

A representational analysis of secondary stress in Italian

Sharon Peperkamp

This paper surveys various analyses of secondary stress assignment in Italian and argues that they suffer from both descriptive and explanatory shortcomings. An alternative account will be developed, in which stress is not assigned by rule but is selected from a set of conceivable candidates by a system of constraints on representations. The stress patterns that are considered are those of words when pronounced in isolation. It will be shown that monomorphemic and derived words differ only in their stress patterns in that derived words are subject to the requirement that stress from the embedded word be preserved. This requirement, though, is overridden by constraints on metrical and prosodic wellformedness. Optional reranking of these requirements in the relevance hierarchy accounts for the variability of secondary stress which is found mainly in the southern varieties of Standard Italian. Finally, it will be argued that compounds generally consist of more than one stress domain, whereas adverbs ending in *-mente* show hybrid behavior; they cannot be classified either with derived words or with compounds.

1. Introduction

It is well-known that in Italian, main word stress falls on one of the word's last three syllables, but is further unpredictable on the basis of phonological information (cf., among others, Di Pietro (1971); Muljačić (1972); Vogel (1982)). Thus, we find minimal pairs such as *áncora* 'anchor' - *ancóra* 'still', and *finí* 'ends' - *finí* '(he) finished'. Lepschy (1968) argues that secondary stress, too, has a distinctive function. According to this hypothesis, which is discussed in Lepschy & Lepschy (1977) and Lepschy (1992) as well, the compound *cuciréte* 'sewing machine for nets' and the verb form *cuciréte* '(you) will sew' are distinguished from one another by virtue of the presence of secondary stress in the former versus its absence in the latter. Similarly, the compounds *auto-reattóre* 'self-reactor' and *autóre-attóre* 'authoractor' are argued to be distinguished from one another by virtue of the different positions of secondary stress in these words.

The hypothesis that secondary stress in Italian is contrastive, though, is not uncontroversial. For instance, according to Camilli (1965), secondary stress is predictable: unstressed syllables and syl-

lables with secondary stress essentially alternate to the left of the main stress. Muljačić (1972) and Bertinetto (1976, 1981) also argue against the contrastiveness of secondary stress. Bertinetto claims that secondary stress in Italian is rhythmical only. That is, prominence can be given to syllables that do not bear main stress in order to avoid long sequences of unstressed syllables. Bertinetto argues that the position of these additional prominences is dependent on the rhythmic contour of entire utterances rather than on single words. Secondary stress, therefore, is not lexical.

An account that claims to unify the contrastiveness hypothesis of Lepschy and the predictability hypothesis of Camilli, is proposed by Vogel & Scalise (1982). They show, in fact, that the surface differences in pairs with contrasting secondary stress patterns found by Lepschy are predictable on the basis of morphological information. In Vogel & Scalise's approach, then, secondary stress is assigned by a set of four ordered rules. Other accounts of Italian secondary stress in Italian are Roca (1986) and Sluyters (1990), stated in the framework of metrical phonology.

In this paper, I will first discuss the proposals by Vogel & Scalise (1982), Roca (1986), and Sluyters (1990). I will point out some drawbacks and proceed by developing an alternative account of secondary stress assignment within Optimality Theory (Prince & Smolensky 1993). In Optimality Theory, stress is not assigned by rule; rather, a set of hierarchically ranked constraints on surface forms selects the best of all conceivable stress patterns. Stress is thus subject to a checking mechanism (cf. Burzio 1994). It will be shown that the proposed representational account is superior to the various rule-based approaches.

2. Data

The analysis presented in this paper will be based mainly on data from the northern variety of Standard Italian as reported in Vogel & Scalise (1982). It is important to keep in mind that the patterns to be considered are those of words pronounced in isolation. Within phrasal contexts, stress is subject to various readjustment rules which will not be considered here (cf. Nespor & Vogel 1979, 1989).

Lepschy & Lepschy (1977) argue that secondary stress in Italian is to a large extent optional, but that a distinction must be drawn between syllables that can be stressed and those that cannot. For instance, in the word *mercoledì* 'Wednesday', the first syllable

optionally bears secondary stress, but the second and the third cannot be stressed: *mèrcoledì*, **mercoledì*, **mercoledì*. Following Lepschy & Lepschy (1977), Vogel & Scalise (1982) use this notion of stressability and put a stress mark on those syllables that can be stressed. In what follows, one can thus read 'stressable' for 'stressed'. Vogel & Scalise observe that the distribution of secondary stress in both monomorphemic and derived words is subject to the following generalizations:¹

- (1) (i) There are no stress clashes (i.e. no sequences of stressed syllables).
- (ii) Words begin with a stressed syllable (unless this would lead to a clash).
- (iii) There are no sequences of more than two unstressed syllables.

These generalizations do not suffice to unambiguously determine the pattern of secondary stress in a given word. In words with an odd number of syllables preceding the main stress, different patterns can in fact satisfy the conditions in (1). Vogel & Scalise show that the two logically possible patterns for words with five syllables preceding the main stress are both attested. Furthermore, in words with six syllables preceding the main stress, we find two different patterns as well. This is illustrated in (2a) and (2b), respectively.

- (2) a. $\acute{\sigma} \sigma \acute{\sigma} \sigma \acute{\sigma} \dots$ *accettabilità* 'acceptability'
- $\acute{\sigma} \sigma \acute{\sigma} \acute{\sigma} \sigma \dots$ *sentimentalità* 'sentimentality'
- b. $\acute{\sigma} \sigma \acute{\sigma} \acute{\sigma} \sigma \acute{\sigma} \dots$ *classificabilità* 'classifiability'
- $\acute{\sigma} \sigma \acute{\sigma} \acute{\sigma} \sigma \acute{\sigma} \dots$ *rappresentatività* 'representativity'

It is this difference in stress patterns that an adequate analysis of secondary stress should account for.

As noted by Vogel & Scalise, a certain amount of variability is present in secondary stress patterns. In particular, they observe that a small group of words does not necessarily begin with a stressed syllable, in violation of condition (1ii). Some examples are given in (3).

- (3) a. $\acute{\sigma} \sigma \acute{\sigma} \acute{\sigma} \sigma \dots$ *elettricità* 'electricity'
- $\acute{\sigma} \sigma \acute{\sigma} \acute{\sigma} \sigma \acute{\sigma} \dots$ *elettricità* 'electricity'
- b. $\acute{\sigma} \sigma \acute{\sigma} \acute{\sigma} \sigma \acute{\sigma} \dots$ *caratterizzabile* 'characterizable'
- $\acute{\sigma} \sigma \acute{\sigma} \acute{\sigma} \sigma \acute{\sigma} \dots$ *comunicazione* 'communication'

Vogel & Scalise mention three factors that might influence the choice

of the stress pattern. First, the pattern in (3a) is more characteristic for northern standard Italian, and the pattern in (3b) for the southern varieties. Second, relatively familiar words tend to be pronounced with the pattern in (3a), while relatively unknown words are more likely to be pronounced with the pattern in (3b), which preserves the main stress of the embedded word (*elétrico* 'electric', *caráttere* 'character', *comúnica* 'communicate') as a secondary stress. Third, for reasons of phrasal eurhythm, the pattern in (3a) is preferred if it is immediately preceded by more than one unstressed syllable, while that in (3b) is preferred if the preceding word has final stress.

