The Problem. Bracketing Paradoxes (BPs) are seen as a puzzle whose solution may give particular insight into generative structure building and its interpretation at the interfaces. This classic problem arises from mismatches like in (1). Many solutions to BPs have been proposed, but each

1. (a) [[transformational grammarian] Syn/LF (b) [transformational [grammarian]] PF

has drawbacks (Pesetsky 1979/1985, Allen 1978, Williams 1981, Selkirk 1982, Kiparsky 1982, Sproat 1985/1988, Booij & Lieber 1993, Newell 2005/2008, etc.). I argue here that these drawbacks are concentrated around two theoretical propositions. First, that an affixes’ phonological behaviour is mediated through morphological classification (as in Lexical Phonology (LP)) and, second, that hierarchical structure exists in the phonological representation. In this talk I demonstrate that eliminating lexical Levels and Prosodic Hierarchy(PH)-based structure dissolves the paradox. A CVCV linear analysis (Scheer 2004) of phonological outputs combined with cyclic interpretation of syntactic phases is shown to account for apparent mismatches. This solution gives particular insight into the generative process and its relation to the interfaces, and renders the grammar truly modular in the Fodorian sense. A sketch of the solution. Affixes in the phonological output of a derivation are not restricted to appearing in the position ascribed to them by the morpho-syntax, ex. infixation, liaison, cliticization (ex. Peperkamp 1997), morphological merger/lowering (Halle & Marantz 1993), and phonological merger (Newell & Piggott 2014). It is clear that bloody in absobloodylutely is not in a syntactic position intermediate to abso and lutely. Given this indisputable evidence, we must consider the possibility that the syntactic structure, and input to both the phonology and the semantics, is (1a), and that -ian is subject to one of the operations above, ensuring its phonological proximity to grammar despite its syntactic distance. This is exactly what has been independently proposed by Newell (2016). Newell shows that a better account of the ‘Level 1/2’ distinction in English is given if this difference is not morphological but phonological; so-called Level 1 affixes begin with a floating vowel and therefore link with an open vocalic skeletal position at spell-out, as in (2):

2. 

The derivation of transformational grammarian is effected in at least two steps. Presupposing cycles/phases and Late Insertion (as in Distributed Morphology), [[[transformational]a grammar] [țare]]ₙ, undergoes Vocabulary Insertion, and PF outputs [tăenzfamefoñl găemnl]. The second cycle is [[[transformational]a grammar] [țare]]ₙ ian]. After liaison in (2) induces re-syllabification and stressing, we have the expected PF [tăenzfamefoñl gaemnl]. It is irrelevant to the phonological representation if transformational has been interpreted as closer to grammar in the syntax/semantics (e.g. in the same cycle/phase). The ‘phonological bracketing’ in (1b) never exists. That this is not a notational variant of a PH/bracketing account will be demonstrated. This type of analysis will also be shown to account for unhappier and particle verb paradoxes, such as the Russian /pōdũ-žig-l-ú/ → [podžég] ‘set on fire.masc’ (Pesetsky 1979). Such BPs, given independently motivated cyclic syntactic analyses (e.g. Ramchand & Svenonius 2002, Newell 2005), lead to strictly linear phonological representations where the prefixes/particles are not syllabified with their bases, while the suffixes are. Dealing with allomorphy What of allomorphic BPs like Baroque flautist? Here [[[Baroque]ₙ flute[,] g]ₙ, outputs [bąsk flut]. The addition of the suffix -ist cannot induce allomorphic selection of flaut post-hoc. Again, independent arguments from comparative allomorphy in Bobaljik & Wurmbrand (2013) demonstrate that a larger domain of allomorphic conditioning will be forced in just these cases and [[[Baroque]ₙ flute[,] g]ₙ must delay Spell-Out until after -ist is merged. The entire construction is interpreted together. BPs of this type are therefore also illusory. Import of this analysis. Bracketing Paradoxes have been a problem only since the advent of LP and the PH. This analysis demonstrates that problems like BP can reveal the need to reexamine our theoretical tools, forcing a shift of theoretical paradigm. This in turn has an important impact on what constitutes an explanatory theory of phonology.
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