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Morphological Marking Misses the Head

PHILIP MILLER
Ohio State University

One of the classical criteria for determining the Head of a phrase is that it is the primary locus for morphological marking on that phrase. This is embodied in linguistic theories by principles such as the Head Feature Convention (HFC) of GPSG. In this paper I present a series of cases where lexically attached morphological marking appears in non-Head positions on the basis of linear order, viz., on the first or last item of a phrase. The central data discussed are the English possessive marker 's, the Tongan definitive accent, and the French demonstrative enclitics -ci and -là. I propose that this type of lexically realized phrasal inflection is accounted for by EDGE features (which can be FIRST or LAST) that are subject to the Edge Feature Principle (cf. Lapointe 1990, Miller 1992a) and to specific LP statements. I show how this analysis of phrasal inflection accounts for certain types of haplography phenomena which are unaccounted for under postlexical cliticization or syntactic movement analyses.

1. Introduction

The typical situation for the morphological exponence of a feature associated with a phrasal node is that the Head of the phrase is marked for the feature in question. This property is embodied by mechanisms such as the Head Feature Convention (HFC) of Gazdar et al. 1985 (henceforth GKFS). Secondary morphological marking may also occur on certain non-Head items in the phrase by agreement with the Head. This property is accounted for by the Control Agreement Principle of GKFS and similar mechanisms in other theories. The situations which I will be discussing in this paper are crucially different. Namely, I will be analyzing cases where the item of the phrase which receives the morphological mark is...
determined by linear ordering within the phrase, rather than by Head status or Agreement. More specifically, I will be interested in cases where the morphological mark for a feature is realized on the first or the last item of the phrase. The morphological marking can be either affixal or prepositional, and is assumed to be lexically (rather than postlexically) realized. These phenomena have been called phrasal inflection (or affixation) and edge inflection; (cf. Poser 1985; Zwicky 1987; Lapointe 1990; Miller 1992a; Anderson 1992; Halpern and Miller in prep). I will briefly illustrate this notion with respect to the English possessive marker 's and the Tongan Definative Accent (TDA).

It is well known that the English possessive marker 's appears on the last lexical item of a possessive NP. Thus, it is the linear ordering of items within the NP that determines on which lexical item the exponence of the feature POSS, associated with the NP phrasal node, is realized.

1. a. [np The boy's] talk was good.
   b. [np The boy with blond hair's] talk was good.
   c. *[np The boy's with blond hair] talk was good.

Similarly, Tongan indicates a certain type of definiteness on an NP by a prosodic process which consists in shifting the accent from the penultimate mora of a word (the default case) to the final mora (cf. Churchward 1953 §§2.15ff, 4.11ff, 33; Poser 1985; Anderson 1992 pp.212-15; the details of the semantics are not of interest to us here, cf. Churchward for discussion).

(2) a. 'i he fale in a house (specific indefinite interpretation)
   b. 'i he fale in the house

What makes the Tongan Definative Accent (TDA) relevant to our present concerns is that the stress shift marking definiteness occurs on whatever word happens to be the final item of the definite NP. This is illustrated in the following examples, taken from Churchward §2.1.6).

(3) a. 'i he fale. in the house
   b. 'i he fale akô in the school building
   c. 'i he fale ako fo?ô in the new school building

I will argue, following Poser (1985) and Zwicky (1987), that both of these phenomena should be analyzed as lexically realized inflection on the last item of a phrase rather than as the result of postlexical citicization of a separate syntactic formative to the last item. I am assuming that a postlexical clitic is a syntactic word which lacks the appropriate prosodic properties to be a word at the prosodic level, and which is consequently postlexically and postgrammatically attached (citicized) to an adjacent word by a prosodic operation of stray adjunction (cf. Anderson 1992). For the case of an example like (1b), the structure in tree 1 represents a phrasal inflection analysis whereas that in tree 2 represents the 's as a postlexical clitic. The discussion of the precise mechanisms which produce the type of path for the feature PM illustrated in tree 1 is postponed to section 2.

