C V
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 Ø Ø p a ɪ Ø t i k ə l Ø f i z i s i s Ø t Ø

¹² Whether the root and affix in *nuclear* or *particle* are synchronically separable is irrelevant to the discussion here.

¹³ Some compounds have unexpected stress on the rightmost member (c.f. *APPLE cake* vs. *apple PIE*). These exceptions will not be treated here. Main stress falling on the left member of a compound is assumed here to be the default pattern.

This distinction in phonological structure receives support from the behaviour of degree allomorphy in compound structures. A reviewer brings up examples like **punch-drunker* or **house-prouder*, originally discussed in (Spencer 1988). The left-members of these compounds bleed the insertion of the synthetic degree allomorphs *-er/-est*. This can be directly compared to the non-bleeding of synthetic degree morphology in derivations prefixed with *un-* (e.g. *unhappier*), as discussed in §3.2.¹⁴ This distinction is easily explained in terms of phonological domain distinctions. The two words in a compound like *house-proud* are not separated by an empty CV, and therefore at the point of Vocabulary Insertion for the degree head, the entire phonological string *house-proud* is visible and available to condition allomorphy. The *-er/-est* allomorphs do not select for bases that are bi-syllabic which end in stops (c.f. exceptions such as *politer*) and therefore the output of such a derivation will be *more/most house-proud*.¹⁵

The conclusions of §3.1-3.4 are as follows. First, procedural cyclicity is important for determining the position of stress in phrasal, compound, and prefixed structures. The most embedded element in each receives Nuclear Stress. Default nasal place will be assigned to *un-* in its first cycle of interpretation, bleeding place assimilation. In cases of incorporation/compounding, the procedural account of stress placement argues for a distinct representational output from phrasal compounds; notably, the two members of compounds are not separated by an empty CV. This falls out of the predictions of the system, but is then confirmed by the behaviour of compounds in degree derivations. All in all, none of these derivations, traditionally thought to give rise to variations of Level-Ordering-type BPs, give rise to bracketing paradoxes.

3.5 Particle Verb Bracketing Paradoxes

The first full description of a BP was Pesetsky (1979)'s analysis of Russian Yer deletion in Prefixed verbs.¹⁶ Pesetsky notes that Yer vowels (alternating between high vowels (realized as mid-vowels) and unpronounced vocalic positions) are subject to the two following rules:

- (23) Yer lowering: Lower a Yer in a syllable preceding another Yer ($I/U \rightarrow e/o / _ _ C_0 I/U$)
 (24) Yer deletion: Delete any non-lowered yers.

When multiple Yers are evidenced in a row, we can see that the rule of Yer-Lowering applies from left-to-right, as in the following derivation of *deněček* 'day-diminutive-diminutive-nominative'.

¹⁴ It may also be the case that allomorphy of the degree head is sensitive to the position of Nuclear Stress, which would be too far from the right edge in a compound to trigger selection of the synthetic suffixes. Note that *-er* suffixation is also complicated by non-compound modification (e.g. *??incredibly whiter*). See Newell 2008 and references therein for a discussion of these constructions.

¹⁶ Here when I say prefixed verbs or particle verbs I refer to lexical (not supralexic) constructions in Slavic, and to separable (not fused) constructions in Germanic. The literature on different kinds of particle verbs is large and the variation in the behaviour of distinct types of particles is beyond the scope of this paper.

(25)	Underlying	[[[[dIn] Ik] Ik] U
	Cycle 1	---
	Cycle 2	e
	Cycle 3	e
	Cycle 4	e
	Yer-Deletion	Ø
	Other rules	denekek → deněček

(Pesetsky 1979:7)

If Yer-Lowering were applied from Right-to-Left in the fully formed noun, the predicted form would be the ungrammatical *denkk. The relevant paradox comes into view when considering prefixed verbs. There, the realization of the vowel in the prefix varies depending on whether the following syllable contains a pronounced vowel (see also Matushansky 2002 and Gribanova 2012 for discussions of the morpho-phonology of particle verbs in Russian).


- (26) a. podU-žIg-l-U → podžěg 'set fire'
under-burn-past-masc.
- b. podU- žIg-l-a → podožgla 'set fire'
under-burn-past-fem.

Note that the output of (26a) is distinctly *not* the pattern that occurs in (25) where all vowels but the final Yer are realized. The attested pattern is predicted if the prefix is merged after (structurally outside of) the masculine suffix, and the derivation proceeds cyclically as in (27)¹⁷.

(27)	Underlying	[podU[[žIg] l-U]]
	Cycle 1	---
	Cycle 2	žeg-l-U
	Cycle 3	---
	Yer-deletion	/podžěg/
		(+ other phonological rules)

The problem here is that the prefix is decidedly *not* merged outside the final -U 'MASC'. Firstly, the semantic interpretation of particle verbs, including this one, may be idiomatic. Here the meaning 'set fire' is not predictable from the simple composition of the meanings of the particle and the verb. It is generally held that all members of an idiom must be found within a certain domain, at the phrasal level, proposed to be the vP (Marantz 1984b, 1997). Also, the syntactic literature on particle verbs has converged upon the conclusion that the particle heads a PP/Small Clause complement to the verb, as in (28). For the detailed syntactic motivations behind this type of analysis see Wurmbbrand (1998), Taraldson (2000), Ramchand & Svenonius (2002), Svenonius (2004), Caha & Ziková (2016) and those cited within.

¹⁷ Matushansky (2002) proposes that the prefix is marked as non-cyclic, causing it to be ignored by cyclic rules like Yer-Lowering. As argued in the previous sections, this analysis is diacritic and non-modular and therefore cannot be adopted here. We will see that there is a fully modular explanation for the behavior of these morphemes.




(Svenonius 2004a: 222)

It is clear in many languages that the particle does not remain in-situ (hence the possibility of reordering within the VP in (28); *throw out the dog*). In Slavic languages these particles are always preverbal and cannot be separated from the verb. There have been two different types of proposal in the literature explaining how the particles come to be pronounced in this position.¹⁸ The first is that it raises via head-movement, as in (29).