In order to study variability in the stress patterns of words pronounced in isolation, I asked native speakers to read aloud over 200 words, while putting emphasis on those syllables that they felt could be stressed. Five informants were from northern Italy, four from the southern part. The results can be summarized as follows. In monomorphemic words no variation is present. Thus, words like *particoláre* 'particular', *temperatúra* 'temperature' and *universále* 'universal' cannot be stressed on the second syllable; these words always have initial secondary stress. As to derived words, speakers of the northern varieties almost invariably put stress on the first syllable (unless this would lead to a clash with the primary stress); speakers of the southern varieties also stress the first syllable in the majority of cases, but they exhibit more variation. In particular, they sometimes have non-initial stress in suffixed words, such as *perversità* 'perversity'. Moreover, my informants from Palermo but not those from Rome (both southern varieties) can also have non-initial stress in words with a monosyllabic prefix, such as *indipendente* 'independent'. Interestingly, the words that individual speakers of the northern varieties pronounce with non-initial stress are all drawn from a small group, e.g. *elétricitá* 'electricity' and *carátterizza* 'characterizes'. For these speakers, variation thus appears to be related to specific lexical items. This observation goes counter to Vogel & Scalise's suggestion that non-initial stress is especially found with relatively unfamiliar words. Speakers from the southern varieties, in contrast, exhibit more variation in which items they pronounce with non-initial stress.

As a second part of the test, I also confronted the informants with their pronunciations and asked them whether they would accept an alternative suggested by me. For instance, if an informant had said *capacitá* 'capacity' I would ask if (s)he would accept *capàcità* as well. All speakers, regardless of the variety they speak, were liberal in this part of the test. Non-initial stress tends not only to be accepted if the embedded word has stress on the second syllable, e.g. *mirácoloso* 'miraculous' from *mirácolo* 'miracle', but often also if this

correlation is absent, e.g. *occidentále* 'Western' (cf. *occidénate* 'West'). It might be the case that speakers hear both initial and non-initial stress for all types of words in phrasal contexts and therefore tend to accept both patterns. According to Bertinetto (1985) and Lepšcy (1992), variability holds for a much larger class of words than Vogel & Scalise suggest, an observation which is thus confirmed by my data. Given that the acceptance of alternative stress patterns is likely to be conditioned by phrasal contexts, I will not consider it any further.

3. Rule-based approaches

Vogel & Scalise (1982) argue that the differences in the secondary stress patterns in (2) are due to the morphological structure of the words. For instance, *accettábilitá* in (2a) is derived from *accettábile* 'acceptable', with main stress on the antepenult, while *sèntimentálità* is derived from *sèntimentále* 'sentimental', with main stress on the penult. It is the main stress of these words that surfaces as secondary stress in the derived words. Similarly, *clássificábilitá* in (2b) is derived from *clássificábile* 'classifiable', with antepenultimate stress, whereas *rappresèntatívitá* is derived from *rappresèntatívo* 'representative', with penultimate stress. In other words, secondary stress assignment is dependent upon the morphological composition of the word.

Vogel & Scalise thus assume primary stress to be assigned cyclically; each affix contributes to the stress pattern and no stresses of earlier cycles are erased. At the end of the derivation, all stresses but the rightmost one are reduced to secondary stress. Vogel & Scalise argue that the following set of four linear readjustment rules derive the surface secondary stress patterns.

- (4) a. Initial Stress (IS): $\sigma \rightarrow [+ \text{stress}] / \# _ \sigma_1 \acute{\sigma}$
 b. Stress Insertion (SI): $\sigma \rightarrow [+ \text{stress}] / \sigma _ \sigma$
 c. Clash Avoidance (CA): $\acute{\sigma} \rightarrow [- \text{stress}] / _ \acute{\sigma} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sigma \\ \# \end{array} \right.$
 d. Stress Reversal (SR): $\sigma \acute{\sigma} \rightarrow \acute{\sigma} \sigma / \# _ \dots \acute{\sigma}$

Initial Stress (4a) stresses a word-initial syllable if it is followed by at least one unstressed syllable. Stress Insertion (4b) places a stress on the second one of a series of three adjacent unstressed syllables.

* * * * * → * * * * *

* * → (*)(*)(*)(*) Clash (*)(*)(*) *

[[dolo]oso] [[dolo]oso] Deletion [[dolo]oso]

The second readjustment rule, Stress Reversal, is needed to deal with the strong preference to have word-initial stress. It operates in words with an odd number of syllables preceding the main stress, changing, for instance, unattested **tempèratúra* into the correct form *tèmpèratúra*.

A problem with Roca's account, however, is that it cannot derive the alternative accentuations in (3b). For instance, *còmunicazione* 'communication' can also be parsed *comunicazione*. But the former pattern with perfectly alternating stressed and unstressed syllables is yielded in one step by Roca's algorithm, and the latter pattern is beyond reach.

Another point that can be put into question is Roca's assumption that feet in Italian are right-headed. In fact, there are two reasons for which Italian is generally argued to have left-headed feet. First, main stress falls on one of the word's last three syllables, with penultimate stress being the unmarked case. This is accounted for naturally by positing a disyllabic trochee and by assigning final syllable extrametricality to words with antepenultimate stress (den Os & Kager 1986). Second, according to the rhythmic Iambic/Trochaic Law (Hayes 1985, 1995), iambic feet universally correlate with durational contrasts while trochaic feet correlate with intensity contrasts. The canonical iamb therefore consists of a light syllable followed by a heavy one, whereas trochees consist of either two syllables or two moras. In Italian feet are not formed on the basis of syllable weight (cf. Vogel & Scalise 1982; den Os & Kager 1986).⁵ The Iambic/Trochaic Law therefore implies that the foot form is a trochee rather than an iamb.

An alternative metrical analysis, based on cyclic main stress, is put forward in Sluyters (1990). Sluyters proposes that secondary stress be assigned by building syllabic trochees from left to right. No monosyllabic feet preceding the main stress are built; as a consequence, word-initial stress is assigned if and only if the second syllable is unstressed. Stress clash, however, still occurs as a result of cyclic main stress assignment. For instance, in deriving *doloroso* 'painful' from *dolóre* 'pain', the stress of the base word *dolóre* comes to constitute a clash with the main stress introduced by the suffix *-oso*

in the derived word. Sluyters does not consider frequent cases like these, but a clash resolving device should clearly be added to his algorithm.

To sum up this section, Vogel & Scalise (1982) propose a linear account of secondary stress assignment that assumes secondary stress to be related to the morphological composition of words, while Roca (1986) and Sluyters (1990) propose metrical accounts. While the latter approaches have the advantage over a linear analysis of relating the Italian facts to universal metrical principles, I have shown that they have their drawbacks as well. In particular, both analyses still need a repair strategy in order to resolve accentual clashes, while Roca's account has the additional problem that in words with an odd number of syllables preceding the main stress, initial stress is not obtained by the basic algorithm.

In the next section, I will propose an analysis of the Italian facts within the framework of Optimality Theory, which is entirely output-oriented. As a consequence, no repair strategies need to apply. The proposed analysis therefore does not suffer from any of the drawbacks discussed above.

