

ALLOMORPHY OF THE DEFINITE DETERMINER IN NEAPOLITAN

Roberto Petrosino

University of Connecticut

INTRODUCTION This paper provides new data from Neapolitan, a southern Italian dialect; forms of the definite determiner (Ledgeway 2009) and definite prepositions will be analyzed within the framework of *Distributed Morphology* (Halle & Marantz 1994). To explain such forms, suppletion-based accounts list all of them as independent lexical entries. I argue against such a perspective, as it may lead to loss of crucial generalizations at the interface between morphology and phonology; rather, I propose a novel analysis, in which cyclic application of (morpho-)phonological operations brings about allomorphy; such operations include idiosyncratic positive instructions (*rules*), or *repairs* triggered in response to violations of active *filters* (Calabrese 2009).

	[-fem]		[+fem]	
	[-pl]	[+pl]	[-pl]	[+pl]
$_N/C$	o	e	a	e _N [CC
$_N/V$	l		l	əll

DATA The forms of the Neapolitan definite determiner are given in (1). A lateral shows up in front of vowel-initial nouns, whereas the vocalic suffix appears before consonant-initial nouns. Feminine consonant-initial plural nouns have their initial consonant geminated; in feminine vowel-

(2)	[-fem]				[+fem]			
	[-pl]	[+pl]	[-pl]	[+pl]	[-pl]	[+pl]	[-pl]	[+pl]
	C	V	C	V	C	V	C	V
	ro	el	re	el	ra	el	re	CC ell

initial plural nouns the lateral of the determiner gets geminated, and a prosthetic /ə/ is then inserted. Neapolitan prepositions undergo similar morpho-phonological changes when preceding the definite determiner; for example, the alveolar of *de* ‘of’ (2)

gets flapped when followed by a vowel, but deleted elsewhere.

ANALYSIS I assume that the definite determiner in Neapolitan has the same underlying representation as in most Italian varieties, i.e. */l-V_φ/, where V_φ is the vowel marking gender and number. The definite determiners, as lacking prosodic stability, first cliticize onto the following noun; then, it cyclically undergoes morpho-phonological changes. In front of vowel-initial nouns, the determiner violates the filter disallowing cross-boundary hiatus (3) this is repaired by the vowel elision rule in (4):

$$(3) \quad * \begin{matrix} X_1 \\ | \\ [-cons] \end{matrix} \oplus \begin{matrix} X_2 \\ | \\ [-cons] \end{matrix}$$

$$(4) \quad \begin{matrix} X_1 \\ | \\ [-cons] \end{matrix} \rightarrow \emptyset$$

On the other hand, the lateral of the determiner gets deleted in compliance with the coronal deletion rule in (3), when followed by a morphological boundary:

$$(5) \quad \begin{matrix} -son \\ [+anterior] \\ -cont \end{matrix} \rightarrow \emptyset / (_ \dots \oplus ($$

Such rule is also present in other Italian varieties – e.g. in Romanesco, [o:s'tadjo] ‘the stadium (m.sg.)’, but [l'ortsi] ‘the bear (m.sg.)’; [a:'mano] ‘the hand (f.sg.)’, but [l'oka] ‘the goose (f.sg.)’. Crucially, hiatus resolution (3-4) leads to bracket erasure, and thus bleeds application of (5).

In feminine plural nouns, a skeletal position is inserted and then filled by feature spreading from the neighboring consonant:

$$(6) \quad \emptyset \rightarrow X / (\dots \oplus _ \begin{matrix} X \\ | \\ [+cons] \end{matrix} \dots)_{\omega} \oplus [+fem, +pl]$$

$$(7) \quad (\dots \oplus X \begin{matrix} \swarrow \\ | \\ [+cons] \end{matrix} _ \begin{matrix} X \\ | \\ [+cons] \end{matrix} \dots)_{\omega}$$

Rule in (6) and (7) apply with vowel-initial nouns too; in such cases, an additional rule of vowel epenthesis (9) applies, in order to repair the filter in (8). Sample derivations follow.

