

In summary, I argue that *Ps* are constructed in a secondary WS (2WS), as complex specifiers are (Nunes & Uriagereka, 2000). Portions of the primary WS (*IWS*) may have already been sent to the interfaces by the point when the 2WS is initiated (3a). Instead of being consolidated with the *IWS*, this 2WS is terminated by transfer of the root (3c). Because any material from the *H* already present at SM will have been assigned to a ϕ (3f), the *P* will be placed between the ϕ s of the *H* already present at SM, so as not to interrupt an already-established ϕ , which would be a violation of NTC (3d). The derivation then continues in the *IWS* (3b). WS termination encapsulates the transferred material within an intonation phrase (ι) at SM, meaning the *P* forms its own ι when the 2WS is terminated (3g). NTC will thus prevent material from the *H* from intervening in the *P* after such material has been transferred (3d). In this way, my proposal predicts that *Ps* **are** acceptable at ϕ boundaries in the *H* (and only there, see (1)).

Conceptual Advantage: This phonosyntactic approach captures the phenomenon of “niching” (Ross, 1973), the observation that some syntactically-defined positions are more susceptible to *P*-insertion than others (e.g. *Ps* are generally acceptable between subject DP and the VP, not between a D head and its NP complement), while simultaneously capturing the fact that *Ps* *can*, under the right circumstances, occupy *any* position (e.g. a *P* *can* occur between a D and NP, see e.g. Espinal, 1991, fn17; Dehé, 2014, ex1.29b)). Under my approach, the positions available to *P*-insertion are determined by prosodic structure. The syntax-phonology mapping exhibits strong tendencies for ϕ boundaries to correlate with XP boundaries, which explains why certain syntactically-defined positions are more often than not available for *P*-insertion. However, these tendencies are not strict; non-syntactic considerations can lead to deviations from the most common mapping (Selkirk, 2000; 2005). It therefore makes sense that *Ps* can sometimes be inserted in otherwise odd positions, because non-syntactic properties (e.g. prosodic heaviness, emphasis, and pause-insertion (and pragmatic properties, which I do not discuss)) can modify prosodic constituent structure in such a way as to make *P* insertion possible in those positions.

Selected Abridged References: Dehé, N. (2014). *Parentheticals in spoken English: The syntax-prosody relation*. Cambridge University Press. || Dobashi, Y. (2014). Prosodic Domains and the Syntax-Phonology Interface. *The Routledge Handbook of Syntax*, 365-387. || Dobashi, Y. (2018). Termination of derivation and intonational phrasing: a preliminary study. *Phonological Externalization*, 3, 9-23. || Espinal, M. T. (1991). The representation of disjunct constituents. *Language* 67(4), 726-762. || Griffiths, J., & de Vries, M. (in press). Parenthesis: Syntactic Integration or Orphanage? A Rejoinder to Ott (2016). *Linguistic Inquiry*. || Haegeman, L. (2009). Parenthetical adverbials: The radical orphanage approach. In *Dislocated Elements in Discourse: Semantic, Syntactic, and Pragmatic Perspectives*, 331-347. || Kaltenböck, G. (2007). Spoken parenthetical clauses in English. In *Parentheticals*, 25-52. || Nunes, J. & Uriagereka, J. (2000). Cyclicity and extraction domains. *Syntax*, 3(1), 20-43. || Ott, D. (2016). Ellipsis in appositives. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 1(1), 34. || Peterson, P. (1999). On the boundaries of syntax. In *The Clause in English: In Honour of Rodney Huddleston*, 229-250. || Ross, J. R. (1973). Slifting. In *The Formal Analysis of Natural Languages*, 133-169 || Selkirk, E. (2000). The interaction of constraints on prosodic phrasing. In *Prosody: Theory and experiment*, 231-261 || Selkirk, E. (2005). Comments on intonational phrasing in English. *Prosodies: With special reference to Iberian languages*, 11-58. || Truckenbrodt, H. (2007). The syntax-phonology interface. *The Cambridge handbook of phonology*, 435-456. || de Vries, M. (2012). Unconventional mergers. In *Ways of Structure Building*, 143-166.