4. Principles of stress checking

In Optimality Theory (Prince & Smolensky 1993), phonological processes are not described by a set of ordered rules that modify underlying forms; rather, the relation between underlying form (or *input*) and surface form (or *output*) is established on the basis of a set of hierarchically ranked constraints on the well-formedness of phonetic forms. These constraints are assumed to be universal; that is, they are operative in every language. The ranking of the constraints, though, is language specific. Constraints often conflict, and the basic tenet of the theory is that constraints are violated under compulsion of higher ranked constraints. That is, an output form can violate a constraint as long as it satisfies higher ranked constraints which are violated by other conceivable output candidates, making the latter ill-formed.

Several typological blocks of constraints can be distinguished. For instance, constraints on syllabic well-formedness state that syllables should have an onset and lack a coda. These constraints thus express the universal preference for the core syllable of the form CV (cf. Prince & Smolensky 1993, Chapter 6). Constraints on faithfulness of input representation ban deletion and insertion by requiring that underlying material should surface in the output and that the

output should not contain material which is not present in the input, respectively. Constraints on metrical structure state the preference for iambic or trochaic feet, the enhancement of the strong syllable of the leftmost or rightmost feet to primary stress, the requirement for feet to be binary, etc. Finally, constraints on the alignment of grammatical categories demand that a designated edge of some (morphological or prosodic) constituent coincide with a designated edge of some other constituent (McCarthy & Prince 1993b).

Technically, the selection of the output form on the basis of a given input works as follows. A function that operates on input forms generates a large set of possible output forms. These forms are evaluated recursively against the set of ranked constraints. The highest ranked constraint is considered first. Any candidate with more violations of this constraint than at least one other candidate is regarded as having a fatal violation, resulting in the exclusion of the candidate. The remaining candidates are then evaluated further with respect to the next most highly ranked constraint. The evaluation process continues until there is only one candidate left, i.e. the correct output form. This candidate gives the best satisfaction of the ordered set of constraints and it is thus called optimal.

4.1. *Monomorphemic words: Basic ranking arguments*

With this theoretical background in mind, we are ready to reconsider the Italian facts. Vogel & Scalise (1982) stated three surface generalizations regarding the distribution of secondary stress, given in (1), and repeated below as (8).

- (8) (i) There are no stress clashes (i.e. no sequences of stressed syllables).
 (ii) Words begin with a stressed syllable (unless this would lead to a clash).
 (iii) There are no sequences of more than two unstressed syllables.

The generalizations in (8) are conditions on surface forms which translate naturally into the following universal constraints on the structure of metrical feet, which have all been argued for previously. First of all, the absence of stress clashes is accounted for by FtBIN (McCarthy & Prince 1993a:43):

- (9) FtBIN: Feet must be binary under syllabic or moraic analysis.

Under the assumption that Italian is quantity insensitive, i.e. that the units composing feet are syllables, FtBIN requires feet to consist of exactly two syllables. As a consequence, satisfaction of FtBIN entails that no two adjacent syllables can both be the head of a foot, hence that there can be no sequences of stressed syllables. Furthermore, I assume that feet are left-headed (cf. den Os & Kager 1986). In other words, well-formed feet in Italian are syllabic trochees.

Second, word-initial stress follows from an alignment constraint, which requires the left edge (L) of every prosodic word (PW) to coincide with the left edge of a foot (Ft). McCarthy & Prince (1993b) show that this type of alignment is operative in various unrelated languages with different effects. Formally, the constraint is stated as in (10).

- (10) ALIGN-PW: Align(PW, L; Ft, L)

Given the assumption that feet in Italian are trochaic, the effect of ALIGN-PW is that words start with a stressed syllable.

In Vogel & Scalise's formulation, the requirement of word-initial stress (8ii) is overridden by the prohibition on stress clashes (8i): no stress is assigned to the initial syllable if this would introduce a clash. In Optimality Theory, this result is typically obtained by constraint ranking. That is, the constraint on foot binarity outranks the one that calls for initial stress. This is illustrated by the constraint tableau in (11). Given the input /felice/ 'happy', two output candidates are considered. In the tableau, feet are enclosed in round brackets. In candidate (a), a monosyllabic foot is built on the first syllable. This candidate violates FtBIN, but it satisfies ALIGN-PW. In candidate (b), by contrast, the first syllable remains unfooted, hence FtBIN is satisfied but ALIGN-PW is violated. Constraint violation is indicated by '*'. The violation of FtBIN by candidate (a) is fatal, since the alternative candidate satisfies this constraint; this is indicated by the exclamation mark. Candidate (b) is thus the winner, despite its violation of ALIGN-PW. This constraint is irrelevant for the fate of the candidates, since the correct output form has already been selected on the basis of higher ranked FtBIN. The cells of ALIGN-PW are therefore shaded. Candidate (b), the optimal output form, is pointed at by '↑'.

(11)

	/felice/	FtBIN	ALIGN-PW
a.	(fe)(lice)	*!	*
b. ↑	fe(lice)		

Thus, the underlying form /felice/ yields an output form with a single foot preceded by an unfooted syllable. This is in accordance with the fact that the first syllable of *felice* cannot bear secondary stress.

Finally, in order to account for the fact that there are no sequences of more than two unstressed syllables, as stated in (8iii), the following constraint is needed.

- (12) **PARSE-σ**: Syllables must be dominated by feet. (McCarthy & Prince 1993a:14)

According to **PARSE-σ**, every syllable should be part of a foot. Hence, this constraint bans stray syllables, which are directly linked to the prosodic word. For short words like *felice*, **PARSE-σ** and **ALIGN-PW** always have the same violation marks, hence **ALIGN-PW** could be replaced by **PARSE-σ** in (11) without changing the result. But for longer words, like *temperatura* 'temperature' **PARSE-σ** and **ALIGN-PW** are both crucially dominated by **FTBIN**. To see this, consider the tableau in (13), which evaluates four output candidates.

(13)

	/temperatura/	FTBIN	ALIGN-PW	PARSE-σ
a.	(tèm)(pèra)(tura)	*!		
b.	tem(pèra)(tura)		*!	*
c.	(tèmpe)(rà)(tura)	*!		
d. ^{ES}	(tèmpe)ra(tura)			*

Candidates (a) and (c) satisfy **PARSE-σ**, but they both contain a monosyllabic foot and are ruled out by top ranked **FTBIN**. The remaining candidates, (b) and (d) differ with respect to the position of the unfooted syllable. Candidate (d) wins over (b), since the former but not the latter begins with a foot and hence satisfies **ALIGN-PW**.⁷ Candidate (d) is thus defined optimal. It has a word-initial stress followed by two adjacent unstressed syllables, the first one of which is the weak member of a foot; the word-medial syllable remains unfooted, in violation of **PARSE-σ**. This violation, though, is irrelevant, since the competing candidates violate at least one higher ranked constraint.

4.2. Derived words

So far we have only considered monomorphemic words. As

shown by Vogel & Scalise (1982), derived words satisfy the same surface generalizations as underived words, and the stress patterns of both types often coincide. For instance, monomorphemic *felice* 'happy' patterns with prefixed *incónscio* 'unconscious' and suffixed *barista* 'bartender'; monomorphemic *temperatura* patterns with prefixed *ipe-rattivo* 'hyperactive' and suffixed *sentimentále* 'sentimental'. Derived words thus appear to be subject to the constraint hierarchy established above for monomorphemic words.

