



IN MEMORY OF
JOSEPH A. CREMONA (1922–2003)

Rethinking Languages in Contact

The Case of Italian



EDITED BY

ANNA LAURA LEPSCHY AND ARTURO TOSI



LEGENDA

Modern Humanities Research Association and Maney Publishing
Studies in Linguistics 2

- VMLR], and (ii) Anonimo Romano, *Cronica*, ed. by Giuseppe Porta (Milan: Adelphi, 1979), pp. 3–103 [AR]; (B) for the region of Abruzzo, the three 14th-century verse texts (i) Mahmoud Salem Elsheikh, 'Leggenda del Transito della Madonna', *Studi e problemi di critica testuale*, 51 (1995), 7–42 [LTM], (ii) Adolfo Mussafia (ed.), Buccio di Ranallo, 'Zur Katharinen-legende', *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 110 (1885), 355–421 [LSC], and (iii) a 100-page sample (pp. 3–103) of Buccio di Ranallo, *Cronaca aquilana rimata*, ed. by Vincenzo De Bartholomaeis (Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano, 1907), pp. 3–103 [CAR]; (C) for the modern region of Campania, a 100-page sample of the four 14th-/15th-century prose texts (i) *Libro de la destructione de Troia. Volgarizzamento napoletano trecentesco da Guido delle Colonne*, ed. by Nicola De Blasi (Rome: Bonacci, 1986), pp. 47–147 [LDT], (ii) Douglas McArthur (ed.), "Il Romanzo di Francia". Une version du "Libro di Fioravante", édité d'après le manuscrit unique conservé à la Bibliothèque nationale' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Paris, n.d.), pp. 2–102 [RDF], (iii) Loise De Rosa, *Ricordi*, ed. by Vittorio Formentin (Rome: Salerno Editore, 1998), pp. 513–613 [De Rosa], and (iv) Ferraiolo, *Cronaca* ed. by Roasario Coluccia (Florence: Accademia della Crusca, 1987), pp. 3–103 [Ferr.]; (D) for Sicily, a 100-page sample of the two 14th-century prose texts (i) *Libri de lu dialagu de sanctu Gregoriu*, ed. by Salvatore Santangelo (Palermo: Boccone del Povero, 1933), pp. 3–103 [LDSC], and (ii) *Sposizione del Vangelo della Passione secondo Matteo*, ed. by Pietro Palumbo (Palermo: Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, 1954–57), pp. 3–103 [SVPSM].
48. It should, however, be noted from the outset that, even when topicalized or focused, preverbal subjects, when immediately adjacent to the verb, do not generally offer any unambiguous structural clues as to their status. In light of such interpretative difficulties and for the sake of methodological consistency, all such subjects have been disregarded for the purposes of the results reported in Table 9.3. Other problematic cases concern scene-setting adverbs like *domani* 'tomorrow' and *allora* 'then', which cannot necessarily be interpreted as topicalized when they occur immediately to the left of the verb, in so far as such adverbs can equally occur in peripheral positions within the sentential nucleus (cf. Paola Benincà and Cecilia Poletto, 'Topic, Focus and V2: Defining the CP Sublayers' (MS, University of Padua, 1999), pp. 15–16; Guglielmo Cinque, *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 87; Paola Benincà, 'The Position of Topic and Focus in the Left Periphery', in *Current studies in Italian Syntax: Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, ed. by Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2001), pp. 39–64 (56)). Consequently, simple adverbs of this type have also been disregarded for the purposes of Table 9.3.
49. For an in-depth discussion of the left periphery in relation to a number of Italo-Romance varieties, see Benincà and Poletto, 'Topic, Focus and V2', and Benincà, 'The Position of Topic and Focus'.
50. A parallel situation is reported in Ledgeway, 'Il sistema complementivo', §4.3.1, for the 15th-century Salentino prose text *Il libro di Sidrac salentino* (ed. by Paola Sgrilli (Pisa: Pacini, 1984)), where, in the presence of a left-dislocated topic or focus, the indicative (*ca*) and subjunctive (*ai*) complementizers are both replaced by the undifferentiated complementizer *che*.
51. For a novel theoretical interpretation of the observed *ca* / *che* alternation, see Adam Ledgeway, 'Moving through the Left Periphery: The Dual Complementiser System in the Dialects of Southern Italy' (MS, University of Cambridge, 2004).
52. Alfred Ernout and François Thomas, *Syntaxe latine* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1953), §§304–05.
53. Rohlf, *Grammatica storica*, III: *Sintassi*, p. 189.
54. Ernout and Thomas, *Syntaxe latine*, §305.
55. Veikko Väänänen, *Introduzione al latino volgare* (Bologna: Patron, 1982), p. 273.

