

those in (19), the verb is basic, and the noun derived from it, while when no stress shift is observed as in (20), the noun is basic, and the verb is derived from the noun. Like Arad, he posits a derivational distinction between these processes, with V→N derivation applying at “Level 1” of a level-ordered morphology, and N→V derivation at “Level 2”. One might imagine updating such a proposal with “Level 1” processes preceding and “Level 2” processes following a phase boundary, and then searching for new reasons why the phonology might be sensitive to this architecture. Our goal in this section has been more modest: to establish merely that this boundary is not the locus of part-of-speech categorization, since verbs are verbs both below and above this boundary.

5. Conclusion

We have shown that the empirical claims in Arad (2003, 2005) are not convincingly supported by the data. In particular, the claimed correlation between idiosyncratic and unpredictable semantics and phonology on the one hand, and root-derived (“de-root”) status on the other, does not seem to be borne out, both because of confounds in examples that were given as positive support for the correlation, and because of counterexamples that directly contradict it. We therefore conclude that these arguments, at least, fail to support the existence of category-neutral roots in the syntax.

References

- Arad, Maya. 2003. Locality constraints on the interpretation of roots: the case of Hebrew denominal verbs. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21(4). 737–778.
- Arad, Maya. 2005. *Roots and patterns: Hebrew morpho-syntax* (Studies in Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 63). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Bat-El, Outi. 1994. Stem modification and cluster transfer in Modern Hebrew. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 12(4). 571–596.
- Bleotu, Adina Camelia & Jelke Bloem. 2020. The distinction between true and pseudo denominals? it’s an illusion! In M. Asatryan, Y Song & A. Whitmal (eds.), *NELS 50: proceedings of the fiftieth annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, vol. 1, 39–48.
- Borer, Hagit. 2009. Roots and categories. Paper presented at the 19 Colloquium on Generative Grammar.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by step: essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: a life in language*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Harley, Heidi. 2014a. On the identity of roots. *Theoretical Linguistics* 40(3/4). 225–276.
- Harley, Heidi. 2014b. Reply to commentaries, On the identity of roots. *Theoretical Linguistics* 40(3/4). 447–474.
- Harley, Heidi & Jason D. Haugen. 2007. Are there really two different classes of instrumental denominal verbs in English. *Snippets* 16. 9–10. <https://www.ledonline.it/snippets/allegati/snippets16003.pdf>.
- Kastner, Itamar. 2019. Templatic morphology as an emergent property. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 37(2). 571–619.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1982a. Lexical morphology and phonology. In Linguistic Society of Korea (ed.), *Linguistics in the morning calm: selected papers from SICOL-1981*, 3–91. Hanshin Publishing Company, Seoul.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1982b. Word-formation and the lexicon. In Fred Ingemann (ed.), *Proceedings of the Mid-America Linguistics Conference*, 3–29. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.
- Marantz, Alec. 2000. Roots: the universality of root and pattern morphology. Paper presented at the conference on Afro-Asiatic languages, University of Paris VII.
- Marantz, Alec. 2013. Locality domains for contextual allomorphy across the interfaces. In Ora Matushansky & Alec Marantz (eds.), *Distributed morphology today: morphemes for Morris Halle*, 95–115. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Marvin, Tatjana. 2013. Is word structure relevant for stress assignment? In Ora Matushansky & Alec Marantz (eds.), *Distributed morphology today: morphemes for Morris Halle*, 79–93. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

to the extent that overt nominalizing morphemes are possible in particle constructions (with the well-known puzzle of affix reduplication), they preserve the verbal stress pattern: *picker-upper*, *pütter-downer*, *pissed-offedness*. This suggests some property specific to zero derivation is at stake in the stress shift under discussion, not the compound stress rule.