The constraint **PARSE-σ**, although low-ranked in the constraint hierarchy, has an additional effect in derived words. That is, in longer words it accounts for Vogel & Scalise's observation that there are no word-internal sequences of three unstressed syllables (8iii). This is illustrated in (14) for *rinocerontino* 'small rhinoceros'. Output candidate (a) contains three adjacent unstressed syllables. This candidate is ruled out, since it has two unfooted syllables. The competing candidate (b), in fact, satisfies both **FTBIN** and **PARSE-σ**, and hence is the winner.⁸

(14)

	/rinocerontino/	FTBIN	ALIGN-PW	PARSE-σ
a.	(rino)ceron(tino)			*!*
b. ^{ES}	(rino)(cèron)(tino)			

What remains to be explained is the cyclic effect of stress assignment. That is, we should account for the fact that primary word stress is often carried over as a secondary stress in derived words. A way of doing this is proposed by Burzio (1994), who puts forward a theory of stress checking, in which stress is not assigned by rule but is present underlyingly and subject to well-formedness conditions on derived representations (see also Burzio & DiFabio 1994). Burzio defines a principle of Metrical Consistency, according to which morphemes, stems and affixes alike, maintain fixed accentual properties in word-formation. In fact, Burzio argues that stress is one of the stable properties of form and meaning by which morphemes are defined. Metrical Consistency is not unviolable but subordinate to conditions on metrical well-formedness. In the Optimality Theoretic approach adopted in this paper, Metrical Consistency can be formulated as a faithfulness constraint which requires morphemes to surface with their underlying stress:

- (15) **METRCONS**: morphemes surface with their underlying stress.

Burzio points out that whether a morpheme surfaces with primary or secondary stress is irrelevant for satisfaction of METRCONS. In fact, the enhancement of one of the word's stressed syllables (in Italian the rightmost one) to primary stress, is the consequence of an independent principle.

We have seen that in Italian, words with six syllables preceding the main stress can surface either with two secondary stresses, as *classificabilità* 'classifiability', containing two ternary spans, or with three, as *rappresentatività* 'representativity', presenting a perfectly alternating pattern of stressed and unstressed syllables. The difference is due to the position of main stress in the embedded words: on the antepenult in *classificabile* 'classifiable' and on the penult in *rappresentativo* 'representative'. Given that *classificabilità* surfaces with two unstressed syllables, PARSE-σ must be dominated by a constraint that calls for preservation of main stress on the preceding cycle as secondary stress in the output, ruling out the pattern **clàssificabilità*. This constraint is thus METRCONS.

Satisfaction of METRCONS is computed recursively over the morphological constituents. Thus, in words containing more than one affix, secondary stress should fall on the syllable bearing main stress in the immediately embedded word. In (16), METRCONS is violated by candidate (a), *clàssificabilità*, since the stress of the immediately embedded word *classificabile* is not preserved. Candidate (b), *clàssificabilità*, on the other hand, satisfies METRCONS, and hence is the winner.⁹

(16)

/classificabilità/	FtBIN	ALIGN-PW	METRCONS	PARSE-σ
a. (clàssi)(fìca)(bìli)(tà)	*		*!	
b. ^{ES} (clàssi)(fì)(càbi)li(tà)	*			**

In (17), the (a) candidate, *rappresentatività*, with alternating stressed and unstressed syllables wins, since it preserves the stress of the embedded word *rappresentativo*. The fact that it fares better with respect to PARSE-σ as well, is irrelevant, given the domination of METRCONS over PARSE-σ.

(17)

/rappresentatività/	FtBIN	ALIGN-PW	METRCONS	PARSE-σ
a. ^{ES} (ràppre)(sènta)(tìvi)(tà)	*			
b. (ràppre)sen(tàti)vi(tà)	*		*!	**

The effect of METRCONS on words with an add number of syllables preceding the main stress is illustrated in (18). In these cases, the competing candidates all have one unparsed syllable. Which syllable is left unparsed depends on the position of main stress in the embedded word. Thus, *accettabilità* 'acceptability', from *accettabile* 'acceptable' has the unstressed syllable after the second foot, while in *sentimentalità* 'sentimentality', from *sentimentale* 'sentimental', the unparsed syllable follows the first foot. For completeness, the tableaux also contain candidates in which the word-initial syllable is left unparsed. These candidates are ruled out since they violate higher ranked ALIGN-PW.

(18)

/accettabilità/; /sentimentalità/	FtBIN	ALIGN-PW	METRCONS	PARSE-σ
a. ac(cètta)(bìli)(tà)	*	*!	*	*
b. (àcct)ta(bìli)(tà)	*		*!	*
c. ^{ES} (àcct)(tàbi)li(tà)	*			*
a. sen(tìmen)(tàli)(tà)	*	*!		*
b. ^{ES} (sènti)men(tài)(tà)	*			*
c. (sènti)(mènta)li(tà)	*		*!	*

According to Roca (1986), the data reported in Vogel & Scalise (1982) contain several counterexamples to the hypothesis that stress is assigned cyclically. In particular, Roca mentions the following three cases. First, *probabilità* 'probability' does not preserve the stress of the embedded word *probabile* 'probable'. It is easy to see, though, that this is a case of conflicting requirements; that is, the higher ranked constraint ALIGN is satisfied at the cost of violation of METRCONS. Second, *razionalizzabilità* 'rationalizability' does not preserve the stress of the embedded word *razionalizzare* 'rationalize'. The native speakers I consulted, however, all gave *razionalizzabilità*, as predicted by the cyclicity hypothesis. Finally, Roca mentions *ipersensibilità* 'hypersensitivity'. The prefix *iper-* attaches to both adjectives and nouns, but given the semantic analysis of *ipersensibilità* as 'the state of being hypersensitive', the immediate constituent must be the adjective *ipersensibile*, 'hypersensitive' rather than the noun *sensibilità*. 'sensitivity'. We would thus expect the pattern *ipersensibilità*, with stress carried over from *ipersensibile*, but this pattern is attested with very few speakers. I argue, however, that the

more common pattern *ipersensibilità* is not a counterexample to the relevance of primary stress of embedded words. On the contrary, under the assumption that prefixation induces recursive prosodic structure, it is predicted to be the unmarked pattern. Prefixes often exhibit independent phonological behavior, and accordingly it has been proposed for various languages that prefixes be adjoined to the prosodic word (Inkelas 1989; McCarthy & Prince 1993ab). Carried over to Italian, this hypothesis thus gives (ipersensibilità)_{PW}/PW as the prosodic structure of *ipersensibilità*, and the attested stress pattern satisfies ALIGN-PW with regard to both the inner and the outer prosodic word.¹⁰ The less common pattern *ipersensibilità* with non-initial stress in the embedded prosodic word, then, is a case of variability of secondary stress, to be discussed below.