This position raises two central issues. First, what criteria are relevant to deciding that these are cases of lexically realized inflection, rather than postlexical citicization? It should be noted that criterion A of Zwicky and Pullum (1983) ('Clitics exhibit a low degree of selection with respect to their hosts while affixes exhibit a high degree of selection with respect to their stems'), also known as the 'promiscuous attachment' criterion, goes against the position taken here. This is because the final word of an NP in English or Tongan can be of a variety of categories (essentially due to the fact that NPs are not head final in these languages). Consequently, morphological marking on the last word results in promiscuous attachment. Second, what types of syntactic mechanisms can account for such patterns of marking? Specifically, in tree 1, how can the presence of POSS on the NP node trigger inflection on the word hair? Clearly, it is difficult to interpret such marking as the result of an agreement phenomenon. Linear ordering has never been suggested as a basis of choice for agreement targets. Furthermore, if the marking of the last item in examples such as (1b) and (3b, c) were the result of agreement with the Head, it would be expected that the Head noun would also carry respectively the possessive and the definiteness features. But, in that case, we would expect that the NP would be marked for these features in two different places, in examples such as (1b) and (3b, c), namely, both on the last item and on the Head. Indeed, as shown by (1a) and (3a), the Head nouns do have inflected forms for these features. In what follows, I will address the questions of the appropriate criteria for assigning lexically attached phrasal inflection status and propose a syntactic mechanism, the Edge Feature Principle (EFP), to account for it.

2. The Edge Feature Principle

Elaborating on proposals by Nevis (1985), Poser (1985), Zwicky (1987), Lapointe (1990), I will be proposing a solution based on feature percolation in the GKS style, as illustrated in tree 1 above. The problem can be divided into two parts. First, it is necessary to ensure that a path is established between the phrasal node bearing the relevant feature and some terminal node within the phrase, which will be inflected for the corresponding morphological mark. This is the job of the
Edge Feature Principle (EFP). Second, we must be able to specify that the node in question can be either the first or the last. This will be taken care of by LP rules.

The EFP can be informally stated as in (4) (a technically precise definition is given in the appendix. See Miller 1992a, 122ff. and Halpern and Miller ms. for more extensive discussion). In the definition, the feature T is a TRIGGERING feature. The feature E is an EDGE feature, or MORPHOLOGICAL MARKING feature, which will cause the lexical node on which it appears to be inflected, ensuring the exponent of the triggering feature on that node.

(4) **Edge Feature Principle**

(i) If a node has T then one of its daughters has E;
(ii) if a node has E, then its mother has T or E;
(iii) if a node has E, then one of its daughters has E.

By clause (i) of the EFP, the presence of a triggering feature T on a node forces the instantiation of the corresponding EDGE feature E on one of its daughters. For clause (i) to be able to do its job, the grammar must provide a list of pairs defining which EDGE feature corresponds to each triggering feature. Clause (ii) of the EFP governs the ‘upward percolation’ of EDGE features. It requires that if an EDGE feature appears on a daughter in a local tree, then it must appear on the mother. There is one case where this requirement is relaxed, namely if the mother category bears a triggering syntactic feature corresponding to the EDGE feature under discussion. In that case, the EFP is satisfied whether upward percolation stops (the default case) or whether it continues through the node in question (this possibility is the central point on which the EFP and the Foot Feature Principle (FFP) of GKP differ; it plays a crucial role in accounting for the haplogy phenomena to be discussed below). Finally, clause (iii) governs the ‘downward percolation’ of EDGE features. It requires that if an EDGE feature appears on the mother node in a local tree, it must also appear on one of the daughters. This clause prevents an EDGE feature from ‘getting lost’ on the way down to a terminal node.