- (29) a. Samoljot pere-letajet granicu.
 plane across-flies border
 'The plane is flying across the border' (Russian)


(Svenonius 2004a:220)



(Svenonius 2004a:223)

The second proposal is that particles come to precede the verb via phrasal movement, as in (30).

¹⁸ The motivation for movement of the particle is proposed to be the necessity of the null *ground* operator (perhaps incorporated into the particle itself, to scope over and bind a variable in Asp(ect)P, a phrase that sits above VP (see 30). This is proposed by Svenonius (2004) to explain the perfectivizing effect of particles. Note that in Germanic languages the particle may be separated from the verb by the object (English : threw the dog out) by morphology (German: Part-zu-Verb) or by V2 movement (German: *AUF hat Peter die Tür gemacht (nicht zu)* 'Peter has opened the door' (Wurmbrand 1998:272)). This behaviour is consistent with an XP movement account of particles, to be supported in this section, following Svenonius (2004) and Čaha and Ziková (2016).




(Caha & Ziková 2016: line 442)

Wurmbrand (1998) for German, Svenonius (2004) for Russian, Taraldson (2000) for Norwegian, and Caha and Ziková (2016) for Czech give arguments that the particle, even in Slavic languages where it is never separated from the verb, moves to the left of the verb via XP movement. The evidence for this for Czech in Caha & Zikova (2016) is especially striking.¹⁹

Caha & Zikova (2016), following (Zikova 2012 (following Scheer 2001)), note that there is a difference in the vowel length of the prefix in Czech depending on whether it finds itself within the scope of an aspectual head. If it is base-generated below Asp, the particle must raise (to scope over and bind the perfectivity-inducing variable in Asp⁰ (following Svenonius 2004)). If there is no Asp in the structure there is no trigger for raising and the prefix stays low (ex. in root VP nominalizations). If the particle remains in the VP, its vowel is spelled-out as long (length is indicated by an acute accent), and if it raises its vowel is short.

- (31) a. *Petr na-psal dopis*
 Petr on-wrote letter
 ‘Peter wrote the letter’
 (Caha & Ziková 2016: line 76)
- b. *ná-pis*
 on-write
 ‘a sign’



(Caha & Ziková 2016: line 329)

Caha and Zikova demonstrate this correlation very clearly with reference to verbal, participial, and ‘high-nominalization’ (outside of vP) constructions (short vowel) versus adjectives and ‘low nominalization’ (inside vP) constructions (long vowel). All of the constructions with short vowels

¹⁹ Note that the object of the particle must evacuate the Particle Phrase before XP movement or the object would always intervene between the particle and the verb (Ora Matushansky p.c.). The XP movement of the Particle Phrase is therefore an instance of Remnant Movement as argued for in (e.g.) Nkemnji (1995), Müller (1996), and Koopman (1996).

are shown to be perfective, hence containing an AspP, while the constructions with long vowels are not perfective, indicating the absence of AspP; the trigger for PP raising. The motivation for vowel lengthening is proposed to be templatic.²⁰ Inside a PWd (inside nP/aP) the vowel will be long and outside the PWd (in AspP) the vowel will be short.²¹ Importantly for the discussion of the syntactic structure, Caha & Zikova argue that this spell-out distinction is only possible if the particle has escaped spellout in the domain of vP (as in 32a) or remained in the spell-out domain of an nP (as in 32b). Caha & Zikova's analysis aligns with the fact that the particle is not in the same phonological domain (standardly considered the PWd) as the verb in constructions containing AspP, aligning it with the analysis of Svenonius (2004), where XP-movement of the PP to Spec,AspP is responsible for the aspectual effects of lexical particles in Slavic languages. If the particle were to move via head-movement, this distinction would not be predicted. Morphemes that are co-members of a complex head are almost uniformly considered to be spelled out in the same cycle/PWd.²²

3.4.1 *Particle Verbs Bracketing Paradoxes Resolved*

Based on the evidence from Caha & Zikova's analysis of Czech, from Svenonius' arguments for Russian, from the separability of particles and verbs in Germanic languages, and from a host of other data that indicate a cross-linguistic pattern whereby particles are interpreted separately from the verbs with which they combine, we can argue that XP movement is the means by which particles are spelled out to the left of the verb. This will allow for a uniform analysis of the cross-linguistic particle verb BPs exemplified (but by no means exhausted) by the following data.


First let us consider the Russian BP from Pesetsky (1979). Here the particle will project a PP in the complement of vP.

²⁰ Scheer (2001) proposes that the prefix vowel alternations are due to lengthening, while Zikova (2012) and Caha & Zikova (2016) argue that the alternation must be due to vowel shortening. Regardless of which analysis is correct, the two distinct behaviours are clearly linked to the presence or absence of perfective aspect.

²¹ Another option for explaining the vowel-length difference in these examples might be that the vowel is spelled out as short if interpreted alone (when moved, following Johnson 2004's theory of numerphology), and long if spelled out in combination with another morpheme. A correlation has been noted in the literature between the licensing of long vowels and diphthongs and the presence of a following vowel (see Lowenstamm 1996, Kaye 1990). This distinction, however, could not be generalized to all long and short vowels in Czech.

²² See Dobler et al (to appear) for an exception that does not impact the discussion here.

(33) a.



In the derivation above, the particle will be spelled out in PP, assuming PP is a phase. Even if PP were not a phase, then PP would undergo spell-out upon movement to Spec,AspP. Remember that left-branches (adjuncts, as well as specifiers) must undergo interpretation before (re)merger into the tree according to Uriagereka (1999) and Johnson (2004). The output of the first cycle of interpretation is therefore (34).

