In interactionist lexicalist morphology, affixes are semantically and phonologically interpreted at the point of insertion, in a derivational order that is consistent with their semantic scope. A natural assumption is that they cannot be reinterpreted as a result of later affixation. Therefore the order of affixes from the root outwards mirrors the order in which they are semantically composed with their bases, and lexical phonology applies cyclically to each base-affix combination. The Mirror Principle and phonological cyclicity are thus consequences of the lexicalist architecture. Realizational models of morphology such as Distributed Morphology, which divorce affixation from interpretation, must impose extraneous constraints on derivations to achieve the same results.

However, morphotactic constraints can force affixes to be positioned in a way that does not match the sequence in which they are interpreted, leading to counterscopal affix order and constituency (bracketing paradoxes), and to non-cyclic phonology. These mismatches, far from falsifying lexical morphology, actually provide compelling new evidence for it. The argument is that counterscopal morphology and non-cyclic phonology turn out to go hand in hand, that lexical morphology explains this syndrome, and that a comparable explanation is not available in realizational models.

It follows that whenever affixes appear in the word in the “wrong” (counter-scopal) order, they cannot be added sequentially in that order, since the inner affix cannot then be fully interpreted. The simplest way of conforming to the principle depends on the nature of the mismatch between scope and morphological order/constituency, specifically whether the scope is INTRINSIC (predictable) or DISTINCTIVE. The scope of inflectional morphemes is typically intrinsic. For example, nominal predicates are composed with number before they are composed with possessors, and then with case, and verbal predicates are assigned aspect, tense, and mood in that order. Analytic expressions always reflect this scopal ordering: to (John’s (friend-s). This is also the predominant order of inflectional affixes. Marked, anti-scopal orders of intrinsically scoped affixes can be made FUR-compliant by introducing them simultaneously, bundled as a bimorphemic portmanteau, in which case they can be interpreted together in the required unique scope. Since the components of the bundle have predictable scope, they can be compositionally interpreted. In a range of such cases, the phonology and allomorphy provide independent evidence for affix bundling. Confirming evidence is that affix bundles can develop meanings of their own and a distribution that is not predictable from their parts.

Finnish case and possession illustrates this type of mismatch resolved by affix bundling.

(1) talo- i- ssa- si (Finnish)
   house- Pl- Iness -2Sg
   ‘in your houses’
The proposed principle forces the morphology to generate the flat structure \[ [ N ] \text{Case Poss} \], whose constituents are merged in the only possible way, with Case scoping over Poss. We can tell that the nominal stem plus Case do not form a cyclic domain by the fact that they do not undergo phonology until the Possessor suffixes are added (hence Possessor suffixes can trigger phonology that bleeds Consonant Gradation inside the stem), and by outward morphological selection, such as that Comitative case -ne requires a following Possessive suffix. In the case of the same anti-scopal morphology in Nenets,

\[(2) \text{ngono -xəq -na } -\text{ta} \]
\[
\text{boat } -\text{Pl } -\text{Loc } -\text{3SgPoss}
\]
\`
\text{‘in his boats’}
``

normally cyclic a-epenthesis (3a) is non-cyclic (3b) (Salminen 1997:127), diagnosing bundling.

\[
(3) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } /səl/ & \rightarrow səl-t \rightarrow səl-təq \rightarrow sələdəq (*sələtəq) \text{ ‘return-Refl-Imp.2Sg.’} \\
\text{b. } /\text{myad}/ & \rightarrow \text{mya-m-ta} \rightarrow \text{myata} (*\text{myadənta}) \text{ ‘tent-Acc.Sg.-3Sg.Poss’}
\end{align*}
\]

Bidirectional affix dependency, including crucially outward sensitivity, also indicates affix bundling: the Nom/Acc. dual ending is /-xəh-/ but /-xəyu-/ before a possessive suffix (Salminen:1997: 124).

In Hungarian 3Sg.Past Indef. rohan-hat-ott, the word-level modal suffix precedes the stem-level past tense ending (Siptar and Törkenczy 2000:6, Törkenczy 2004: 30). The suffixes stand in semantically counterscopal order: the form means only ‘it is possible that he ran’, not ‘it was possible that he would run’. Affix bundling resolves both the level ordering paradox and the scopal mismatch.

In Upper Sorbian nan-om-aj ‘with two fathers’ (Pavel Caha, p.c., Fasske 1981: 493), the anti-scopal -om-aj ‘-Instr-Du’ forms an affix bundle, which appears even in declensions that otherwise require other dual endings, e.g. myš-om-aj ‘with two mice’ (Nom.Du. myš-i).

In the second, more radical type of mismatch, the sequence in which affixes are interpreted is DISTINCTIVE. For example, the causative of a desiderative is distinct from the desiderative of a causative. Affix bundling cannot resolve such mismatches because it would merely yield an ambiguous or indeterminate interpretation. Phonology and allomorphy show that the wide-scope affix is then INTROFIXED below a previously introduced affix. Applicativized causatives in Cibemba are derived by inserting the applicative suffix -el- inside causative -i-, with a consonant mutation process applying after both affixations:

\[
(4) -leep \rightarrow -leep-i- \rightarrow -leep-i- \rightarrow -leep-cl-i- \rightarrow -leep-es-i- \quad \text{(Hyman & Orgun 2005)}
\]

Other introfixation cases include Karimojong, where a wide-scope aspectual-temporal affix with [+ATR] vowels is introfixed into the middle of a root-governed [-ATR] harmony span (Lesley-Neuman 2007), the Palauan apparent locality violation described by Embick (2010), where a wide-scope tense marker is introfixed, Quechua “morphological metathesis” (Myler 2009), and Kiowa “long-distance allomorphy” (Bone 2012). I conclude by demonstrating scopally motivated introfixation in Sanskrit verbal prefixes and suffixes.