The functioning of the EFP can be illustrated with respect to tree 1. POSS is the triggering feature. It is the feature which is syntactically and semantically relevant (it is semantically potent in the sense of GKP, p. 223ff.). PM (POSS Marking) is the EDGE feature which is triggered by POSS. The presence of PM on the lexical node dominating hair’s is responsible for it appearing inflected with ‘s.’

In order to account for the fact that PM must follow a rightmost path to a terminal node, it is assigned to the class of LAST features, which are subject to the LP rule (5a). The similar LP rule (5b) for FIRST features ensures that the exponent of a triggering feature which triggers a FIRST feature will be realized on the first item of the phrase.

(5) a. X < LAST 
b. FIRST < X

Separating triggering features from morphological marking EDGE features has a number of advantages. First, it avoids a paradox pointed out for the analysis of Zwicky (1987) by Lapointe (1990). If POSS and PM were the same feature, subject to (5a), then we would incorrectly predict that the possessive NP should follow its sister N. Second, it allows for a distinction between the status of features which can be semantically potent, and features which are responsible for morphological exponent, which are never semantically potent. Third, it provides an account for the fact that different syntactic features can trigger the same types of exponent, and for the fact that certain haplogy phenomena can occur between such triggered morphological marks (cf. section 4).

3. Distinguishing postlexical cliticization from phrasal inflection

Let us now review various criteria that allow a distinction to be made between phrasal inflection and postlexical clitic status. Before doing this, let me briefly point out that the EFP type analysis of phrasal inflection just discussed makes Criterion A of Zwicky and Pullum (1983), quoted above, irrelevant. Indeed, the EFP provides a mechanism that specifically allows for the lexical realization of morphology on items of different categories, as illustrated in the case of the English possessive.

1. Arguments from phonology and morphology.

If lexical phonological rules can apply to the unit formed by the morphological mark and the stem, then the mark is a lexically realized inflection rather than a postlexical clitic. The justification of this criterion follows immediately from the definition of lexical phonological rules. The alternative is to have the lexical phonological rule exceptionally apply postlexically. Similarly, if the realization of the mark depends on the morphological structure of the host, it must be an instance of lexically realized inflection. Indeed, the bracketing erasure convention of Lexical Phonology (cf. Kiparsky 1982), and similar principles of other lexicalist frameworks, make the internal structure of a word invisible to postlexical processes. It should be noted that these types of arguments only carry weight if one assumes the lexicalist hypothesis. Weaker assumptions about the syntax/morphology interface — such as those espoused by current post-*Barriers* GB theory — make them invalid. We will discuss arguments of this type both for the English possessive marker and for the TDA.

2. Processual vs. affixal realization of the morphological mark.

In the case of the English possessive marker, phrasal inflection is realized as a case of phrasal affixation. In the case of Tongan, however, the TDA is realized processually, by a stress shift (cf. Poser 1985 and Anderson 1992, 213-215 for evidence that this cannot be reinterpreted as affixation of a melodically unattached moraic position). Processual realization is a widespread property within morphology. However, it is not clear how postlexical cliticization could be made to account for processual realization. Consequently, if the mark is realized processually, it is an instance of phrasal inflection, not of postlexical cliticization.

---

2 I am assuming that both POSS and PM are unary valued features.

3 Lapointe proposes a different solution to this paradox. However, his proposals raise a number of technical problems. Cf. Miller 1992a, pp.114ff.
3. Haplogy.

If in cases where one would expect two occurrences of the morphological mark under investigation because of the syntactic structure, only one occurrence is found, then the mark is an instance of phrasal inflection rather than of postlexical citicization. Indeed, nothing in the prosodic nature of postlexical citicization would lead us to expect this type of haplogy: one would simply expect a sequence of two occurrences of the clitic. On the other hand, it will become clear below how the phrasal inflection analysis via the EFP directly predicts the relevant types of haplogy.