(34)

C	V	C	V
p	o	d	U

In (34), the final Yer is unlinked/floating. According to the rule of Yer Lowering, a Yer will only be lowered and pronounced (linked to a V position on the CV tier) if followed by another Yer in a subsequent syllable. In terms of Government Phonology, this means that a Yer vowel will only be required to link if it is not governed by a vowel in the following V-position. Final unlinked Yers are exceptionally licit (they are not deleted) due to a parameter that permits final vowel positions to remain empty/unlinked/unpronounced.²⁴

The following cycle will see the spell-out of the verb and its suffixes. Griбанова (2013) argues that the verb in Russian moves to a position above vP and below TP; AspP in (33). As the verb has raised out of vP it will undergo spell-out in the CP phase with its suffixes. Here the output of the CP phase will be as in (35).

(35)

C	V	C	V	C	V
ž	e	g	Ø	l	U


²³ AgrP is included here for expository purposes. Should agreement not project in the tree, but rather emerge due to checking relations in the syntax, nothing will change about the analysis herein. (see Embick (1997) on dissociated morphemes).

²⁴ This is also true for some languages that do not contain Yers. Final empty vowel positions are not sanctioned in all languages. Languages that require final vowels to be pronounced will not permit consonant-final words.

In (35) the final Yer remains unpronounced for the reasons stated above, and the *l* deletes for independent reasons. As the Yer in the root (spelled out as ‘e’) is followed by another Yer, or in terms of GP, as the root Yer is non-final and ungoverned, it must be linked and pronounced. Subsequent to this cycle of spell-out the particle and verb are linearized (36).



In (36), the final Yer of the particle is not followed by a Yer, as the root-Yer has been previously lowered and linked to the CV tier (35). It is now indistinguishable from a regular vowel and does not trigger Yer-Lowering of the particle’s final vowel. The full vowel of the root governs the vowel of the preceding syllable, allowing it to remain unlinked and unpronounced. Note that this derivation informs us about the order of operations in the second phase. First *žlg-l-U* is spelled out, and then *podU* and *žlg-l-U* are linearized. If linearization preceded the application of phonological operations on *žlg-l-U* then *podU* would be sensitive to the yer in *žlg* and would spell-out as *podo*.²⁵ Also of note here is the distinction in edge-marking between Russian and the English examples in we have seen. Russian phase edges will not be marked by an empty CV. This lack of marking is independently supported in Lowenstamm (1999) and Scheer (2009a). Initial CVs are supported only in languages whose onsets conform to the Sonority-Sequencing Principle. In onsets that rise in sonority, the relationship of Infrasegmental Government applies between the two consonants. Obstruents, being structurally more complex than sonorants can govern a following sonorant consonant, permitting the intervening vocalic position to remain unpronounced. This, in turn, allows the vowel of the initial empty CV to be governed by the full vowel that follows the complex onset (37).



In languages where obstruents are not uniformly in a position to Infrasegmentally Govern a sonorant in complex onsets (like in Russian), the vowel separating the two consonants must be governed by a following overt vowel, leaving no governor for an empty vowel in an initial CV. As ungoverned vowels must be pronounced, and as no word-initial vowels are epenthesized, there can be no initial CV in such languages.

²⁵ A reviewer notes that on purely phonological grounds, the prefix may spell-out after the CP-cycle has undergone phonological interpretation. In such a case, the prefixal Yers, like in the derivation of (25), would be processed left to right. Although this derivation works, the examination of similar cross-cyclic phonological behaviour (ex. liaison in French), as well as the theoretical proposals in work such as Uriagereka (1999) and Johnson (2004), point towards derivations where the spell-out of syntactic left-branches occurs before the structure linearized to its right is visible. What is also clear from the above discussion is that Yer-lowering cannot be effected only at the ‘post-lexical’ level, or the across-the-board left-to-right lowering pattern in the ungrammatical **podožžeg* would be predicted to be grammatical.

not (ex. Slavic). Derivations like the preceding can easily be extended to explain other particle-verb phonological patterns cross-linguistically, including but not limited to, Hungarian vowel harmony (which does not cross the particle-verb domain (40)), Warlpiri vowel-harmony, stress-assignment, and verb conjugation class which is sensitive to the domain of the verb and not to the particle (41), and compound stress patterns and the separability of the particle verb in German (42). In these languages, onsets obey the sonority sequencing principle, and therefore cyclic spell-out ensures that there is an empty CV sequence separating the phonological domains of the particle and the verb.²⁶

- | | | | | | |
|------|----|---|----|---|--|
| (40) | a. | át-lép-és
across-step-dev
'transgression' | b. | le-tartóztat-ás
down-hold-dev
'arrest' | (front/back harmony: Kenesai 1995:158) |
| (41) | a. | [[pirri-] kuju-rnu]
preverb-throw-PAST
'to scatter' | b. | pirri-kiji-rni
preverb-throw-nonPAST
'to scatter' | (i/u vowel harmony: Nash 1980:140) |
| (42) | a. | áuf-gèben
part-give
'give up' | c. | ver-gèben
prfx-give
'forgive' | (particle vs. prefix stress: Wurmbrand 1998) |

To conclude this section, particles are interpreted separately from the verb with which they combine due to the fact that they undergo phrasal movement out of the vP. This movement ensures that particles undergo spell-out separately from the verbs that select for them. Subsequent to movement, particles will be treated as separate phonological domains in languages that mark the left edge of a phase with an empty CV (ex. German, Warlpiri), and may be incorporated into the phonological domain of the verb in languages that do not have the ability to CV-mark their phonological domains (ex. Russian, Czech), although this incorporation will be sensitive to operations that have taken place in the independent phonological cycles that occur prior to the linearization of the prefix and verb. Left branches (adjuncts and specifiers) will be spelled-out separately from the structures they combine with. This generalization over spell-out domains, the independently supported proposals that particles undergo XP movement (Wurmbrand 1998, Taraldson 2000, Svenonius 2004, Caha & Zikova 2016) and a flat theory of phonology combine to erase any paradoxical nature of particle verb constructions. The question of why there is a general tendency for particles cliticize to verbs can be subsumed under the question of why phonological clitics behave as dependents in general; a question that is beyond the scope of this article (See Svenonius 2016 for a recent proposal).