CHAPTER 10



Dialectology and History: The Problem of the Adriatic–Tyrrhenian Dialect Corridor

Rosanna Sornicola

1. Dialectology and History

The difficulties in the relationship between the disciplines of dialectology and history become clear in the pages that the French historian Lucien Febvre devoted to the subject. Febvre initially notes that 'Il était plus facile dans ces dernières années d'apprécier le vif intérêt que pourrait présenter, pour l'étude de certaines questions particulières, la collaboration de l'histoire et de la dialectologie — que de réaliser cette collaboration même.'¹ He discusses in some detail a few dialectological studies that are of interest to the historian, such as the one undertaken by Paul Passy on the valley of Ossau in the Pyrenees. In the Bearnais patois of south-west France, the article appears in two polymorphic variants, taking the form *lu*, *la* on the plains beneath the Pyrenees, and *et*, *era* in the mountain valleys. This is an entirely regular geographical distribution, based on the division between the plains and the mountains, except in the valley of Ossau. Here we find *lu*, *la* in place of *et*, *era*, apart from in three villages in the area that forms a border between the plains and the mountains. An explanation in terms of 'invasion of forms', according to which the forms found on the plains would have moved up along the valley, replacing the older mountain forms, poses two difficult questions: Why are these forms not found in the three villages nearest the plains? And why would they have moved up only along the valley of Ossau, which, compared to the other valleys, has no particular connection with the plains that might account for the spread of these forms in this area? In fact, there are numerous examples of proven contact between the villages of the plains and those of the mountains, yet in these cases there is no sign of article substitution. Is it possible, then, to explain this phenomenon in terms of 'invasion of population' rather than 'invasion of forms'? Febvre observes how Passy began his examination of the exclusively historical dimension of this problem by carefully studying and comparing linguistic parallels between those dialects that may be grouped together according to the two types of article form. This analysis allowed Passy to conclude that the dialects in the valley of Ossau with *lu*, *la* are related to the sub-Pyrenean group, while the dialects of the three villages that are the exception, having *et*, *era*, are related to the mountain group.

The French scholar underlines the contribution of linguistics in the following way:

Ainsi les recherches proprement linguistiques, qui ont permis de poser le problème, viennent en préciser les termes. Elles font plus encore: elles fournissent des éléments de solution. Car de l'étude des dialectes de la plaine, ne ressort pas seulement leur parenté générale avec ceux du val d'Ossau — mais la parenté particulière de quelques-uns d'entre eux, répartis géographiquement en deux groupes distincts, avec ceux des villages ossalois. (pp. 148–49)

And yet, according to Febvre, linguistics has only a 'preliminary' role in Passy's investigation:

Entre ces deux régions, peut-on choisir? Oui, mais non plus à l'aide de la dialectologie. D'elle est né le problème; avec elle, on a pu le 'poser correctement'; par elle enfin, on a entrevu d'abord, puis approché la solution; à l'histoire maintenant d'achever et de confirmer ce que l'étude des faits linguistiques a déjà commencé. (p. 149; my italics)

Of particular interest is the fact that Febvre maintains an element of scepticism about the reliability of the conclusions that Passy has drawn through the comparison of historical and linguistic data. To move from observing fairly limited similarities between dialects to looking for and (apparently) identifying some external historical motivation such as population movement for these similarities is perhaps too hasty; the conclusions that Passy reaches are ingenious but not entirely reliable.

The French historian had accurately identified the basic problem of the theory and methodology of contact linguistics based on history, that of the constant uncertainty of the results — an effect of combining the methods of the linguist and those of the historian, which has always been problematic: 'À des hypothèses linguistiques l'auteur ajoute des hypothèses historiques: d'une somme d'hypothèses ne saurait résulter une certitude' (pp. 149–50). A harsh judgement, but not inherently dissimilar to that which, expressed in purely linguistic terms, states that linguistic methods are not sufficient to prove the existence of a contact phenomenon, and that these methods are ambiguous when compared to the historical method.