These three types of criteria are those that will be central to the discussion in this paper. Other criteria are also relevant. In Miller 1992a and 1992b, I argue in favour of two criteria based on repetition of morphological marks in coordinate structures:

(6) a. If an item must be repeated on each conjunct in a coordinate structure it is a lexically realized inflectional mark, not a PLC.
   b. If an item may not be repeated on each conjunct in a coordinate structure, then it must be a PLC, and cannot be a lexically realized inflectional mark.

Other criteria can also be found in Zwicky and Pullum 1983, based on the presence of arbitrary gaps, morphophonological idiosyncrasies, interaction with syntactic rules and ordering between affixes and clitics. I will not discuss these criteria further here.

4. The English possessive marker ‘s

4.1. Phonological and morphological evidence for phrasal inflection status

As pointed out by Zwicky (1987), the English possessive marker exhibits a haplogy phenomenon with Z ending words on the condition that the Z ending is a morphological mark (e.g., the plural marker or the 3rd person singular marker as in (7b) and (7d) below respectively), and not part of the stem (as in (7a) and (7c)). Note also that the presence of plural marking not realized by a Z (as in (7c)) does not lead to haplogy.4

(7) a. the goose’s egg /*lɛs/ /lɛz/ 
b. the hens’ eggs /lɛnz/ /lɛzn/ 
c. the geese’s eggs /*lɛz/ /lɛz/ 
d. the hen that sings’ eggs /lɛnz/ /lɛzn/

If one accepts the central tenets of the lexicalist hypothesis, these haplogy data give us crucial evidence that the possessive marker must be lexically attached. Indeed, if it were attached by postlexical citicization (or syntactic movement), accounting for these data would entail a violation of the principle in (8):

(8) The morphological structure of a word should not be visible for syntactic or postlexical rules or conditions.

Zwicky (1987) uses the notation ‘Z’ to note the different allomorphs [s], [z] and [ts] of the plural, the 3rd pers.sg., and the possessive.

4.2. Haplogy between possessive markers

Zwicky (1987) shows that a haplogy effect appears in cases where one would expect more than one occurrence of the possessive marker on a word, due to the syntactic structure. Consider example (9) which exhibits a ‘locative possessive’ (at Harry’s) in final position within a larger standard possessive NP (the people at Harry’s). Instead of the two occurrences of Z, that one might expect, only a single occurrence appears.

(9) The people at Harry’s hats (*Harry’s’s [ziz])

This phenomenon is automatically accounted for given the feature percolation solution provided above, as shown in the structure assigned to (9).

Tree 3

\[ \text{NP[POSSL]} \]
\[ \text{Det} \]
\[ \text{N[PM]} \]
\[ \text{PP[PM]} \]
\[ \text{the} \]
\[ \text{people} \]
\[ \text{P} \]
\[ \text{at} \]
\[ \text{NP[POSSL, PM]} \]
\[ \text{NP[PM]} \]
\[ \text{N[PM]} \]
\[ \text{at} \]
\[ \text{NP[PM]} \]
\[ \text{Harry's} \]

I assume that the feature PM, which marks the locative possessive, is triggered by a separate triggering feature POSSL (this assumption is necessary to account for the specific semantics of the locative possessive, which is obviously different from that of the standard possessive. See Barker 1991 on the semantics of possessions). The haplogy is then automatically accounted for given the EFP and the GKPS framework. The node N dominating Harry’s is specified as carrying the feature PM both by clause (i) and by clause (iii) of the EFP, since its mother has both the triggering feature POSSL and the marking feature PM. But, given the GKPS definition of categories as partial functions, this cannot result in doubly marking the N node for PM. The double requirement is satisfied by a single specification for the feature PM. This case provides us with an example of the type promised above, where the same morphological marking feature (PM) is triggered by two different triggering features (POSSL and POSSL), and haplogy can be observed between the resulting morphological marks. Without the distinction between triggering features and marking features, one would either have to say that the features driving the locative possessive and the standard possessive are different, which would satisfy the semantics but fail to account for the haplogy, or that the features are the same, accounting for the haplogy but not for the semantics. Note that the formulation of clause (ii) of the EFP, which allows a marking feature on a daughter
if the mother has the triggering feature or the marking feature,⁵ is central to this account. This is the aspect of the EFP which crucially distinguishes it from the Foot Feature Principle (FFP). Indeed, it allows one morphological mark to satisfy the demands of more than one triggering feature. If one attempted to account for the instantiation of EDGE features by the FFP, this would not be possible, barring modifications of the FFP that would be disastrous for the treatment of long distance dependencies (viz., they would incorrectly allow one gap to correspond to multiple fillers).