3.5 Reduplication Bracketing Paradoxes

Finally, let us turn to the discussion of a Reduplication paradox presented in Marantz (1987), taken from Odden & Odden (1985). This section will demonstrate how the analyses of BPs in the


²⁶ See also Biskup, Putnam & Smith (2011) for a discussion of verb-particle spell-out.

sections above can be easily extended to cover the Kihehe-type domain mismatches in Full Reduplication as exemplified in (43) below.

- (43) a. ku-tova-RED → ku-tova-tova ‘to beat a bit’
 Inf-beat-RED
- b. ku-iita-RED → kwíita-kwíita ‘to pour a bit’
 Inf-pour-RED
- c. kú-lu-iita-RED → kú-lwiita-lwiita ‘to pour it a bit’
 Inf-it-pour-RED
- d. n-teléka-RED → neleka-neleka ‘I will cook a bit’
 1SG-cook-RED


(Marantz 1987)

In (43a) we see the output of a reduplicated consonant-initial verb. It is clear that the reduplicative marker scopes outside the domain of the verb (copied), and under the infinitive (not copied). Yet, as pointed out by Marantz, there are two environments where an outer affix will apparently ‘tuck in’ under the reduplicative morpheme, even though this causes a mismatch between the phonological and morpho-syntactic domains. In (43b,c) we see constructions with V-initial verbs following prefixes that end in a high round vowel. This vowel (together with a preceding consonant) will syllabify in the onset of a following V-initial morpheme (as a C-glide onset). In (43d) the 1SG prefix is underlyingly a floating nasal feature. This feature associates to the segmental structure of the consonant to its right. In cases where gliding or featural association combine with reduplication the affix that syntactically scopes over the reduplicative morpheme behaves as though it sits within the reduplicative domain. Note that the reduplicated domain is the stem, not the verb root (final vowels and other suffixes are reduplicated if present). In (44) I suggest that the RED affix sits in AspP and the Infinitival prefix in TP. These labels are not crucial. It is also not crucial whether the 1SG marker scopes above or below RED, as unlike the *u*-final prefixes, the behaviour of the nasal feature is not variable. The nasal associates with the onset position to its right regardless of the featural content of that position. What is crucial for an explanation of the variable behaviour of the *u*-final prefixes is that RED scopes over the vP, and under the position of the Infinitival marker.



Marantz argues that “The Kihehe reduplication involves a morpheme unit, not some unit that is phonologically definable independent of the stem.” (204). He proposes (along with Sproat 1985) that BPs are caused by a phonologically-induced rebracketing, as in (45b)

- (45) a. Phonological structure isomorphic with (44) b. Rebracketed structure



Marantz proposes that adjacency at phonological structure is associative. This entails that [ku[iita RED]] is equal to [[ku iita] RED]. The requirement in Kihehe that high-round segments syllabify as onsets if possible is what triggers this re-bracketing in the case of vowel-initial stems. Therefore, at spell-out, RED will scope over the relevant prefixes, explaining their inclusion in the reduplicative domain.

The translation of Marantz' solution into a derivation that functions in the linear system proposed here is not difficult. First, we must consider the evolution of syntactic theory, and the subsequent effect of phases on phono-syntactic relations. Assuming the verb stem is the spell-out of vP, we can see that Marantz was mistaken in his statement to the effect that the domain of reduplication is not definable in the phonology. The reduplicated domain is the entire phonological string that is the output of the first phase.



Next, we have to define how the RED morpheme targets this domain for doubling. In a modular system, RED cannot target the morpho-syntactic node that dominates *tova* or *iita*, as phonological outputs cannot contain morphological information. RED can only target a phonological object, as its copy-function is operative over the phonological output of the previous phase. But, Marantz is also correct that the RED morpheme cannot be of a specific phonological size (syllable, foot), as the size of the reduplicated domain tracks the size of the stem. This type of pattern is easily captured within the system of reduplication found in Raimy (2000). According to Raimy, reduplication adds a loop to the linearization algorithm of a string of segments. Licit targets for the beginning and end of a loop include first and last segments, consonants, vowels etc. Full reduplication, as seen in Kihehe, is the insertion of a loop that begins at the final segment and returns to the first segment of a phonological domain. According to this type of system, the output of the vP phase will be a strictly linearized string as in (47), where # signals the beginning and % the end of the string.



If we translate this into a CVCV framework and insert an empty initial CV to mark the edge of the domain, we get the following outputs at PF.

²⁷ Note that Raimy's # and % are not elements in the string like # and + were in SPE. Here they are included solely to clarify the beginnings and endpoints of strings.

- (48) a. # → C → V → C → V → C → V → %
 | | | | | |
 ∅ ∅ t o v a
- b. # → C → V → C → V → C → V → C → V → %
 | | | | |
 ∅ ∅ ∅ i t a

In the CP phase in (44), the RED and infinitival affixes will be spelled out. RED, as stated above, will insert a loop from the last to the first segment of the domain in its scope (here to its left, as RED in Kihehe is suffixal).

- (49) a. # → C → V → C → V → C → V → %
 | | | | | |
 ∅ ∅ t o v a
- b. # → C → V → C → V → C → V → C → V → %
 | | | | |
 ∅ ∅ ∅ i t a

Then the infinitival (or person agreement/object clitic) affix will be inserted. The *u* of the prefix (or the [nasal] feature) will scan the melodic tier (50a). If there is a vowel to its right, the prefixal melodic material will merge into the appropriate domain (50b). In a case where the environment for merger is not met, the prefix will sit outside of the domain to its right (51). The predicted phonological outputs are obtained. Extra empty CVs (as in (50b)) may be deleted in the final representation, but they are maintained below for ease of exposition.

