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Outline: I show that (i) the morphological template in the noun phrase of Eastern Uralic languages should be derived on the basis of an underlying structure that is consistent with standard assumptions about the DP syntax and the Mirror Principle by postsyntactic reordering operations and (ii) the interactions of these processes with a deletion process called Suspended Affixation (SA) provide new insights on the derivational nature of postsyntax. SA generally deletes the right edge of non-final conjuncts under recoverability. In Mari (unlike in Turkish), SA applies to underlying rather than surface structures. I show that only a derivational account in terms of ordered postsyntactic operations makes the correct predictions concerning the surface order of morphemes and the ability of each morpheme to delete under SA. In particular, I show that, in some cases, only a Duke-of-York derivation captures the facts adequately. This, as it stands, provides a strong argument for derivational theories of postsyntax.

The nominal template: The nominal template of Eastern Uralic languages is remarkable wrt. to a number of properties, two of which are (i) Local cases precede possessive affixes whereas structural cases follow them. (ii) Number occurs in various positions: Either adjacent to the stem or to the right of the possessive affix (see Luutonen (1997), McFadden (2004)) (ex. from Mari).

(1) pasu-vlak-ěšte-na  (2) pasu-vlak-na-m
garden-PL-INESS-1.PL.POSS  garden-PL-1.PL.POSS-ACC
'our gardens' (INESSIVE) 'our gardens (ACCUSATIVE)'

(3) pasu-vlak-na  (4) pasu-na-vlak
garden-PL-1.PL.POSS  garden-1.PL.POSS-PL
'our gardens'  'our gardens'

These alternations raise the question whether the nominal template of Mari can be deduced to the standardly assumed order of affixes as predicted by the Mirror Principle (Baker (1985)).

Suspended Affixation: The nominal coordinator /den/ in Meadow Mari enforces a process called Suspended Affixation typically known from Turkish languages (see e.g. Kabak (2007)). This process deletes the right edge of non-final conjuncts if it is identical with the one of final conjunct as in (5). As (6) and (7) show, there is no requirement for the remnant to be an otherwise attested form which suggests a deletion analysis (cf. Ershler (2012)).

(5) Pij den kajek-vlak-em  (6) memna den nunem  (7) 1.PL.NOM = /me/
dog and bird-PL-ACC us.?? and them.ACC 1.PL.ACC = /memnam/
'dogs and birds.' 'us and them' 1.PL.GEN = /memnan/

In Turkish languages, SA has a strong requirement that only right edges can be deleted (8). Deletion of non-final affixes while maintaining the final ones is ungrammatical (9):

(8) kasaba ve kent-ler-imiz-den  (9) *kasaba-dan ve kent-ler-imiz-den
town and city-PL-1.PL.POSS-ABL town-ABL and city-PL-1.PL.POSS-ABL
'from our towns and villages'  'from our towns and villages'"
These data raise the question whether SA can receive a unified analysis in Turkish and in Mari. **Analysis:** The two questions raised at the end of the previous sections can receive a unified analysis:

The order of operations is as following: (16) D-SA creates an order paradox as VI-DL follows by D or not. This is expected given the order in (16) as VI-S-A serves a basis for SA can neither be reduced to the syntactic output nor the surface string. It is thus unclear how representational theories (e.g. Ryan 2010) could capture these facts at all.

Further Evidence: The established order of operations can be tested against evidence from allomorphy and suppletion. E.g., the illative case marker (-š vs. -ške) is sensitive to whether it behaves differently wrt. to SA: It is some kind of underlying representation that serves as a basis for the application of SA.

The syntactic output structure looks as follows: \[ KP \{DP \{NumP NP Num \} D \} K \] with Num hosting the plural affix, D hosting the possessive affix and K hosting case. This serves as the input to postsyntactic operations needed to derive the full pattern of affix order and whether affixes are deletable: (i) D-Lowering (D-L): Operation that lowers D to left-adjjoin to Num. Applies on the basis of hierarchical structure (see McFadden (2004)). Derives (4) on the basis of (3). D-L is optional. (ii) Suspended Affixation (SA): Deletes right edges of KPs of a conjunct in coordination if the features are recoverable on the final conjunct. Applies on linearized structures. (iii) D-Metathesis (D-M): Puts D to the right of K if K has a local case feature. This metathesis rule can be deleted (for some speakers) even apply over a possibly intervening Num-head. D-M applies on linear structures. Derives the difference between (1) and (2). D-M is obligatory. Also, we need (v) linearization (LIN) and (vi) vocabulary insertion (VI) as in Arregi & Nevins (2012) (A&N).

**Derivations:** SA deletes the right edge of the whole complex at its point of application. Thus, the order of operations in (16) is crucial to give the correct results in terms of (a) morpheme order and (b) ability to delete under SA. D-L precedes SA and thus changes of order induced by D-L have an effect on SA. After D-L, Num follows D and can thus be deleted by SA irrespective of the (non-)identity of D in both conjuncts (12). D-M however follows SA and the reordering of structural case marker and possessive affix has thus no effect on which morphemes can be deleted (11) & (12). If both D-L and D-M apply, this creates a Duke-of-York derivation (Pullum 1976) as D-M undoes the effects of D-L. However, SA shows that there was an intermediate stage of the derivation where D preceded Num. D-M however comes too late to affect SA. Thus, K can be deleted although it is followed by a D in (11).

**Discussion:** The need of intermediate levels of representation for a SA provides a clear argument for a derivational nature of the PF module as laid out in A&N. In the analysis, the structure that serves a basis for SA can neither be reduced to the syntactic output nor the surface string. It is thus unclear how representational theories (e.g. Ryan 2010) could capture these facts at all.