5. The Tongan Definitive Accent

5.1. Phonological and morphological evidence for phrasal inflection status

Poser (1985) extensively argues that the accent placement characterizing the TDA must be a lexical process. Specifically, Poser shows that accent placement must precede a phonological rule of syllable fusion which he shows to be a lexical rule. Furthermore, because of the processual nature of the realization of the inflection, it is not clear how it could be interpreted as the result of cliticization at all. One idea would be to postulate a clitic with, as phonological representation, a melodically unattached mora position that would be relevant for accent placement. Anderson (1992, 213-15) points out that this floating position should be attached to adjacent melodic material with the current default assumptions of autosegmental theory, resulting in a stress shift and a lengthening of the final vowel if it is monomoraic. No such lengthening is attested however. Furthermore, Anderson discusses a set of cases in Tongan phonology where an empty position does in fact get attached to adjacent melodic material, showing that the default assumptions can be considered to be at work in Tongan.

5.2. Tongan Definitive Accent Hapology

In the line of the above proposals for the analysis of the English possessive marker, I propose that the TDA is the morphological realization of a LAST feature DEFN on the final element of an NP. The feature DEFN is a morphological marking feature triggered by the presence of a semantically potent feature DEF on the NP node. Such an analysis leads to the prediction that if an NP marked for DEF is final within a larger NP also marked for DEF, a haplogy phenomenon similar to that observed for the English possessive in example (9) should occur. In fact, Churchward (1953, 279) explicitly describes situations of this type, and indicates that the relevant haplogy is possible.

(10) a. Ko e ha [np e ?uhinga na?e ?ita a ia] [np e faik[6] kiate ad]?
    is the what reason Past angry prt SM the teacher with me
    Why was the teacher angry with me?

b. Ko e ha [np e ?uhinga na?e ?ita ki a kiate a a] [np e faik[6]]?

In (10a) and (10b), a complex definite NP has an embedded definite NP within it. If the embedded NP is not final within the larger NP, both exhibit the stress shift as shown in (10a). If the embedded NP is final within the larger NP, then a single realization of the stress shift on the final word can make both NPs definite as in (10b). Note that (10b) is actually predicted to be triply ambiguous under this analysis: it results if either the embedded NP or the larger NP are definite (i.e., have the feature DEF) or if both are. For the reasons mentioned above in comparing the FFP with the FFP, the haplogy reading is impossible under Poser's suggestion to treat the feature driving the TDA (def in Poser's analysis) as a FOOT feature, but immediately falls out if it is treated as a LAST feature, by mechanisms entirely parallel to those accounting for (9).

6. The French demonstrative enclitics -ci and -là

A similar haplogy phenomenon also occurs for the French demonstrative enclitics -ci and -là, which I propose to treat as instances of phrasal inflection, rather than as postlexical clitics. These items can appear on the last word of an NP with the demonstrative determiner ce, as illustrated in the following examples.⁶

(11) a. Cette fille-ci  
    b. Cette grande fille-ci  
    c. *Cette grande-ci fille  
    d. Cette fille intelligente-ci  
    e. *Cette fille-ci intelligente

In Miller 1992a, I analyze -ci and -là as being respectively the morphological realization of the feature specifications +L-PROX and -L-PROX, where L-PROX is a LAST feature. L-PROX is triggered by the semantically potent feature PROX⁷ which an FCR restricts to occurring on demonstrative NPs. As in the case of the English possessive and the TDA, examples can be constructed where a demonstrative NP is embedded within a larger demonstrative NP. The relevant aspects of the structures for these NPs are given in trees 4 and 5 (it is beyond the scope of this paper to motivate the details of these structures; see Miller 1992a for extensive justification).

