For our purposes, let us assume the relevant syntax as in (21a) above, whereby the adjective is morpho-syntactically higher than the noun. The only relevant prosodic constraint here is MATCHWORD whereby a syntactic head is mapped to a phonological word, i.e. $X^0 \rightarrow {}_{\omega}(\ )$.[6] Compare this to example (21b) with the smotherer DEM. MATCHWORD applies as it does in (21a), but additionally a phonological phrase is introduced. This is indexed with *i* to indicate that it is sponsored by the 1φ-modifier DEM. As a shorthand, we attribute this φ-constituent to a constraint SUBCAT(DEM) which enforces the subcategorization frame.

One can see that the left φ-boundary aligns with the leftmost phonological word (the lexical head), while the right φ-boundary aligns to the trigger DEM itself. This structure is not guaranteed by the constraint SUBCAT(DEM), which would equally be satisfied by several φ-phrase alignments. To guarantee the attested structure, we adopt constraints ALIGN-L(Domain,φ) and the ALIGN-R(DEM,φ) to enforce φ-alignment. In an analysis with pre-specification rather than subcategorization, the φ-phrase comes pre-aligned to the right edge of DEM in the underlying representation. Regardless, it is critical that no Match constraint MATCHPHRASE apply here which maps XPs to ${}_{\varphi}(\ )$.

The prosodic structure output from spell-out is then fed into the phonological module where additional prosodic patterns are established. This is shown below.

(22)	**Phonological Input**	→	**Output**	
a.			$\varphi(\quad)\ \varphi(\quad)$	Attested patterns
	ω(NOUN) ω(ADJ)	→	ω(NOUN) ω(ADJ)	
b.	$\varphi(_i$ $)_i$		$\varphi(_i$ $)_i$	
	ω(NOUN) ω(ADJ) ω(DEM$_i$)	→	ω(NOUN) ω(ADJ) ω(DEM$_i$)	
c.	$\varphi(_i$ $)_i$		* $\varphi(_i\ \varphi(_j$ $)_j\ \varphi(_j$ $)_j\ \varphi(_j$ $)_j\ )_i$	Ungrammatical patterns
	ω(NOUN) ω(ADJ) ω(DEM$_i$)	→	ω(NOUN) ω(ADJ) ω(DEM$_i$)	
d.	$\varphi(_i$ $)_i$		* $\varphi(_i$ $)_j\ \varphi(_j$ $)_j\ \varphi(_j$ $)_i$	
	ω(NOUN) ω(ADJ) ω(DEM$_i$)	→	ω(NOUN) ω(ADJ) ω(DEM$_i$)	
e.	$\varphi(_i$ $)_i$		* $\varphi(_j$ $)_j\ \varphi(_j$ $)_j$ $\varphi(_i$ $)_i$	
	ω(NOUN) ω(ADJ) ω(DEM$_i$)	→	ω(NOUN) ω(ADJ) ω(DEM$_i$)	

In (23a) with only a non-smothering 2φ-modifier ADJ, there is no φ-structure in the input. Therefore by default each phonological word coincides with a phonological phrase, for which we can employ constraints ALIGN-L(ω,φ) and ALIGN-R(ω,φ), constraints which were not active at spell-out. In contrast in (23b), the input has φ-structure in the input which is faithfully preserved in the output.

There are three ungrammatical examples in (22c-e) which maximally satisfy the two ALIGN(ω,φ) constraints, whereby all phonological words coincide with a phonological phrase. These patterns are non-optimal due to other highly ranked constraints. In (22c), recursive φ-structure is introduced which we can eliminate as it violates NONRECURSIVITY (Selkirk 1995, Elfner 2015:1202). In (22d), the φ-boundaries indexed to the demonstrative are interrupted by new φ-boundaries, which we index $_j$ for clarity. We can eliminate this pattern with a prosodic integrity constraint *$\Pi(_i\ )_j\ \Pi(_j\ )_i$ which states that a prosodic boundary $\Pi(_j$ of prosodic category Π cannot disrupt a prosodic constituent $\Pi(_i\ )_i$ of the same category Π. Finally, (22e) where the ${}_{\varphi}(_i$ boundary moves to the left edge of ${}_{\omega}$(DEM$_i$) is eliminated due to an IDENT-φ constraint (or family of constraints), requiring faithfulness to the input structure.

In short, although we have framed prosodic smothering as 'restructuring' (section 3.2 above, following BHH:196), our analysis actually posits an early stage establishing idiosyncratic prosodic structure, with a later stage establishing default prosodic structure. Strictly speaking, no actual 'restructuring' takes place, although we still find the metaphor a useful one. A consequence of this analysis is that subcategorization frames associated with particular morphemes (or natural classes of morphemes, e.g. demonstratives) are satisfied at spell-out, with default prosodification after spell-out. In this way, our analysis is reminiscent of early approaches to subcategorization. As Inkelas (1990) points out, "prosodic subcategorization frames introduce structure which blocks the application of the default Prosodic Constituent Formation Algorithm" (p. 78-79), with such an algorithm "operat[ing] as an elsewhere case, assigning phrasal constituency only to material already lacking it" (p. 255).

[6] We gloss over the fact that nouns in Bantu are complex, with both a class marker and a nominal root.