Let us now turn to words containing a monosyllabic prefix. Consider, for instance, *areligioso* 'irreligious', from *religioso* 'religious'. The prosodic structure is (a (religioso)_{PW})/PW, and given that feet are binary, alignment cannot be satisfied with regard to both the inner and the outer prosodic word. Two output candidates should be compared, one in which a foot begins at the left edge of the outer prosodic word, and one in which a foot begins at the left edge of the inner prosodic word. It is the former candidate that should win, but the constraint hierarchy established so far cannot select this surface form. In fact, both candidates incur exactly the same violation marks, since one syllable is necessarily left unparsed, and alignment of the inner prosodic word induces misalignment of the outer prosodic word and *vice versa*. In the tableau, the desired selection of the attested output is indicated by '§'.

(19)

	/areligioso/	FtBIN	ALIGN-PW	METrCONS	PARSE-σ
a. §	(àre)li(giòso)		*		*
b.	a(rèli)(giòso)		*		*

Apparently, there is an additional constraint which favours candidate (a) over (b). I propose that this be ALIGN-MW, requiring that the morphological word begin with a foot.

(20) ALIGN-MW: Align(MW, L; Ft, L)

In words without prefixes, ALIGN-PW and ALIGN-MW are equivalent. In prefixed words, however, the left edge of the inner prosodic word

does not coincide with a morphological word boundary. In words with a monosyllabic prefix, then, ALIGN-MW is decisive, picking out the candidate with initial stress. This is illustrated in (21). Note that this case does not provide any arguments for the ranking of ALIGN-MW with respect to the other constraints. Below it will be shown that ALIGN-MW must be dominated by METrCONS. In the tableau, ALIGN-MW is therefore ranked at the bottom of the hierarchy. The dotted line which separates the columns of PARSE-σ and ALIGN-MW indicates that these constraints are unranked with respect to each other.

(21)

	/areligioso/	FtBIN	ALIGN-PW	METrCONS	PARSE-σ	ALIGN-MW
a. §	(àre)li(giòso)		*		*	
b.	a(rèli)(giòso)		*			*

A final issue to be discussed concerns the variability of secondary stress. We have seen that in words with an odd-numbered syllable string preceding the main stress, secondary stress tends to be on the word-initial syllable rather than on the second one. This holds for both monomorphemic words (see e.g. *temperatura* 'temperature', not **temperatúra* in (13)) and derived words (e.g. *sentimentale* 'sentimental', not **sentimentále*). The tendency of having a ternary span word-initially rather than having a word-initial unstressed syllable is dubbed the Initial-dactyl effect by Prince (1983:49); in fact, it is characteristic of many unrelated languages with a trochaic stress pattern (see also McCarthy & Prince (1993b) and Hayes (1995)). In Optimality Theory, high-ranked ALIGN-PW is responsible for the effect. Now, recall from section 2 that some variability is present in Italian; especially in the southern varieties secondary stress can sometimes be on the second syllable of derived words. Two cases should be distinguished. First, in suffixed words, for instance *perversità* 'perversity' from *perverso* 'perverse', main stress of the embedded word is respected at the cost of misalignment.¹¹ This type of variability is found in both southern varieties of which I collected data, spoken in Rome and Palermo, respectively. In order to account for this type, I propose that, optionally, the ranking of ALIGN-PW and METrCONS be reversed. This is illustrated in the tableau in (22).¹²

(22) ALIGN-PW and METRCONS reranked

/perversità/	FtBIN	METRCONS	ALIGN-PW	PARSE-σ	ALIGN-MW
a. (pèrver)si(tá)	*	*!		*	
b. ^{ES} per(vèrsi)(tá)	*		*	*	*

Second, in words with a monosyllabic prefix, for instance *disintegrato* 'disintegrated' from *integrato* 'integrated', it is a secondary stress which is carried over from the base. This type of variable secondary stress is characteristic of only a part of the southern varieties; according to my data, speakers from Palermo often have non-initial stress in prefixed words, but speakers from Rome do not exhibit this pattern.

In this case, the ranking of ALIGN-PW is irrelevant. In fact, given the embedded prosodic word structure, both the candidate with initial stress and the one with non-initial stress incur exactly one violation of this constraint. Reranking of ALIGN-PW and METRCONS therefore does not account for this type of variability. Rather, I would like to propose that, optionally, METRCONS refer to primary as well as secondary stress of the embedded word. Thus, in (23a), METRCONS is violated, since the secondary stress of *integrato* 'integrated' is not preserved in the prefixed word, whereas the candidate in (23b) satisfies this requirement. The latter candidate, then, is selected as the correct output form. Note, furthermore, that ALIGN-MW is crucially dominated by METRCONS, since the winning candidate obeys METRCONS while violating ALIGN-MW, whereas the reverse holds for the other candidate, i.e. it satisfies ALIGN-MW but violates METRCONS.

(23)

/disintegrato/	FtBIN	ALIGN-PW	METRCONS	PARSE-σ	ALIGN-MW
a. (dìsin)te(gráto)		*	*!	*	
b. ^{ES} dì(sinte)(gráto)		*		*	*

This concludes the discussion of secondary stress in derived words. I have shown that a constraint requiring the preservation of stress of the embedded word, METRCONS, should be added to the set of constraints introduced in the previous section for monomorphemic words. Furthermore, I have argued that optional reranking of METRCONS above ALIGN-PW accounts for variability of secondary

stress in suffixed words, while a reinterpretation of METRCONS as referring to both primary and secondary stress of the embedded word accounts for variability in prefixed words.¹³

4.3. Compounds and adverbs in -mente

It was mentioned in section 1 that Lepschy (1968) bases the hypothesis that secondary stress is contrastive on the stress pattern of compounds. Thus, according to Lepschy, the compound *cuciréte* 'sewing machine for nets' has a secondary stress, while the verb form *cuciréte* '(you) will sew' lacks such a stress. The two compounds *autoreattore* 'self-reactor' and *autoreattore* 'author-actor' are distinguished from one another by virtue of the different positions of secondary stress under this view. Vogel & Scalise (1982) also observe that compounds show special stress behavior. In particular, the stress pattern of compounds does not always conform to the surface generalizations given in (1) that hold for monomorphemic and derived words. According to Vogel & Scalise, a clash is present in, for instance, *città dormitorio* 'dormitory town'; word-initial stress is missing in *aspirapolvere* 'vacuum cleaner' and *valigia armadio* 'suitcase-wardrobe'; and a sequence of three unstressed syllables is contained in *càrcere modello* 'model prison'.

The assumption of both Lepschy and Vogel & Scalise that all compound words contain a single primary stress, though, is questionable. In fact, it is argued in Nespor & Vogel (1986) on the basis of several segmental rules, that each element of a compound in Italian constitutes an independent prosodic word. For instance, Nespor & Vogel show that the low vowels [E] and [O], which may only occur in syllables bearing primary stress, are found in the first member of compounds such as *t[O]stapáne* 'bread toaster' (cf. the derived word *t[O]statóre* 'toaster', in which [O] is raised to [o]) and *p[E]lterossa* 'red skin' (cf. derived *p[E]llicína* 'small piece of skin', in which [E] is raised to [e]). Under the assumption that a prosodic word is characterized by having one and only one primary stress, the conclusion is that each member of a compound is mapped onto a separate prosodic word. More recently, it has been argued that different types of compounds should be distinguished (Peperkamp 1993; Nespor & Ralli 1996; Nespor to appear; Peperkamp to appear a, b). In lexicalized compounds, [O] and [E] are raised to [o] and [e], respectively, indicating that these compounds contain a single primary stress and hence constitute one prosodic word. For instance, we find *f[è]rrovia* 'railway' (cf. *f[E]rro* 'iron'). That lexicalized compounds do, in fact, conform to the overt generalizations regarding the distribution of secondary

stress is shown by, for instance, *gàlantuómo* 'gentleman', with secondary stress on the first syllable rather than on the second (cf. *galànte* 'gentle'). In productively formed compounds, by contrast, vowel raising does not apply. Examples are *fɛlɛrro battúto* 'wrought iron' and *p[ɔ]rtacénere* 'ashtray', as well as *[ɛ]uroparlaménto* 'Europeanliament' and *f[ɔ]nregistrátore* 'tape-recorder', which are compounds composed of a stem plus a word.¹⁴ These compounds are thus composed of two prosodic words.