(12) a. Ce garçon de cette ville-ci  
    b. *Ce garçon de cette ville-ci-ci  
    c. *Ce garçon de cette ville-ci-là

Tree 4

| NP | NP [+PROX] | L | N | N [+L-PROX] | ce-garçon | de-cette-ville-ci |

Tree 5

| NP | NP [+PROX], +L-PROX | L | N | N [+L-PROX] | ce-garçon | de-cette-ville-ci-là |

⁵Note that it is crucial that this is an inclusive or.

⁶The facts are somewhat more complex than is indicated here. See Miller 1992a, 273ff., 289ff. for a more detailed discussion. The semantic effect of -ci and -là is proximal vs. distal (the demonstrative ce being neutral in this respect).

⁷Note that clause (i) of the full version of the EFP given in the appendix accounts for the fact that the triggering feature PROX transmits its value + or – to the triggered feature L-PROX.
As expected, the NP (12a) is triply ambiguous: the proximal reading can be assigned to the higher NP, to the embedded NP or to both. The interpretation where 
-ci realizes the exponent of +PROX present both on the higher NP and on the 
lower NP is shown in tree 4, which exhibits the same type of merging of paths of 
LAST features, leading to the haplogry effect, as in tree 3 for the English 
possessive marker haplology. If, on the other hand, -ci was a postlexical clitic, 
there would be no reason to expect the haplogry under this reading. One would 
correctly expect to get two occurrences of the the phrase morpheme as in (12b). Indeed, 
there is nothing about (12b) that could lead us to believe that it is prosodically ill-
formed. (12a), on the other hand, would be predicted to be ambiguous only 
between a proximal reading for the higher NP or the embedded NP but not both at 
the same time. Finally, the phrasal affix analysis correctly predicts that (12c) cannot 
be generated. Indeed, in order to generate it (and in order for the EFP to be 
satisfied), it would be necessary for the feature L-PROX on the node directly 
dominating ville in tree 5 to be marked both for the values + and -, which is 
impoverish given the definition of categories as partial functions. Once again, the 
postlexical cliticization analysis has no obvious way to avoid generating (12c).

To my knowledge, there is no clear evidence from phonology either supporting 
or arguing against the lexically attached phrasal inflection status 
proposed here for -ci and -lā. For instance, it is not clear that one could construct an 
argument based on the fact that strings like garçon-ci are stressed on -ci rather than 
on the final syllable of garçon. Indeed, the question of whether stress is determined 
at the level of the morphological word or at a more inclusive prosodic level can only 
be decided on the basis of numerous auxiliary hypotheses.

7. Further perspectives on non-Head morphological marking

In this section, I would like to briefly review further cross-linguistic data 
which can be argued to be instances of non-Head morphological marking. In my 
thesis, I provide extensive arguments based on syntax, morphology and phonology 
that in French, the determiners and the prepositions à, de and en should be analyzed as 
phrasal inflections on the NP, driven by FIRST features. The case of Welsh soft 
motion can also be argued to be an instance of processually realized phrasal 
inflection driven by a FIRST feature (cf. Zwicky 1984).8

The definite articles in Rumanian, Macedonian and Bulgarian provide 
farther interesting evidence, showing that, in some cases, the notions of first and 
last lexical item in the phrase are not sufficient to account for the locus of non-Head 
morphological marking. Consider the following data from Rumanian:9

---

8See Anderson (1992, 215) for arguments against Lieber's (1987) proposal to analyze soft 
motion as the result of the affixation of [+Voice, +Continuant].