2. The Adriatic–Tyrrhenian Dialect Corridor

The problem I address in this study — the 'justification' for the existence of a supposed Adriatic–Tyrrhenian corridor — poses difficulties similar to those mentioned above. It is an issue in Italian (and Romance) linguistics that is also of interest for theoretical and methodological reasons. Can we ever prove external contact through internal, purely linguistic means? And vice versa. Given the existence of structural differences between varieties, up to what point can we legitimately hypothesize external contact? And how can acknowledging the importance of external history be of use?

In an article of 1911 in the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, Carlo Salvioni observes:

Può parer strano, ma è fin qui sfuggita a tutti che hanno ragionato del vocalismo meridionale, una importante rivelazione che il D'Ovidio ha fatto da un pezzo circa il dialetto di Pozzuoli. Si legge essa in tutte le successive edizioni del *De vulgari eloquentia* [...] e suona nel senso che Pozzuoli conosca un dittongamento delle toniche che viene esemplificato colle parole *albiče* alici, *čaina* cena. Vedano

gli studiosi napoletani di dircene di più; ma intanto già la preziosa notizia del D'Ovidio ci permetterà di riconoscere che con quei tipi di dittonghi non fa che ripetersi sul versante mediterraneo un fatto fonetico ritenuto fin qui caratteristico di una larga sezione del versante adriatico.²

In addition to the information provided by D'Ovidio, Salvioni also notes that there is a further, previously unsuspected connection between the Tyrrhenian coast to the north of Naples (and especially on the islands of Ischia and Procida) and the Adriatic region, with regard to a significant phenomenon that has long been recognized in the latter area — the palatalization of tonic /a/.³ This term, in the tradition of Romance dialectology, denotes a variable degree of fronting and raising of the vowel. His observation of the occurrence of this phenomenon in the Sannio region (in Cerreto Sannita, in the province of Benevento) already hints at the existence of a 'corridor'⁴ between the Adriatic and the Tyrrhenian.

Even more interesting than the identification of corresponding features in a new area is a wider-reaching implication, rightly brought to light by Salvioni: the need to re-examine Ascoli's classification of Southern Italian dialects based on a clear geographical division formed by the Apennines. Putting into perspective the importance of this geographical distinction, Salvioni further rejects the validity of Adriatic–Puteolan diphthongization as a criterion for classification, as this is a relatively recent phenomenon, which is clear from the fact that it operates in contexts not affected by metaphony.

The whole discussion is centred on historical linguistic coordinates that may appear outdated today. But it remains interesting for two reasons: to show (a) that genetic classifications may be relative and provisional, and (b) that not all phenomena are given the same importance in determining classification. Concerning the latter, Salvioni adheres to an entirely traditional opinion in historical linguistics, according to which only older phenomena may permit genetic classification. Aside from the historical detail of this discussion, there still remain problematic aspects of the classification of Campanian dialects, such as the difficulty in identifying a dialect area with characteristics clearly different from those of other dialects of the Centre, towards the region of Lazio and towards the Adriatic coast, beyond the Apennines.⁵

As regards the situation outlined by Salvioni, the possibility today of integrating a number of new sources enables us to create a more detailed image of this apparent 'corridor' area. It seems, too, that the phenomena supporting a spatial characterization of this kind are now more numerous and varied, allowing us partly to overcome such difficulties as have been raised, though bringing to light new problems in the process. The very definition of a zone that stretches from the Adriatic to the Tyrrhenian is problematic, as not all the linguistic parallels between various phenomena follow the same geographical lines. If we take as a point of reference the area immediately north of Naples, where the features repeated on the opposite side of the peninsula are particularly in evidence, we see that, for some phenomena, parallels exist in the regions of Abruzzo and Molise, for others, they are found in the Apulia region, and for others still, they are common to each. In addition, there are cases in which these parallels are unique to the South, while in others they are shared by various southern regions (Calabria, Lucania, Sicily). No less problematic is the fact that the shape of the zone connecting the two areas varies from phenomenon to phenomenon.