Turning now to the examples upon which Lepschy bases his claim that secondary stress can be contrastive, we see that a reanalysis of his data is readily available. First, according to the classification discussed above, the productively formed word + word compound *cùciréte* 'sewing machine for nets' has two main word stresses and hence contrasts with the verb form *cùciréte* '(you) will sew', which has a secondary and a primary stress. Second, the compounds *autoreattóre* 'self-reactor' and *autore-attore* 'author-actor' do not contrast the position of secondary stress. In fact, while *autoreattore* is a stem + word compound the first element of which can bear either a primary or a secondary stress (cf. note 14), yielding *autòrèattóre* or *autòrèattóre*, respectively, *autóre-attóre* is a word + word compound which does not contain a secondary stress at all.

As to the data discussed by Vogel & Scalise (1982), it is easy to see that they are only apparent counterexamples to the generalizations regarding the distribution of secondary stress. First, in *cittá dòrmitório* 'dormitory town' there is no word-internal clash of two secondary stresses. Rather, this compound consists of two prosodic words, each of which carries its own primary stress. The monosyllabic foot which ends the compound's first member bears main word stress; this stress is stored as such in the lexicon and a violation of FTBIN within the domain of the prosodic word *cittá* is unavoidable. Second, the fact that *aspirapólvere* 'vacuum cleaner' and *valígia armádio* 'suitcase-wardrobe' do not have stress on the initial syllable, is also the consequence of the presence of main word stress on the first element of these compounds. That is, these compounds do not begin with a stress, just as the words *aspira* 'inhale' and *valígia* 'suitcase' in isolation do not. Finally, *cárcere modéllò* 'model prison' equally consists of two prosodic words, each with its own primary stress, and none of them contains a sequence of three adjacent unstressed syllables.

Another class of words that do not appear to pattern alike with monomorphemic and derived words is constituted by adverbs in *-mente*, e.g. *bellissimamente* 'beautifully', *intensamente* 'intensely', *stupidamente* 'stupidly'. Vogel & Scalise (1982) treat these words as on a

par with derived words, but the stress pattern of, for instance, *bellissimamente* cannot be derived with their rules. Instead, the pattern *bellissimamente* is predicted. The set of ranked constraints proposed in this paper equally predicts the wrong stress pattern. This is shown in (24); the selection of the wrong output candidate is indicated by '*'.

(24)

/bellissimamente/	FTBIN	ALIGN-PW	METRCONS	PARSE-σ	ALIGN-MW
a. *(bèllis)(sima)(mènte)			*		
b. bel(lissi)ma(mènte)		*!		**	*

Given high-ranked ALIGN-PW, the candidate in which main stress of the adjective is preserved is erroneously ruled out.

Along the lines of Harris (1983) and Roca (1986), who propose a postlexical ordering for the suffix *-mente* in Spanish and Italian, it could be argued that adverbs in *-mente*, similarly to compounds, consist of two prosodic words in Italian. They would then consist of two stress domains, each with its own main word stress. However, Nespor & Vogel (1986) provide evidence to the contrary. They show that adverbs in *-mente* regularly undergo the rule of vowel raising. Thus, the low vowel [ɔ] of *s[ɔ]lito* 'usual' is raised to [o] in *s[ol]itamente* 'usually', indicating that the main stress of the adjective is reduced to secondary stress in the adverb. Hence, according to the data of vowel raising, adverbs in *-mente* constitute single prosodic words.

Alternatively, it could be proposed that for adverbs in *-mente*, ALIGN-PW and METRCONS be reranked with respect to each other. This would account for the pattern *bellissimamente*; main stress of *bellissima* 'beautiful' is carried over to the adverb at the cost of misalignment. However, a closer look at the class of adverbs in *-mente* reveals some more accentual oddities which cannot be accounted for by reranking. Consider words like *autenticamente* 'authentically' and *genericamente* 'generically'. These adverbs are similar to *bellissimamente* in that their base adjectives have antepenultimate stress: *auténtico*, *genérico* (cf. *bellíssimo*). The native speakers I consulted do not pronounce these words with a uniform stress pattern. One group, mostly speakers of a southern variety, treats them on a par with *bellissimamente* and thus has *autènticamènte*, *genèricamènte*; the other group treats these adverbs as ordinary derived words and hence pronounces *autènticaménte*, *genèricaménte* with regular initial stress. Moreover, whereas the accentuation *bellissimamente* is rejected by

almost everybody, those speakers that have the spontaneous pronunciations *autenticaménte* and *genéricaménte*, all accept the alternative with initial stress. In other words, the suffix *-ísimo* never allows stress to move away, while *-ico* is special only for some speakers and to a certain extent.¹⁵ Finally, speakers with *autenticaménte* and *genéricaménte* contrast these not only with the pattern of derived words like *accumulaménte* 'accumulation' (cf. *accúmula*), but also with that of shorter adverbs in *-mente*, like *intensaménte* 'intensely' and *feroceménte* 'ferociously' (cf. *inténso*, *feróce*), all of which surface with regular initial stress. The difference between the two types of adverbs is that if stress falls on the first syllable, in the shorter adverbs a sequence of two unstressed syllables follows, whereas in the longer ones, a sequence of three unstressed syllables follows which must be broken up by the insertion of an additional stress.

In sum, adverbs in *-mente* exhibit special accentual behavior.¹⁶ They cannot be classified with either derived words or compounds. At present, I do not have an analysis that unifies the irregularities of adverbs in *-mente*.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, I have proposed a representational account of secondary stress in Italian. Output candidates are posited with their phonological constituent structure, and the winning candidate is selected on the basis of how well a limited set of constraints can be satisfied. These constraints are of two types. First, FTBN, ALIGN-PW, ALIGN-MW and PARSE- σ deal with metrical and prosodic wellformedness. Together, they unambiguously determine the distribution of secondary stress in monomorphemic words. Second, METRCONS concerns the surfacing of underlying stress of stems and affixes. In monomorphemic words, it is satisfied vacuously, while in derived words, it accounts for the effect of stress preservation.

