

The alternation is that, when following a **plural** morpheme, the *ls* in these suffixes become *ns*, i.e., $-lxu \rightarrow -nxu$ and $-lle \rightarrow -nne$. This is shown in (4a) (the *n* form) vs. (4b) (the *l* form).

- (4) a. $nəʃq \quad -ən \quad -\emptyset \quad -lle (=nəʃqənne)$ b. $nəʃq \quad -o \quad -\emptyset \quad -lle (=nəʃqalle)$
 kiss.PRS -**BPL** -**S3** -**L3PL** kiss.PRS -**BF.SG** -**S3** -**L3PL**
 ‘they kiss them’ (p. 127) ‘she kisses them’ (p. 133)

In environments where these *L* suffixes follow PL $-ən$, as in (3b)/(4a), there seems to be a phonological explanation for $l \rightarrow n$, progressive assimilation. **However, $l \rightarrow n$ cannot be the result of assimilation.** First, progressive assimilation is not the norm in Turoyo (though one could speculate that this is how the $l \rightarrow n$ alternation arose diachronically, and why it targets only CC-initial suffixes, cf. §2.1). More revealingly, when there is no adjacent nasal (which happens when the *S* suffix is non-null), the $l \rightarrow n$ alternation still occurs, (5a–b). (This holds in absence of the $-ən$ allomorph, (5a–b), and in the absence of any preceding nasal, (5b).)

- (5) a. $zəbʈ \quad -i \quad -na \quad -lxu (=zəbʈinanxu)$ b. $zəbʈ \quad -\emptyset \quad -ut \quad -lle (=zəbʈutne)$
 catch.PRS -**BPL** -**S1PL** -**L2PL** catch.PRS -**BPL** -**S2PL** -**L3PL**
 ‘we catch you (pl)’ (p. 136) ‘you (pl) catch them’ (p. 135)

The generalization here is that CC-initial *L* suffixes (not a natural class morphosyntactically) undergo approximant nasalization in the context of a preceding plural feature.

The examples above display the *l/n* alternation w.r.t. a plural *B/S* suffix, but the alternation extends beyond this—when two *L* suffixes are stacked, as they can be in past tense, we can observe the alternation in the second *L* suffix, sensitive to PL in the first *L* suffix:

- (6) a. $səm \quad -lxu \quad -lle (=səmxənne)$ b. $səm \quad -lxu \quad -lxu (=səmxənxu)$
 make.PST -**L2PL** -**L3PL** make.PST -**L2PL** -**L2PL**
 ‘you (pl) made them’ (p. 139) ‘you (pl) made yourselves’ (p. 139)

3. Analysis and implications: Bobaljik (2000), a.o., argues that when a phonological form is chosen for a morpheme/bundle of morphemes (vocabulary insertion; VI), the phonological form *overwrites* the morphosyntactic features. If VI is cyclic (starting from the most embedded morpheme) this means that *inward*-sensitive allomorphy should see only phonological forms, while *outward*-sensitive allomorphy should see only morphosyntactic features. If the verbal complex in Turoyo is contained in one X^0 , with the verb being the most embedded morpheme, then Turoyo seems to show the exact reverse pattern—inward sensitivity to morphosyntactic features (*L*), outward sensitivity to phonological form (*B*). Do we conclude then, as others have (e.g., Gribanova and Harizanov 2017), that *overwriting* is too strong?

The alternative analysis that I pursue is that the verbal complex is *not* a syntactic word, but rather a series of adjacent heads (subscripted with the agreement series they correspond to):

- (7) $[\overset{\downarrow}{\dot{V}} [_{TP} T [_{AspP} Asp_{B/S} [_{vP} v_L [_{AppIP} AppL [_{VP} \overset{\uparrow}{\dot{V}}]]]]]]]$

This analysis is supported by a number of empirical facts (not shown here for space reasons), including (i) allomorphy of the verb base, (ii) the position of the past tense morpheme, and (iii) the agreement configuration: the last agreement suffix in the verbal complex agrees with the lowest argument (can be an indirect object), and the first displays person restrictions. (An open question is the nature of V-raising, as long-distance head mvmt or remnant VP mvmt.) This analysis is compatible with *rewriting*, but requires allomorphy to cross phrase boundaries, contra most such locality conditions (e.g., Bobaljik 2012, Bobaljik and Harley 2017, Thornton 2017). I discuss this trade-off in terms of its empirical and theoretical consequences.