**Recursivity and the Definition of MATCH in Italian Syntax-Prosody**

Nicholas Van Handel
University of California, Santa Cruz

Early work on Italian prosody assumed Strict Layering [1, 2], and subsequent work still assumes that Italian lacks prosodic recursion [3]. I revisit three Italian processes argued to apply within the phonological phrase (φ): Word-Final Vowel Deletion (VD; *mar**e** azzurro* → *mar_ azzurro*; [4]), Stress Retraction (SR; *parti**rà** **Giú**lio* → ***pár**tira **Giú**lio*), and Final Lengthening (FL; *i litigi tra am**i**ci* → *i litigi tra am**ii**ci*; [1, 2]). I show that VD is sensitive to smaller domains than FL and SR, motivating the existence of recursive φ. I argue that Match Theory [5] derives the correct outputs if and only if MATCH constraints are defined to see only XPs with a phonologically overt head [6].

In N+PP sequences like (1), VD optionally applies on the head $N_1$ *sapore*. [4] argues for two prosodic structures: VD applies on *sapore* in (1b) but is blocked by a φ boundary in (1c). If FL applied in the same domain, FL would be optional on $N_1$ in these structures. Instead, in (2b) FL only applies to the $N_2$ *mandorle*; FL on $N_1$ results in a marked structure in (2c) [2]. The two processes diverge in distribution, suggesting they apply in different domains. A similar divergence is observed in other syntactic contexts, while SR patterns with FL. Function words (D, P) are omitted from the schematization.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) | a. | Syntax | $_{TP}$[rimane $_{DP}$[il $_{NP}$[sapore $_{PP}$[di $_{DP}$[cioccolata]]]]] | $_{TP}$[V $_{DP}$[$N_1$ $_{PP}$[$N_2$]]] |
| | b. | φ-Phrasing | $_{\varphi}$(rimane) $_{\varphi}$(il sapor_ di cioccolata) | $_{\varphi}$(V) $_{\varphi}$($N_1$ $N_2$) |
| | c. | φ-Phrasing | $_{\varphi}$(rimane) $_{\varphi}$(il sapor**e**) $_{\varphi}$(di cioccolata) | $_{\varphi}$(V) $_{\varphi}$($N_1$) $_{\varphi}$($N_2$) |
| | | | 'The taste of chocolate persists' | |
| (2) | a. | | $_{TP}$[ho $_{VP}$[assaggiato $_{DP}$[il $_{NP}$[pollo $_{PP}$[colle $_{NP}$[mandorle]]]]]] | $_{TP}$[V $_{DP}$[$N_1$ $_{PP}$[$N_2$]]] |
| | b. | | $_{\varphi}$(ho assaggi**aa**to) $_{\varphi}$(il pollo colle m**aa**ndorle) | $_{\varphi}$(V) $_{\varphi}$($N_1$ $N_2$) |
| | c. | | ?$_{\varphi}$(ho assaggi**aa**to) $_{\varphi}$(il p**oo**llo) $_{\varphi}$(colle m**aa**ndorle) | ?$_{\varphi}$(V) $_{\varphi}$($N_1$) $_{\varphi}$($N_2$) |
| | | | 'I have tasted the chicken with almonds' | |

To explain this divergence, I appeal to recursive φ and prosodic subcategories [7]: VD is sensitive to all φ, while SR and FL are sensitive to Maximal φ, those φ which are not dominated by any other φ. The structure $_{TP}$[V $_{DP}$[$N_1$ $_{PP}$[$N_2$]]] maps to either (i) $_{\varphi Max}$(V) $_{\varphi Max}$($N_1$ $_{\varphi}$($N_2$)) or (ii) $_{\varphi Max}$(V) $_{\varphi Max}$($_{\varphi}$($N_1$) $_{\varphi}$($N_2$)). VD takes place in (i) but not (ii) because (i) does not have a right φ boundary after $N_1$. $N_1$ is never final in $\varphi^{Max}$, which correctly predicts that FL does not apply to the head $N_1$.

Match Theory derives the right outputs, but only if MATCH **only sees XPs with phonologically overt heads**. This is necessary to explain the prosody of ditransitives (3) and Subj+V sequences (4). If MATCHXP sees all XPs, the VP will be matched, which incorrectly predicts that NP and PP will phrase together to the exclusion of V (3c). Similarly, Subj and V will phrase together due to FP (4c). The new definition of MATCH ignores VP and FP, deriving the phrasings (3b) and (4b).

(3) a. $_{TP}$[darò$_j$ $_{VP}$[$_{NP}$[libri] t$_j$ $_{PP}$[a Gianni]]]
b. $_{\varphi Max}$(**dà**ro **lí**bri) $_{\varphi Max}$(a Gianni)
c. *$_{\varphi Max}$(da**rò**) $_{\varphi Max}$(**lí**bri a Gianni)
'I will give books to Gianni'

(4) a. $_{FP}$[$_{DP}$[Papà] $_{TP}$[mangia]]
b. $_{\varphi Max}$(Pa**pà**) $_{\varphi Max}$(**mán**gia)
c. *$_{\varphi Max}$(**Pá**pa **mán**gia)
'Daddy is eating'

This definition of MATCH is not unprecedented [6] but is a departure from [8]. While MATCH may vary across languages, Italian is yet another language that deploys recursive φ.

[1] **Nespor, M. & I. Vogel**. 1986. *Prosodic Phonology*. [2] **Ghini, M.** 1993. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics*. [3] **Samek-Lodovici, V.** 2017. *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory*. [4] **Meinschaefer, J.** 2005. *Arbeitspapier Nr. 118*. [5] **Selkirk, E.** 2011. *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*. [6] **Truckenbrodt, H.** 1999. *Linguistic Inquiry*. [7] **Ito, J. & A. Mester**. 2013. *Lingua*. [8] **Elfner, E.** 2012. Doctoral dissertation.