- (50) a. # C → V → C → V → C → V → C → V → C → V → C → V → % #
 | | | | | | | | |
 ∅ ∅ k u ∅ ∅ ∅ i t a
 → ku-iita-iita
- b. # C → V → C → V → C → V → C → V → C → V → C → V → % #
 | | | | | | | | |
 ∅ ∅ ∅ ∅ k ∅ w i t a
 → kwiita-kwiita
- (51) # C → V → C → V → # → C → V → C → V → C → V → % #
 | | | | | | | | |
 ∅ ∅ k u ∅ ∅ t o v a
 → ku-tova-tova

In this way, the phonological output of the CP phase is not inconsistent with the morpho-syntactic bracketing. As seen in the previous sections, it is in fact impossible for a bracketing mismatch to occur in a linear phonological system.²⁸

4. Conclusion

In this paper I have argued for a fully modular derivational system, where only strictly phonological objects and operations are present in the phonological module of each derivation. Specifically, hierarchical structures, if included in the derivation, only serve to create Bracketing Paradoxes that would otherwise not arise. Once these BPs are admitted into the system, then they must be repaired. Over the last 40 years, linguists have been proposing ad-hoc operations in various attempts to rid the system of BPs. I have demonstrated here that, using proposals that have been independently motivated; phases, the independent spell-out of adjuncts and specifiers, linearization, lateral relations between segments, CVCV phonology, liaison, and modularity, we have a system in which all the types of Bracketing Paradoxes that have troubled morpho-phonologists over the last decades do not arise, and therefore do not need to be repaired. A system that doesn't produce impossible structures is clearly preferable to one that does, and this distinction should inform our global evaluation of possible phonological representations.

References

- Allen, M. R. (1979). Morphological investigations. Ph. D. dissertation. UConn.
- Arad, M., 2003. Locality constraints on the interpretation of roots: The case of Hebrew denominal verbs. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 21(4), pp.737-778.
- Beard, R. (1991). Decompositional composition: The semantics of scope ambiguities and 'bracketing paradoxes'. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 9(2), 195-229.
- Benua, L. 1995. Identity effects in morphological truncation. *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 18: 77-136.
- Bermúdez-Otero, R. 2011a. May. The missing cycles in the Spanish diphthongal alternation. In CASTL Colloquium, Tromsø.
- Bermúdez-Otero, Ricardo 2011b. Cyclicity. *The Blackwell Companion to Phonology*, edited by Marc van Oostendorp, Colin Ewen, Elizabeth Hume & Keren Rice, 2019-2048. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bermúdez-Otero, R. 2013. The stem-level syndrome. UPenn Linguistics Department Speaker Series. Philadelphia, 11.
- Bermúdez-Otero, R., 2017. Stratal phonology. In *The Routledge Handbook of Phonological Theory* (pp. 114-148). Routledge.

²⁸ Marantz discusses two other examples of reduplication BPs. The first is a Tagalog reduplication pattern that interacts with an operation of root truncation. It is clear from Carrier (1973) that these examples are cases of allomorphy akin to the cases like *baroque flautist* in §3.3. The second is a case from Mende where initial consonant mutation occurs in certain syntactic environment (generally when the word in question follows its complement). There is a debate in the literature over whether the Mende case is triggered by a morpheme or a strictly phonological environment (Conteh, Cowper & Rice 1984; Cowper & Rice 1984, 1985, 1986; Lieber 1983, 1987; Seidl 2001; Iosad 2008, 2010). In either case, there is a requirement that the trigger of mutation be directly to the left of the relevant consonant, indicating that a linear phonological analysis is feasible. Evaluating the various analyses of Mende mutation cannot be accomplished herein.

- Bermúdez-Otero, R. 2019. Challenges to Stratal Phonology. Session 2 handout. Brugmann Fellow course, IGRA, Leipzig, July.
- Biskup, P. 2018. Prepositions and Verbal Prefixes: The case of Slavic.
- Biskup, P., Putnam, M. and Smith, L.C., 2011. German particle and prefix verbs at the syntax-phonology interface. *Leuvense Bijdragen*, 97, pp.106-35.
- Bobaljik, J.D., 2000. The ins and outs of contextual allomorphy. *University of Maryland working papers in linguistics*, 10, pp.35-71.
- Bobaljik, J.D., 2012. *Universals in comparative morphology: Suppletion, superlatives, and the structure of words*. MIT Press.
- Bobaljik, J. and Wurmbrand, S., 2013. Suspension across domains. *Distributed morphology today: Morphemes for Morris Halle*, pp.185-198.
- Bobaljik, J. & H. Harley. 2017. Suppletion is local: Evidence from Hiaki, in Newell, H., M. Noonan, G. Piggott, & L. Travis (eds). *The structure of words at the interfaces*. OUP.
- Booij, G., & Lieber, R. (1993). On the simultaneity of morphological and prosodic structure. In *Studies in lexical phonology* (pp. 23-44).
- Caha, P. (2018). Notes on insertion in Distributed Morphology and Nanosyntax. In L. Baunaz, L. Haegeman, K. De Clercq, & E. Lander (Eds.). *Exploring Nanosyntax*. 57-87. OUP.
- Caha, P. and Ziková, M., 2016. Vowel length as evidence for a distinction between free and bound prefixes in Czech. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 63(3), pp.331-377.
- Carnie, A. (1991). A domain based phonology: The evidence from Modern Irish. In *Proceedings of the Leiden Conference for Junior Linguists* (Vol. 3, pp. 59-76).
- Carrier, J.L., 1979. The interaction of morphological and phonological rules in Tagalog: a study in the relationship between rule components in grammar (Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology).
- Chierchia, G. 1986. Length, syllabification and the phonological cycle in Italian. *Journal of Italian Linguistics* 8, 5-34.
- Chomsky, N. & M. Halle. (1968) *the Sound Pattern of English*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Chomsky, N. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, edited by Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, pp. 1–52. MIT Press, Cambridge, Ma.
- Chomsky, N., 2001. Derivation by Phase (MITOPL 18). Ken Hale: A Life is Language, pp.1-52.
- Chung, I. (2007). Suppletive negation in Korean and distributed morphology. *Lingua*, 117(1), 95-148.
- Conteh, Patrick, Elizabeth Cowper, and Keren Rice. 1985. The environment for consonant mutation in Mende. In *Current issues in African linguistics*, Gerrit Dimmendaal (ed.), vol. 3, 107–116. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Cowper, Elizabeth and Keren Rice. 1987. Are morphosyntactic rules necessary? *Phonology Yearbook* 4: 185–194.
- Cowper, E. and Rice, K., 1985. The destruction of tonal structure in Mende. *Studies in African Linguistics*, pp.57-62.
- De Clercq, Karen, 2013. *A unified syntax of negation*. Doctoral dissertation, Ghent University.
- Devine, A. and L. Stephens. 1976 The Function and Status of Boundaries in Phonology. In *Linguistic Studies offered to Joseph Greenberg on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*, Alphonse Juilland (ed.), 285-312. Saratoga, Cal.:Anma Libri.
- Downing, L. J., Hall, T. A., & Raffelsiefen, R. (Eds.). (2005). *Paradigms in phonological theory*. Oxford University Press.