	(8)	*X, if unsyllabified		
	(9)	$\emptyset \rightarrow /ə/ / (_$		
(10)		(l-o [⊕] (tavələ) _ω) _ω <i>'the table (m.sg.)'</i>	(le [⊕] (tavələ) _ω) _ω <i>'the boards (f.pl.)'</i>	(le [⊕] (oŋŋə) _ω) _ω <i>'the nails (f.pl.)'</i>
	(3) – (4)	-	-	(loŋŋə) _ω
	(5)	(o(tavələ) _ω) _ω	(e(tavələ) _ω) _ω	-
	(6) – (7)	-	(et(tavələ) _ω) _ω	(lloŋŋə) _ω
	(8) – (9)	-	-	(əlloŋŋə) _ω
	SR	/o.ta.və.lə/	/et.ta.və.lə/	/əl.loŋ.ŋə/

The rules stated above account for the forms of definite prepositions such as *de* ‘of’ (2) too. Additionally, the flapping rule in (11) applies post-cyclically.

$$(11) \text{ flapping: } \begin{bmatrix} +cons \\ +anterior \\ +voice \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow [+son] / \frac{X}{_}$$

Relevant derivations are reported below. Notice in (12) that bracket erasure may crucially occur at the end of each cycle and as result of hiatus resolution (3-4).

		(de [⊕] (lo [⊕] (tavələ) _ω) _ω) _ω <i>'of the table (m.sg.)'</i>	(de [⊕] (le [⊕] (tavələ) _ω) _ω) _ω <i>'of the tables (f.pl.)'</i>	(de [⊕] (lo [⊕] (ɔccjə) _ω) _ω) _ω <i>'of the eye (m.sg.)'</i>	(de [⊕] (le [⊕] (oŋŋə) _ω) _ω) _ω <i>'of the nails (f.pl.)'</i>
<i>1st cycle</i>	(3) – (4)	-	-	(de [⊕] (lɔccjə) _ω) _ω	(de [⊕] (loŋŋə) _ω) _ω
	(5)	(de [⊕] (o(tavələ) _ω) _ω) _ω	(de [⊕] (e(tavələ) _ω) _ω) _ω	-	-
	(6) – (7)	-	(de [⊕] (et(tavələ) _ω) _ω) _ω	-	(de [⊕] (lloŋŋə) _ω) _ω
<i>2nd cycle</i>	(3) – (4)	(dotavələ) _ω) _ω	(dettavələ) _ω) _ω	-	-
	(5)	-	-	(_e(lɔccjə) _ω) _ω	(_e(lloŋŋə) _ω) _ω
	(11)	(rotavələ) _ω) _ω	(rettavələ) _ω) _ω	-	-
	SR	/ro.ta.və.lə/	/ret.ta.və.lə/	/e.lɔc.cjə/	/el.loŋ.ŋə/

Interestingly, determiner-less PPs with proper nouns undergo (5) only, regardless of the phonological nature of the noun-initial segment: [es.te.fa.nə] ‘of Stephen’, [e.kar.me.lə] ‘of Carmela’, [e.an.nə] ‘of Anna’. This is arguably due to the fact that proper nouns generally preserve their morphological boundaries; in such cases, vowel elision cannot apply, and (5) applies instead. However, vowel elision (4) must apply when cross-boundary hiatus (3) involves two identical vowels; in such cases, (11) applies: [ren.ri.kə], not *[e.en.ri.kə] ‘of Henry’. Such asymmetries in rule interaction strongly support a derivational account over a suppletion-based analysis; indeed, if both the definite forms of the preposition *de* ‘of’ – i.e., [e] and [r] – were considered as suppletive, the three-way interaction between (3-4), (5) and (11) would be completely missed.

CONCLUSIONS. In this paper, I accounted for the allomorphy on the definite determiners and definite prepositions in Neapolitan, by arguing that all allomorphic variants derive from a single underlying representation undergoing the same set of (morpho-)phonologically-conditioned operations. On the contrary, analyses employing suppletion have to stipulate that all the surfacing forms are listed in the lexicon, and thus overlook generalizations regarding the interaction between the morphological and the phonological levels.

REFERENCES. Calabrese, A. (2009). Markedness Theory versus Phonological Idiosyncrasies in a Realistic Model of Language. In Raimy, E. & C. E. Cairns, *Contemporary Views on Architecture and Representations in Phonology*. • Halle, M. & A. Marantz (1994). Some key features of

Distributed Morphology. In Carnie, A. & H. Harley, *MITWPL 21*. • Ledgeway, A. (2009).
Grammatica diacronica del napoletano. Verlag.