What could be the 'explanation' for this corridor? Does it represent the continuation of an earlier linguistic situation or the emergence of a new one? In other words, is it a case of conservatism or of innovative convergence? Although Salvioni provided arguments to answer these questions, he did not directly address this issue, but restricted himself to a criticism of Ascoli's model based on ethnic substrates.⁶

The data presently available illustrate a very varied situation. Regarding the Tyrrhenian coast, if diphthongization is a relatively recent phenomenon (though how recent?), the palatalization of tonic /a/, which today is clearly defined in its essentially metaphonic nature, could be a relatively early conservative phenomenon, showing signs of erosion in some contexts. Furthermore, if it now seems problematic to create a classification based on polygenetic phenomena such as spontaneous diphthongization, we must ask ourselves if it is necessary for the latter to be explained by a series of independent developments in space and time. The consideration of metaphonic palatalization of tonic /a/ also leads to a not entirely different question. This phenomenon, according to some, is the final stage of the extension of an early morpho-phonological process that began with the mid-high vowels and spread to the low vowels through independent local developments.⁷

Spontaneous diphthongization and palatalization of tonic /a/ are, however, only some of the phenomena that are characteristic of the corridor. But it should be noted that today there exist other phenomena that could equally support the existence of such an area, or at least confirm the connection between the Tyrrhenian region to the north of Naples and the area around the Adriatic. In this paper I shall discuss only spontaneous diphthongization and the palatalization of tonic /a/ (an examination of other phenomena is presented in the fuller version of this study). Where possible, I shall take into account any available comparison with the interior Apennine region.⁸

3. The Phlegraean Area and Adriatic-Tyrrhenian Parallels

3.1 *Phlegraean diphthongization and Adriatic diphthongization*

The parallels with the Adriatic area are problematic. A few general features are shared by the Phlegraean area and the areas of Abruzzo, Molise and Apulia:

- (i) A general sensitivity in the vowel system to the open or closed nature of the syllable. This tendency, however, is also found in other areas of the Centre-South. Moreover, it affects the vowels that remain (more or less) stable, while the processes of diphthongization display different reactions to syllable structure (cf. the following paragraphs).
- (ii) The marked tendency to diphthongize tonic vowels.
- (iii) A notable instability (lability) in the types of diphthong that result from such a tendency, according to prosodic and syntactic factors.⁹

The crucial point, however, is that between the two areas significant structural differences also exist:

- (i) The Adriatic type of diphthongization occurs only in open syllables, while the Phlegraean type also occurs in closed syllables.

- (ii) The Adriatic type is sensitive to the stress pattern of the word, and is in fact blocked when the word is a proparoxytone (and sometimes when it is an oxytone),¹⁰ while this is not true of the Phlegraean area.
- (iii) The vowel alterations that make the Abruzzese and Apulian systems so dynamic occur more regularly and with a more far-reaching effect on the inventory:¹¹ they have the same effect on all vowels that are not affected by metaphony, including the low central vowel, through entirely phonetic processes, in contrast to what we find in the Phlegraean area, where in most places spontaneous modification of the vowels usually affects only the mid-vowels or at most the mid- and high vowels. In the Adriatic area, then, a wider range of vowels is affected, while in the Phlegraean area fewer vowels are affected but the phenomenon occurs in a wider range of contexts.

There are also some basic problems in the theory and methodology that make comparison difficult. The first and most obvious is that a comparison of the modern situations may be deceptive, disguising similarities (or differences) that may have existed in the past. For example, for the Abruzzo area Giammarco notes¹² that at the beginning of the twentieth century all the varieties in the area exhibited breaking (*frangimento*) of vowels, while today the phenomenon is found only in the areas of Ortona, Vasto and Agnone. The second problem relates to the lack of homogeneity in the representation of diphthongs by various scholars. The third problem is of a fully theoretical type.

As far as it is possible to judge from the present-day synchronic situation, Phlegraean diphthongs seem to have parallels in the areas of Abruzzo and Apulia (in the latter, particularly in the province of Bari). In order for them to be of real value, however, these parallels require a preliminary consideration of general questions of dynamic analysis of vowels and diphthongizing processes, something that is often entirely ignored in currently available studies. For example, the area variation of vocalic chromatism in diphthongs is often described with emphasis on one specific fixed result for every instance of diphthong movement in each location, although for some places two or more possible outcomes are attested.¹³ The same approach can be seen in the diachronic treatment of these structures, where one particular result of the diphthongization process is frequently assumed to be typical of a specific historical period, and the developments are often considered in a unilinear manner.¹⁴ Now this instability undoubtedly complicates to some extent the description of the internal dynamic, as well as the understanding of diachronic dynamics and the area comparison. Conversely, the trajectories of some diphthongs are characterized by falling movements in which the final phase is a high segment of short length, articulated weakly, with an inherent tendency to monophthongization (this phenomenon can be often observed in the Phlegraean area; for the Apulian region see Valente).¹⁵ This entirely natural process, affecting all vowels, including those that are (more) stable, could render the comparison only moderately significant for the study of contact.