In an analysis of English stress, Burzio (1994) argues that a checking approach is superior to rule-based theories, since it captures both the similarities and the differences between monomorphemic and derived words in a unified manner. This paper shows that Burzio's arguments carry over to Italian. Morphologically simple and complex words are all subject to the constraints on metrical and prosodic wellformedness, whence the similarities observed by Vogel & Scalise (1982) stated in (1). The differences between monomorphemic words and derived words are entirely due to METRCONS, which is active only in the latter. Given that METRCONS is subordinate to FTBN

and ALIGN-PW, which determine the basic pattern, its force is limited. It was shown that in the southern varieties of Standard Italian, however, METRCONS can optionally be reranked above ALIGN-PW, in these cases, more stress preservation effects are found.¹⁷

Finally, it was shown that adverbs in *-mente* exhibit hybrid stress behavior, in that they cannot be classified with either suffixed words, which constitute a single stress domain, or compounds, which generally consist of more than one stress domain. The accentual peculiarities are part of a large set of hybrid phonological properties of adverbs in *-mente* (cf. note 16). An analysis that provides a unified account of the behavior of this class of words is still to be awaited.

Address of the Author:

Department of Italian, Spuistraat 210, 1012 VT Amsterdam, The Netherlands, s.peperkamp@let.uva.nl

Notes

* I am grateful to Tina Langeveld, Marina Nespor, and two anonymous reviewers for comments and questions.

¹ As to compounds, various types can be distinguished, some of which can violate the principles in (1). I will return to the stress pattern of compounds in section 4.3.

² Vogel & Scalise assume derivation to be based on words. Vowel Deletion, a rule that deletes a word-final vowel before a vowel-initial suffix (SCALISE 1984), therefore applies before the stress rules. By contrast, I have argued in Peperkamp (1995) that derivation is based on stems. Word-final vowels are therefore not part of the input to suffixation. For the purpose of this paper it is irrelevant whether word-final vowels are deleted before vowel-initial suffixes or simply not present underlyingly.

³ Vogel & Scalise's assumption of non-cyclic rule application is based on the argument that if the rules were to apply at the end of every cycle, more steps would be required in order to derive the same patterns. The opposite assumption, however, i.e. that the application of the rules in (4) proceeds cyclically, would yield two immediate advantages. First, a single rule application would always be sufficient to derive the correct stress pattern, and as a consequence, no rule ordering would be required. Second, the formulation of Clash Avoidance (4c) could be made more transparent. With non-cyclic rule application it is necessary to specify that the clashing configuration is followed by an unstressed syllable or a word boundary. In a sequence of three stressed syllables, it is thus the second one that is destressed. Without this additional information in the structural description, the rule could apply from left to right, incorrectly destressing the first one of three adjacent stressed syllables. By contrast, in a cyclic account, sequences of three stressed syllables simply do not occur, given that each affix introduces at most one stressed syllable. Clash Avoidance could therefore be stated as follows: given two adjacent stressed syllables, the first one is destressed.

⁴ I will return to this question in section 4.2, showing that the words Roca mentions are only apparent counterexamples to the cyclic assignment of primary stress.

⁵ A heavy penultimate syllable, however, generally attracts stress. Sluyters (1990) therefore proposes that main stress be quantity sensitive while secondary stress is quantity insensitive.

⁶ For ease of exposition, I abstract away from main stress assignment and assume that the main stressed foot is part of the input.

⁷ Notice that this case does not provide an argument for the ranking of ALIGN-PW and PARSE-σ with respect to each other. Anticipating further data, ALIGN-PW precedes PARSE-σ in the tableau.

⁸ Other conceivable output candidates, such as *rinocerontino*, violate at least one of the constraints FRIN and ALIGN-PW, and are not considered in the tableau.

⁹ In several recent papers, e.g. Benua (1995); Kenstowicz (1996); McCarthy (1995), cyclic effects have been argued to be compelled by Base-Identity constraints. Base-Identity requires phonological identity between words that stand in a morphological relationship. It might be appealing to call on a Base-Identity constraint in accounting for cyclic secondary stress as observed in pairs like *classificabile* - *classificabilità*. However, Base-Identity crucially relies on the occurrence of the base as an independent word. Under the assumption that Italian derivation is based on stems rather than on words (Peperkamp 1995), similarities in secondary stress patterns between bases and derivatives cannot be due to Base-Identity. The present proposal, though, is reminiscent of Kenstowicz's (1996) constraint Uniform Exponence, which requires the minimization of allomorphic differences in the realization of morphemes.

¹⁰ For Italian, at least two different proposals regarding the prosodic structure of prefixed words have been made (Nespor & Vogel 1986; Peperkamp 1995). In both proposals, consonant-final prefixes and vowel-final ones are not treated alike, and not all prefixes are separated from their bases by a prosodic word boundary. Both proposals suffer from serious shortcomings, a discussion of which is outside the scope of this paper; see Peperkamp (to appear) for arguments that prefixes in Italian are uniformly separated from their base by a prosodic word boundary.

¹¹ The pattern *ipersensibilità* 'hypersensitivity', which – as mentioned above in the text – is found as an alternative for the more common pattern *ipersensibilità*, also falls into this category. In fact, the inner prosodic word *sensibilità* has a marked non-initial secondary stress, which is carried over from the embedded word *sensibile* 'sensitive'. Furthermore, this type of variable secondary stress includes those lexical items in which many northern speakers prefer non-initial stress. A special case of this is *caratterizza* 'characterizes' from *carattere* 'character'. Whereas northern speakers show a preference for non-initial stress, southern speakers even reject the pattern with initial stress altogether. I do not intend to account for variability found in the northern varieties in a systematic way. Instead, given that – as mentioned in section 2 – it concerns a limited and fixed class of items in these varieties, I assume that non-initial secondary stress is stored in the lexicon.

¹² Alternatively, Jacobs (1994) proposes to account for variability in secondary stress patterns by storing the stress preserving patterns as such in the input forms. The alternative patterns, then, are the output of his constraint ranking, which mimics the effect of iterative footing form left to right. For instance, in *elettricità* 'electricity', which preserves the stress from the base *elettrico* 'electric', secondary stress is present underlyingly, while in the alternative pattern *elettricità*, the secondary stresses are the result of constraint ranking. This proposal is not only *ad hoc*, it also fails to account for a large amount of data. In fact, Jacobs

only considers words of the *electricità* type. He disregards longer words like *classificabilità* 'classifiability'. In Jacob's approach, this pattern would have to be stored in the input, since it preserves the main stress from the base *classificabile* 'classifiable', and the constraint ranking would incorrectly derive the trochaic pattern **classificabilità* as an alternative.

¹³ An anonymous reviewer points out that certain patterns in derived words which are commonly heard are not accounted for by my proposals. For instance, *rinocerontino* 'small rhinoceros' (14), *classificabilità* 'classifiability' (16) and *accettabilità* 'acceptability' (18), would be possible pronunciations, despite the fact that secondary stress is not carried over from the embedded words *rinoceronte* 'rhinoceros', *classificabile* 'classifiable' and *accettabile* 'acceptable', respectively. The reviewer does not mention in which varieties these pronunciations are found, nor whether they are heard when the words are pronounced in isolation or in phrasal contexts only. As mentioned in section 2, the present analysis does not account for the stress patterns of words in phrasal contexts, which are subject to various rhythmic rules. My own data of words pronounced in isolation, however, contain a few instances by speakers from Palermo of words with non-initial secondary stress that is not carried over from the embedded word. I do not have anything to say with regard to these exceptions to the generalization that non-initial stress is due to stress preservation.

¹⁴ Both stem + word compounds and word + word compounds are subject to variation, in that some speakers do raise the vowels in certain compounds of these types. For an account of this variation, see Peperkamp (to appear a, b).