- Embick, D., 2014. Phase cycles, ϕ -cycles, and phonological (in) activity. The form of structure, the structure of forms: essays in honor of Jean Lowenstamm, pp.271-86.
- Embick, D. (1997). Voice and the interfaces of syntax. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Encrevé, P. (1988). La liaison avec et sans enchaînement (Vol. 15). Seuil.
- Fabb, N., 1988. English suffixation is constrained only by selectional restrictions. *Natural language & Linguistic theory*, 6(4), pp.527-539.
- Fábregas, A. In press. *Morphologically Derived Adjectives in Spanish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Fodor, J, A. 1983. *The Modularity of Mind*. Cambridge Mass. MIT Press.
- Fodor, J.A., 1985. Precis of the modularity of mind. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 8(1), pp.1-5.
- Giegerich, H.J., 1999. Lexical strata in English: Morphological causes, phonological effects (Vol. 89). Cambridge University Press.
- Gribanova, V. 2008. Russian prefixes, particles and palatalization in Stratal OT. Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, ed. Charles B. Chang and Hannah J. Haynie, 217-225. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Gribanova, V. 2012. Connecting cyclic morphosyntax and morphophonology: Russian Bracketing Paradoxes. Presented at ETII. McGill.
- Gribanova, V., 2013. Verb-stranding verb phrase ellipsis and the structure of the Russian verbal complex. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 31(1), pp.91-136.
- Halle, M., & Marantz, A. (1994). Some key features of Distributed Morphology. *MIT working papers in linguistics*, 21(275), 88.
- Harley, H., 2014. On the identity of roots. *Theoretical linguistics*, 40(3-4), pp.225-276.
- Haspelmath, M., 2011. The indeterminacy of word segmentation and the nature of morphology and syntax. *Folia linguistica*, 45(1), pp.31-80.
- Haugen, J. D., & Siddiqi, D. (2016). Towards a Restricted Realization Theory. In Siddiqi D. and H. Harley (eds.). *Morphological metatheory*, 229, 343.
- Hyman, L. 1978. Word Demarcation. In *Universals of Human Language*, Vol 2, Joseph Greenberg (ed.), 443-470. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Inkelas, Sharon (1998). The theoretical status of morphologically conditioned phonology: a case study of dominance effects. *Yearbook of Morphology 1997*. 121-155.
- Iosad, P. (2010). Right at the left edge: initial consonant mutations in the languages of the world. In *Rethinking Universals*. Wohlgemuth, J. & M. Cysouw (Eds.). De Gruyter. pp. 105-137.
- Iosad, Pavel. 2008. Initial consonant mutation and information flow in Mende. Presentation at Old World Conference in Phonology 5, Université de Toulouse–Le Mirail.
- Johnson, K., 2004. Towards an etiology of adjunct islands. *Nordlyd*, 31(1).
- Julien, M., 2002. *Syntactic heads and word formation*. Oxford University Press.
- Kang, B. M. (1993). Unhappier Is Really a "Bracketing Paradox". *Linguistic inquiry*, 788-794.
- Kaye, J., 1990. 'Coda'licensing. *Phonology*, 7(1), pp.301-330.
- Kenesei, I. (1995/1996). On Bracketing Paradoxes in Hungarian. In F. Kiefer & P. Siptár (eds) *Acta Linguistica Hungaria*. Akadémiai Kiadó. Budapest. : 158
- Kenstowicz, M. and C. Kisseberth. 1977. *Topics in Phonological Theory*. New York: Academic Press.
- Kiparsky, P. (1982a). Lexical morphology and phonology. *Linguistics in the morning calm: Selected papers from SICOL-1981*, 3-91.