Moreover, our point of reference can be limited to the use of the most frequently occurring variants, a procedure that is by no means tenuous, provided that its partial and provisional nature is taken into account and, most importantly, that the existence of a wide range of variants is borne in mind at all times.

The polymorphism of variants found in the Phlegraean area coincides significantly, if not entirely, with that attested in the Adriatic area. This is particularly evident in the behaviour of the mid-high vowels /e/ and /o/.¹⁶ The variants [ei], [eɪ], [ai], [a] from mid-high /e/ are characteristic of a number of locations on the Adriatic coast: [ei] in Palena (Abruzzo); [ei] in Lucera (Apulia); [ai] in Gessopalena, Opi, Pescasseroli (Abruzzo), in Alberobello, Canosa, Ruvo, Trani (Apulia) [a] (varieties found in Vasto and Teramo).¹⁷ The variants [ou], [au] from mid-high /o/ are equally well documented: [ou] in Barletta, Lucera, Martina Franca (Apulia) and also in Fara S Martino, Palmoli (Abruzzo); [au] in Alberobello, Andria, Ruvo (Apulia), Opi, Pescasseroli (Abruzzo). However, there also exist significant chromatic differences.

For the series of variants of the mid-high back vowel in the Phlegraean area, I have not managed to find forms of the type [oi], with backing and rounding of the main element of the diphthongs. Instead, I can document a range of diphthong trajectories that are found across the mid and mid-low front, central and back regions of the phonetic space,¹⁸ wider than that recorded for the Adriatic area. It is possible that more homogeneous methods of inquiry (a wider collection of material from spontaneous speech) and of phonetic representation would permit us to identify further corresponding variants. As far as it is possible to judge from the available material, the territories around Vasto and Teramo and that of the province of Bari seem to form an area in which corresponding variants are more limited in number.

A diphthong from /i/ with central quality in the holding phase can be found in Apulia in Trani, while the result [eu] from /u/ is attested in Apulia in Ruvo, Palmoli and Tocco, [ju] again in Ruvo and also in Bitonto and Castellana.¹⁹ For the last of these there is evidence that it is present also in the Abruzzo area, in Vasto, Agnone and Pescasseroli.²⁰ In comparison with the Adriatic zone, in the Phlegraean area the range of parallels in the diphthongization of /i/ and /u/ is more restricted, and is limited to a few areas. Such phenomena are especially characteristic of the fishermen of Pozzuoli and Forio,²¹ who have both variants of /u/ cited here for the Adriatic area, while for /i/ the predominant type of diphthong is [əi].²²

As far as diphthongs are concerned, then, the realizations [ɛi], [ʌⁱ], [ʌ] from /e/, found across the whole Phlegraean area suggest closer parallels with the Vasto/Teramo area, while for the diphthongization of /i/ and /u/ it seems that closer parallels exist between Forio and Pozzuoli and the Apulian area.

3.2 Metaphonic palatalization of tonic /a/

3.2.1 Double palatalization in the Phlegraean area

One characteristic of the Phlegraean area is that the process of metaphonic palatalization of /a/ is triggered by word-final -i (-i) and word-final -u (-u).²³ This process is today fossilized in some morphological paradigms, more numerous in some areas than in others. It is very well preserved on the island of Procida and in Monte di Procida²⁴ and, outside the Phlegraean area, in some parts of the area around Caserta, such as Casal di Principe. Morphologization affects fewer grammatical alternations in Ischia, and occurs irregularly and residually in some social groups in Pozzuoli (data from ADICA). In all these locations speakers are fully aware of the resulting morpho-

phonological structures, but the frequency of their occurrence in spontaneous speech varies considerably.²⁵

Within the Phlegraean area, on the island of Procida and in Monte di Procida, the phonological conditions of the process have proved to have extremely pervasive effects, as all possible morphological classes have been affected entirely and regularly.²⁶

Metaphony triggered by -u:

- all singular nouns and adjectives for which an underlying inflectional -u can be postulated (*kesə* 'cheese', *rettʃ* 'arm', *jeŋkə* 'white', but *kumbarə* 'godfather', *salə* 'salt', *panə* 'bread');
- masculine singular past participles (*ndzuretə* 'married', *kandzetə* 'changed');
- adverbial forms (*tennə* (= *tannə*) 'then', *kwenənə* (= *kwannə*) 'when').