¹⁵ Several informants who generally preferred initial stress (and thus had, e.g. *miracoloso* 'miraculous', from *miracolo* 'miracle') said that they accepted the alternative pattern with stress preservation (*miracoloso*) only with some semantic emphasis. Possibly, the exceptional stress pattern of adverbs like *bellissimamente* is related to the inherent emphasis of the superlative affix *-issimo*. This still does not explain the exceptional status of the suffix *-ico* for many speakers.

¹⁶ Several other well-known facts attest to the hybrid status of the suffix *-mente* and its counterparts in other Romance languages. First, in Italian, Spanish, Portuguese and French, *-ment(e)* attaches to the feminine form of the adjective (Harris 1977; Scalise 1984). Second, in Spanish and Portuguese, *-mente* can be factored out in conjunctions. (Suñer 1975; Harris 1983). Third, Spanish adverbs in *-mente* may present an otherwise unattested word-internal stress clash (Harris 1983; Roca 1986). Fourth, in Italian, the final vowel of adjectives that end in *-e* does not surface before *-mente* if it is preceded by a sequence of a vowel and a liquid consonant (Scalise 1984).

¹⁷ Burzio (1994) and Burzio & DiFabio (1994) also show that a stress-checking approach offers insight into the phenomenon of morpheme suppression in the inflectional paradigm of Italian verbs.

References

- BENUA L. (1995), "Identity effects in morphological truncation", in J. BECKMAN, L. WALSH DICKEY & S. URBANCZYK, eds., *Papers in Optimality Theory*. University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers 18, Amherst, GLSA, 77-136.
- BERTINETTO P.M. (1976), "L'accento secondario nella fonologia italiana. Analisi teorica e sperimentale", in R. SIMONE, U. VIGNUZZI & G. RUGGERO, eds., *Studi di fonetica e fonologia*. Roma, Bulzoni, 189-235.

- BERTINETTO P.M. (1981), *Strutture prosodiche dell'italiano*, Firenze, Accademia della Crusca.
- BERTINETTO P.M. (1985), "A proposito di alcuni recenti contributi alla prosodia dell'italiano", *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 15:581-643.
- BURZIO L. (1994), *Principles of English stress*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- BURZIO L. & E. DIFABIO (1994), "Accentual stability", in M. MAZZOLA, ed., *Issues and theory in Romance Linguistics: Selected papers from the Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages XXIII*, Washington, Georgetown University Press:19-34.
- CAMILLI A. (1965), *Pronuncia e grafia dell'italiano*, Firenze, Sansoni.
- DI PIETRO R. (1971), Review of Mario Saltarelli (1970), "A phonology of Italian in a generative grammar", *Language* 47:718-730.
- HALLE M. & J.-R. VERGNAUD (1978), *An essay on stress*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- HARRIS J. (1977), "Spanish vowel alternation, diacritic features and the structure of the lexicon", in J. KEGL, D. NASH & A. ZAENEN, eds., *Proceedings of NELS VII*:99-113.
- HARRIS J. (1983), *Syllable structure and stress in Spanish*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- HAYES B. (1981), *A metrical theory of stress rules*, Bloomington, Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- HAYES B. (1985), "Iambic and trochaic rhythm in stress rules", in M. NIEMOKUJ *et al.*, eds., *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 13:429-446.
- HAYES B. (1995), *Metrical stress theory*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- INKELAS SH. (1989), *Prosodic constituency in the lexicon*, doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- JACOBS H. (1994), "How optimal is Italian stress?", in R. BOK-BENNEMA & C. CREMERS, eds., *Linguistics in The Netherlands* 11:61-70.
- KENSTOWICZ M. (1996), "Base-Identity and Uniform Exponence: Alternatives to cyclicity", in J. DURAND & B. LAKS, eds., *Current trends in phonology: models and methods*, volume I, Salford: ESRI, 369-393.
- LEPSCHY A.L. & G. LEPSCHY (1977), *La lingua italiana*, Milano, Bompiani.
- LEPSCHY G. (1968), "Note su accento e intonazione con riferimento all'italiano", *Word* 24:270-285.
- LEPSCHY G. (1992), "Proposte per l'accento secondario", *The Italianist* 12:117-128.
- MCCARTHY J. (1995), *Faithfulness in prosodic morphology and phonology: Rotuman revisited*, ms., UMass, Amherst.
- MCCARTHY J. & A. PRINCE (1993a), *Prosodic morphology I. Constraint interaction and satisfaction*, Ms. UMass, Amherst, and Rutgers University, New Brunswick.
- MCCARTHY J. & A. PRINCE (1993b), "Generalized alignment", in G. BOOIJ & J. VAN MARLE, eds., *Yearbook of morphology 1993*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Press:79-153.
- MULJAČIĆ Z. (1972), *Fonologia della lingua italiana*, Bologna, Il Mulino.
- NESPOR M. (to appear), "Stress domains", in H. VAN DER HULST, ed., *Word prosodic systems in the language of Europe*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nespor M. & A. Ralli (to appear), "Morphology-phonology interface: Phonological domains in Graek compounds", *The Linguistic Review* 13:357-382.
- NESPOR M. & I. VOGEL (1979), "Clash avoidance in Italian", *Linguistic Inquiry* 10:467-482.
- NESPOR M. & I. VOGEL (1986), *Prosodic phonology*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- NESPOR M. & I. VOGEL (1989), "On clashes and lapses", *Phonology* 6:117-148.
- OS E. DEN & R. KAGER (1986), "Extrametricity and stress in Spanish and Italian", *Lingua* 69:23-48.
- PEPERKAMP SH. (1993), *Italian compounds in Prosodic Lexical Phonology*, ms., University of Amsterdam / HIL.
- PEPERKAMP SH. (1995), "Prosodic constraints in the derivational morphology of Italian", in G. BOOIJ & J. VAN MARLE, eds., *Yearbook of morphology 1994*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers:207-244.
- PEPERKAMP SH. (to appear a), "The prosodic structure of compounds", in G. MATOS, ed., *Papers from the International Conference on Interfaces in Linguistics*.
- PEPERKAMP SH. (to appear b), *Prosodic Words*, doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam / HIL, The Hague, HAG.
- PRINCE A. (1983), "Relating to the grid", *Linguistic Inquiry* 14:19-100.
- PRINCE A. & P. SMOLENSKY (1993), *Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar*, ms., Rutgers University, New Brunswick, and University of Colorado, Boulder.
- ROCA I. (1986), "Secondary stress and metrical rhythm", *Phonology Yearbook* 3:341-370.
- SCALISE S. (1984), *Generative morphology*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- SELKIRK E. (1980), "The role of prosodic categories in English word stress", *Linguistic Inquiry* 11:563-605.
- SLUYTERS W. (1990), "Length revisited: a metrical account of diphthongization, vowel lengthening, consonant gemination and wordfinal vowel epenthesis in Modern Italian", *Probus* 2:65-102.
- SUNER M. (1975), "Spanish adverbs: support for the phonological cycle?", *Linguistic Inquiry* 6:602-605.
- VOGEL I. (1982), *La sillaba come unità fonologica*, Bologna, Zanichelli.
- VOGEL, I. & S. SCALISE (1982), "Secondary stress in Italian", *Lingua* 58:213-242.