- Kiparsky, P. (1982b). Word-formation and the lexicon. Paper presented at the Mid-America Linguistics Conference. University of Kansas.
- Kiparsky, P. 2000. Opacity and cyclicity. *The Linguistic Review* 17: 351-367.
- Kiparsky, P. (2005). Paradigm uniformity constraints. Ms, Stanford University. Available at www.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/Papers/LexConservatism.pdf.
- Koopman, H. 1996. The spec-head configuration. *Syntax at Sunset: UCLA Working Papers in Syntax and Semantics*, edited by Edward Garrett and Felicia Lee.
- Larsen, B. U. 1998. Vowel length, Raddoppiamento Sintattico and the selection of the definite article in Italian. In P. Sauzet (éd) *Langues et Grammaire II-III, Phonologie*. Paris: Université Paris 8, 87-102.
- Lebeaux, D. 1991. Relative clauses, licensing and the nature of the derivation. In *Syntax & Semantics 25: Perspectives on phrase structure*, ed. S. Rothstein, 209-239. New York: Academic Press.
- Lieber, R. (1980). *On the organization of the lexicon* Ph. D. dissertation, MIT.
- Lieber, R. 1983. New developments in autosegmental phonology: Consonant mutation. In *Proceedings of the 2nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Stanford.
- Lieber, R. 1987. *An Integrated Theory of Autosegmental Processes*. State University of New York Press
- Lieber, R. (1992). *Deconstructing morphology: Word formation in syntactic theory*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lowenstamm, J., 1996. CV as the only syllable type. *Current trends in phonology: Models and methods*, 2, pp.419-441.
- Lowenstamm, Jean 1999. The beginning of the word. *Phonologica 1996*, John Rennison and Klaus Kühnhammer, 153-166. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Marantz, A. (1984a). Tagalog Reduplication is Affixation, Too. Paper presented at the LSA, Baltimore.
- Marantz, A., (1984b). *On the Nature of Grammatical Relations*, vol. 10 of *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs*.
- Marantz, A., 1987. Phonologically induced bracketing paradoxes in full morpheme reduplication. In *Proceedings of the Sixth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* (pp. 203-212).
- Marantz, A. (1989). Clitics and phrase structure. *Alternative conceptions of phrase structure*, 99-116.
- Marantz, A., 1997. No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon. *University of Pennsylvania working papers in linguistics*, 4(2), p.14.
- Marantz, A., 2007. Phases and words. *Phases in the theory of grammar*, 191, p.222.
- Marantz, A. (2013). Locality domains for contextual allomorphy across the interfaces. *Distributed morphology today: Morphemes for Morris Halle*, 95-115.
- Marvin, T., 2002. Topics in the stress and syntax of words (Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology).
- Marvin, T., 2013. Is word structure relevant for stress assignment. *Distributed morphology today: Morphemes for Morris Halle*, 79-93.
- Matushansky, O., 2002. On formal identity of Russian prefixes and prepositions. *MIT working papers in linguistics*, 42, pp.217-253.
- McCarthy, John. 1995. Faithfulness in Prosodic Morphology & Phonology: Rotuman Revisited. ROA.

- Merchant, J. (1995). An Alignment Solution to Bracketing Paradoxes. *Phonology at Santa Cruz*, 4.
- Mohannan, K. P. (1982). *Lexical phonology*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Müller, G. 1996. Incomplete category fronting. Sfs report 01-96, Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Tübingen
- Nash, D. G. (1980). *Topics in Warlpiri grammar* Ph. D. dissertation, MIT.
- Nespor, M., & Vogel, I. (1986). Prosodic phonology (studies in generative grammar 28). *Dordrecht: Foris*.
- Newell, H. (2005a). A late adjunction solution to bracketing paradoxes. In *The proceedings of NELS* Vol. 35, No. 2, p. 451.
- Newell, H. (2005b). Bracketing paradoxes and particle verbs: a late adjunction analysis. *Proceedings of ConSOLE XIII*, 249-272.
- Newell, H., 2008. Aspects of the morphology and phonology of phases (Doctoral dissertation, McGill University).
- Newell, H. 2016a. The Ontology of English morpho-phonology. 24th Manchester Phonology Meeting (MfM). University of Manchester. 26-28 May.
- Newell, H. 2016b. The Pathology of Level-Specific Morpho-Phonology. Montreal-Ottawa-Laval-Toronto Phonology Workshop (MOLT). Carleton University. 19 March.
- Newell, H. 2017a. There is no word. Presented at GLOW 40. Leiden.
- Newell, H. 2017b. The ontology of English morpho-phonology. Presented at the 24th Manchester Phonology Meeting. Manchester.
- Newell, H. 2017c. English Lexical Levels are not Lexical, but Phonological. <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003898>
- Newell, H. 2018. There are no Bracketing Paradoxes, or How to be a Modular Grammarian. Poster presented at GLOW 41. Budapest.
- Newell, H. 2019. Bracketing Paradoxes in Morphology. In R Lieber (ed). *Oxford Encyclopedia of Morphology*. OUP.
- Newell, H. and Scheer, T., 2017. 25th Manchester Phonology Meeting University of Manchester May 25-27 2017.
- Newell, H and M. Noonan (2018). A Re-portage on spanning; Feature Portaging and Non-Terminal Spell-Out. In *Moving A-Head: Linguistic Treats for Lisa Travis*. McGill Working Papers in Linguistics 21:2. Ileana Paul, Laura Kalin, and Jozina vander Klok (guest eds). 289-303.
- Newell, H., M. Noonan, G. Piggott, & L. Travis (eds). 2017. *The structure of words at the interfaces*. OUP.
- Newell, H. and Piggott, G., 2014. Interactions at the syntax–phonology interface: Evidence from Ojibwe. *Lingua*, 150, pp.332-362.
- Nkemnji, M. A. 1995. Heavy Pied-Piping in Nweh. Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Ochi, M. 1999. Multiple Spell-Out and PF adjacency. In *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistic Society 29*. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Odden, D. and Odden, M., 1985. Ordered reduplication in Kihehe. *Linguistic Inquiry*, pp.497-503.
- Orgun, C. Orhan (1996). Sign-based morphology: a declarative theory of phonology-morphology interleaving. PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Pater, J. (2000). Non-uniformity in English secondary stress: the role of ranked and lexically specific constraints. *Phonology*, 17(02), 237-274.