Metaphony triggered by -i:

- all plural nouns and adjectives for which an underlying inflectional -i can be postulated;
- masculine plural past participles;
- all verbal forms of the 2nd person singular in the present indicative (*kentə* 'you sing', *sepə* 'you know').

In these two localities²⁷ morphologization brings about entirely regular alternations between nominal and adjectival roots in the masculine and feminine singular (*kainetə* 'brother-in-law' vs. *kainata* 'sister-in-law'; *jeŋkə* 'white' (masc.) vs. *jaŋkə* 'white' (fem.)) and plural (*i kainetə* 'brothers-in-law' vs. *rə kkainatə* 'sisters-in-law'; *jeŋkə* 'white' (masc. pl.) vs. *jaŋkə* 'white' (fem. pl.)), as well as alternations in the forms of the present indicative (*jé kantə* 'I sing', *tu kentə* 'you sing', *issə kantə* 'he sings' etc., *jé sottʃə* 'I know', *tu sepə* 'you know', *issə sapə* 'he knows'). The names of the days of the week are also affected by this process: *sepətə* 'Saturday' e *mertə* 'Tuesday' (AIS 2, 334 and 2, 330). On the island of Ischia we detect a similar situation to that found on Procida and in Monte di Procida, but the range of nouns affected is more restricted (cf. the forms collected in Buonopane (Ischia) e *mustattʃə* 'moustaches', *sankə* 'side', where Procida has *i mustettʃə* and *senkə*, respectively [from ALI I, 27 and I, 62]), while verbal alternations are well preserved.²⁸

Analysis of the grammatical categories involved seems to offer an insight into the duration and complexity of the historical process, where activating factors from different periods may operate simultaneously. Regarding (pan-Romance) metaphony by word-final -i, on the whole better retained in various locations in the Phlegraean area, this has been triggered both by contexts where an original verbal inflection -is can be postulated and by plural nominal inflections in -i. For metaphony by word-final -u, it seems obvious that nouns that belonged to the 2nd and 4th declensions in Latin provided an early basis from which the process could have been set in motion.²⁹ Whether the phenomenon was already present in Latin or whether it began in Romance is a controversial question with no easy solution, a problem that is connected with the fate of Latin inflectional endings and, in particular, with the modifications of the stem-final vowel that preceded the desinence. The feature [+high] of back unstressed segments in word-final position, which are the inflectional endings of the masculine singular, can still be clearly observed today across many southern

areas. In the territories under examination (as well as in Naples and most places of Campania), word-final elements have been reduced to [ə], making the structural contexts which originally provided the conditions for metaphony somewhat opaque, but it is highly probable that a high vowel must have been present in the original context. The tendency for unstressed vowels in any position to be raised can still be observed in many of the varieties spoken on the islands.³⁰ Moreover, the forms of the masculine definite article — singular *u*, plural *i* — that are characteristic of the varieties of Procida and Monte di Procida, testify to rooting and the persistence of high vowels in unstressed position in these dialects. Although it may be plausible to hypothesize that this situation originated at an early stage in the history of these varieties, it must be admitted that this may not be a unilinear process, whereby the height of the Latin word-final vowel is preserved, but a series of more complex diachronic developments.³¹

