

## Words within words

Heidi Harley, University of Arizona

Do we see locality domains within words because of cyclic nodes triggering within-word phasal spell out? We have seen many putative examples of within-word phonological domains, ranging from Mohawk to English, suggesting the existence of spell-out cycles within words. Are these cycles the result of a spell-out triggering property of e.g. Voice° or C° nodes?

In this talk, I argue that the answer is no, based on a detailed case study of Hiaki complex verb forms. An initial inspection of the bound and free verb stems of Hiaki suggests that there is a morphosyntactic boundary exactly at Voice°, right where we might expect to see one.

However, I then demonstrate that the syntax of Voice does not line up correctly with this hypothesis; there are syntactic reasons to suppose that some boundary-less words contain a null Voice head which does not trigger cyclic spell out.

Upon closer inspection, we discover that the so-called 'free' forms of Hiaki are multimorphemic, albeit with some fairly arbitrary morphologically conditioned allomorphy that has hitherto obscured their multimorphemic character, and the 'bound' forms are independent prosodic words, albeit in such necessarily close construction with their complements that they appear to be phonologically bound, and have hitherto been described as affixes.

I claim instead that these different types of 'word'-internal boundaries reflect different kinds of word-assembly operations: The 'free' form results from the highest verbal element head-moving into the inflectional domain. The 'bound' forms, each spelled-out in-situ on previous cycles, are then prosodically concatenated to create the complex verb word. The syntax/morphology interface reflects different derivational histories of different types of word-assembly operations, here head-movement vs. prosodic concatenation, aka morphological merger.

The moral of the story is another version of the observation that affixation doesn't necessarily matter for the syntax: prosodic wordhood is not a good diagnostic of head-movement. It remains an open question whether bound vs. free morphological behavior should be modelled in terms of (complex) terminal-node-hood.