- Pesetsky, D., 1979. Russian morphology and lexical theory. Manuscript, MIT.,
- Pesetsky, D., 1985. Morphology and logical form. *Linguistic inquiry*, 16(2), pp.193-246.
- Plag, I., 1999. *Morphological productivity: Structural constraints in English derivation* (Vol. 28). Walter de Gruyter.
- Postal, P. 1969. Anaphoric islands. In *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 205–239. Chicago IL: CLS.
- Pyle, C. 1972. On Eliminating BM's. In *Papers from the eighth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Paul Peranteau, Judith Levi and Gloria Phares (eds.), 516-532. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Raffelsiefen, R. (1999). Phonological constraints on English word formation. In *Yearbook of Morphology 1998* (pp. 225-287). Springer Netherlands.
- Raffelsiefen, Renate. (2015). Phonological restrictions on English word-formation. In Müller, P., I. Ohnheiser, S. Olsen, & F. Rainer (Eds.) *Word-Formation. An international handbook of the languages of Europe*. Vol. 2. De Gruyter. 894-917.
- Raimy, E., 2000. The phonology and morphology of reduplication (Vol. 52). Walter de Gruyter. Vancouver.
- Ramchand, G. & Svenonius, P. 2002. The Lexical Syntax and Lexical Semantics of the Verb-Particle Construction. *WCCFL 21 Proceedings*, ed. L Mikkelsen and C. Potts, pp. 387–400. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Reiss, C. (2007). Modularity in the “Sound” Domain: Implications for the Purview of Universal Grammar. In Ramchand, G. and C. Reiss (eds) *The Oxford handbook of linguistic interfaces*. OUP.
- Rice, Keren and Elizabeth Cowper. 1984. Consonant mutation and autosegmental morphology. In *Proceedings of CLS20*, Joseph Drogo, Veena Mishra and David Testen (eds.), 309–320. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Rotenberg, Joel. 1978. *The Syntax of Phonology*. Ph.D dissertation, MIT.
- Scheer, T. 2001. The Rhythmic Law in Czech: Vowel-final Prefixes. In Gerhild Zybatow et al. (eds.) *Current Issues in Formal Slavic Linguistics*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang. 37–48.
- Scheer, T., 2004. What is CVCV and why should it be? (Vol. 68). Walter de Gruyter.
- Scheer, Tobias 2008. Why the Prosodic Hierarchy is a diacritic and why the Interface must be Direct. *Sounds of Silence: Empty Elements in Syntax and Phonology*, edited by Jutta Hartmann, Veronika Hegedüs & Henk van Riemsdijk, 145-192. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Scheer, T., 2009a. External sandhi: what the initial CV is initial of. *Studi e Saggi Linguistici*, 47, pp.43-82.
- Scheer, T., 2009b. Representational and procedural sandhi killers: diagnostics, distribution, behaviour. *Czech in Formal Grammar*, edited by Mojmír Dočekal & Markéta Ziková, pp.155-174.
- Scheer, T., 2011. *A guide to morphosyntax-phonology interface theories: how extra-phonological information is treated in phonology since Trubetzkoy's Grenzsignale*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Scheer, T., 2016. Melody-free syntax and phonologically conditioned allomorphy. *Morphology*, 26(3-4), pp.341-378.
- Seidl, Amanda. 2001. *Minimal indirect reference: A theory of the syntax-phonology interface*. London/ New York: Routledge.
- Selkirk, E. 1981 [1978] On prosodic structure and its relation to syntactic structure. In *Nordic Prosody II*, Thorstein Fretheim (ed.), 111-140. Trondheim:TAPIR.

- Selkirk, E. (1982). The syntax of words (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 7). Cambridge, MA.
- Selkirk, E., 2011. The syntax-phonology interface. *The handbook of phonological theory*, 2, pp.435-483.
- Siegel, D. C. (1974). *Topics in English morphology* Ph. D. dissertation, MIT.
- Speas, M. (1984). Navajo Prefixes and Word Structure Typology." MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, vol . 7.
- Sproat, R. (1984). On bracketing paradoxes. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, 7, 110-130.
- Sproat, R. W. (1985). *On deriving the lexicon* Ph. D. dissertation, MIT.
- Sproat, R. (1988). Bracketing paradoxes, cliticization and other topics: the mapping between syntactic and phonological structure. *Morphology and modularity. Dordrecht: Foris*, 339-360.
- Sproat, R. (1992). Unhappier Is Not a "Bracketing Paradox". *Linguistic Inquiry*, 23(2), 347-352.
- Steriade, Donca (2000): Paradigm uniformity and the phonetics-phonology boundary. In: Michael B. Broe und Janet B. Pierrehumbert (Hg.): *Papers in Laboratory Phonology V: Language Acquisition and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 313–334.
- Starke, M. (2018). Complex left branches, spellout, and prefixes. Baunaz, L., Haegeman, L., De Clercq, K., & Lander, E. (Eds.). *Exploring nanosyntax*, 239-249. OUP.
- Strauss, S. L. (1982). On "relatedness paradoxes" and related paradoxes. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 13(4), 694-700.
- Stepanov, A., 2001. Late adjunction and minimalist phrase structure. *Syntax*, 4(2), pp.94-125.
- Svenonius, P., 2004. Russian prefixes are phrasal. Ms. University of Tromsø.,
- Svenonius, P., 2016. Spans and words. *Morphological Metatheory*, 229, p.201.
- Taraldsen, Tarald. 2000. V-movement and VP-movement in derivations leading to VO-order. In Peter Svenonius (ed.) *The Derivation of VO and OV*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 97–122.
- Uriagereka, Juan. 1999. Multiple Spell-Out. In *Working minimalism*, ed. Samuel David Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 251-282. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- van Oostendorp, M. (1994). Affixation and integrity of syllable structure in Dutch. *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 11(1), 151-162.
- Vogel, I. (2009). The status of the Clitic Group. In Grijzenhout, J., and Kabak, B. *Phonological domains: universals and deviations*, Walter de Gruyter. 15-46.
- Williams, E. (1981). On the notions "Lexically related" and "Head of a word". *Linguistic Inquiry*, 12(2), 245-274.
- Wurmbrand, S., 1998. Heads or phrases? Particles in particular. *Phonology and morphology of the Germanic languages*, pp.267-295.
- Ziková, M. 2012. Lexical Prefixes and Templatic Domains: Prefix Lengthening in Czech. In Markéta Ziková & Mojmír Dočekal (eds.) *Slavic Languages in Formal Grammar: Proceedings of FDSL 8.5*, Brno 2010. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 325–338