9The Rumanian data reported here are being studied in independent work, within this 
perspective, by Aaron Halpern, Peter Svenonius (cf. Svenonius ms.) and myself. For an analysis 
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(13) a. prieténul  the friend
b. bunul prietén vs +bun prieténul  the good friend
c. *foarte bun prietén vs. foarte bun prietén vs * foarte bun prietén

the very good friend

As shown in (13a), the definite article in Rumanian is realized as a suffix (-ul or -le 
in the masc. sg.). If the noun is preceded by an adjective, the suffix must appear on 
the adjective (13b). If however, the prenominal adjective is itself modified by the 
advverb foarte, then the suffix must appear on the adjective (13c). These data are 
compatible with the EFP, but it is clear that the LP statement (5b) will be 
insufficient to account for cases like (13c). The Rumanian data, and the somewhat 
similar data from Bulgarian and Macedonian, show that further investigation is 
needed of the possible loci for non-Head morphological marking (cf. Halpern 1992 
and Svenonius 1992 for concrete proposals). It should also be noted that the linear 
ordering of the determiner affix after the first word of the NP makes it impossible to 
analyze it as the result of postlexical cliticization interpreted as a purely prosodic 
phenomenon (see however Sadock 1991, e.g., 117, for an alternative perspective).

Finally, a still more challenging case can be taken from certain Amharic data 
(cf. Halefom 1990, Svenonius 1992). In Amharic, definiteness is indicated by a 
suffix that occurs on the Head of the leftmost phrase in the NP. Moreover, the 
suffix may be repeated on the Heads of other prenominal phrases. Accounting for 
such multiple occurrences of morphological marking for the same feature on a 
phrase will require further rethinking of the principles which control the 
directionality of percolation of the marking features.

8. Head movement and affix lowering analyses

Up to this point, I have only discussed analyses in terms of postlexical 
cliticization and phrasal affixation for the range of data presented here, ignoring 
possible post-barriers type analyses in terms of Head movement (cf. e.g., Baker 
1988) or affix lowering (cf. e.g., Chomsky 1991). My position is that, in the 
absence of compelling evidence in favour of the contrary position, general 
metatheoretical principles disfavour the less restrictive and less modular conception 
of the syntax/morphology interface embodied in post-barriers style analyses (cf. 
Zwicky and Pullum 1986 for more general argumentation in favour of restrictive 
interfaces between modular components of grammar). Moreover, two empirical 
arguments against such analyses can be made with respect to the data discussed 
here. First, the existence of processually realized phrasal inflection, as in the cases 
of the TDA and Welsh soft mutation, is hard to reconcile with the essentially affixal 
approach which characterizes Head movement and affix lowering approaches.
Second, the haplogry phenomena discussed above are just as problematic for these 
approaches as for postlexical cliticization. The very concrete approach to the 
interaction of syntax and morphology, advocated by Baker, claiming that certain 
pects of affix ordering can be directly accounted for by the ordering of syntactic 
movement, gives us no reason to expect the type of haplogry discussed above. On 
the contrary, that approach leads to a strong expectation that there should be 
multiple occurrences of the relevant morphological marks.
Appendix

Definition: Edge Feature Principle (EFP)

Let $\Phi$ be the set of projections from $r$, where $r = C_0 \to C_1, \ldots, C_n$, and let $g_k$ be a syntactic feature triggering the morphological marking EDGE feature $f_k$.

Then, $\phi \in \Phi$, meets the EFP on $r$ if and only if for all pairs $(g_k, f_k)$

(i) if $[g_k, v] \in \phi(C_0)$ then $\exists C_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$, such that $[f_k, v] \in \phi(C_i)$; and

(ii) $\forall C_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$, if $[f_k, v] \in \phi(C_i)$ then $[g_k, v] \in \phi(C_0)$ or $[f_k, v] \in \phi(C_0)$; and

(iii) if $[f_k, v] \in \phi(C_0)$, then $\exists C_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$, such that $[f_k, v] \in \phi(C_i)$.
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