The fact that this phenomenon is triggered by more than one context is demonstrated by the co-existence of metaphonized lexemes whose morphological conditions are from different periods. The strength of the Latin conditions may be seen in the regular occurrence of metaphony in forms that have undergone morphological restructuring, such as *manu* 'hand' and *eca* 'needle'. These derive from Latin feminine lexemes of the 4th declension (then merged with nouns of the 2nd), whose continuators in Romance with the ending in *-u* (cf. *la manu*, *la acu*) were remodelled and assigned the feminine desinence *-a*. This is even more evident in another presumably metaphonic lexical type, characteristic of Procida, *a kepa* 'the head'.³² Its original etymon, the 3rd-declension neuter noun *CAPUT*, could have been remodelled as a noun of the 2nd or 4th declension,³³ or more simply, as happened with the majority of neuter nouns, it could have developed in many Romance varieties via the syncretic nominative/accusative form *CAPU(T)* (with loss of the final dental consonant; cf. It. *il capo* and dialect forms *u capu* [cf. AIS I, 93]). Furthermore, in a large part of the South this form occurs, with a metaplasm of gender, in the feminine (*a capu*), often also with formal adaptation of the desinence (*a capa*). The phenomenon has been explained in various ways, by the influence of the Greek term κεφαλή (DEI I, 737a) or by the formation of a feminine Latin type **CAPU*.³⁴ Whatever the explanation, this phenomenon must constitute an early development, given the extent of the area in which it is attested. It follows, then, that at least for some words the metaphonic process must have occurred at a rather early point. The type *fretə* 'brother' (which does not produce stem allomorphy in the plural *i fretə*) must be examined under similar chronological considerations. This form can be explained on the basis of a form *fratru*, which has a corresponding form in *soru* 'sister', or on the basis of a singular form *fratri*. In fact forms of this lexeme with word-final *-i* or *-u* are widespread across the South, which again leads to the possible conclusion that the activating factors may be somewhat older. Moreover, a consideration of metaphony triggered by word-final *-i* for the forms of masculine plural nouns leads to similar conclusions: as is well known, in the Italo-Romance area at an early stage the plural in *-i* formed the prototype to which nominal forms that had different inflections in Classical Latin were assigned.³⁵ Furthermore the role played by the Romance or proto-Romance phases in the raising of vocalic elements in word-final position

clearly appears when one considers the metaphonic forms of the gerund (also found around Caserta and Benevento: data from ADICA)³⁶ and the adverbial forms *tennə* 'then' and *kwennə* 'when', found on the island of Procida (data from ADICA).

It should also be noted that traces of spontaneous palatalization of non-metaphonic origin have been attested across the whole Phlegraean area, in different lexical categories (nouns, verbs, adjectives). Consider, for example, a form such as *petə* 'padre', which Parascandola³⁷ claims are early (occurring in *locutions figées*). Forms such as *eria* (Procida) and *jeria* (Panza) 'air' show, on the other hand, the effect of non-metaphonic palatalization in the presence of a trill consonant (of an *rj* cluster), a phonetic conditioning factor that can be found in other Romance-speaking areas, and constitutes an earlier tendency also found in the Latin of various times.³⁸ Also due to non-metaphonic conditioning factors, presumably, are the lexemes *jennəla*, (Ischia) and *jendrə* (Procida), 'gland', which Rohlf's³⁹ considers, along with Ischian *pemmənə* 'vine-leaf', to be a result of the metaphonizing effect of the high vowel of the syllable adjacent to that displaying palatalization. To account for these forms we can look to the instability of vowels preceded by *j-*, as in the Late Latin *JENUARIUS* for *JANUARIUS*, widespread across Romania.⁴⁰ In these cases it could be that *j-*, derived from *g(L)-*, caused palatalization. Also of interest is the purely phonetic spontaneous tendency towards palatalization of */a/* in some dialect speakers whom I interviewed in Procida.⁴¹ Finally, toponomastics offers some relevant data with forms in which the palatalization of */a/* is clearly not metaphonic but due to a phonetic process: compare the form *Serrera*, which, according to the older inhabitants of Ischia, is an earlier form than *Serrara*.⁴²

3.2.2 Implications of the palatalization of */a/* for the Adriatic-Tyrrhenian corridor

The fact that metaphony of */a/* is triggered by both *-i* and *-u* may be significant for the categorization of the Phlegraean area as well as for our understanding of the Adriatic-Tyrrhenian corridor. While metaphony of */a/* brought about by word-final *-i* is a fairly widespread phenomenon across Italy and the Romance-speaking area, metaphony of */a/* brought about by word-final *-u* is today restricted specifically to the Phlegraean area and to the area north of Naples (Giugliano, Casal di Principe). Sporadic relics of this phenomenon have been attested in Castro dei Volsci in toponymy (such as *Puzzu ə Santə Tumesə*).⁴³ No less interesting is the fact that, on a scale of implication, the Phlegraean area and the area north of Naples can be placed on a higher level in terms of structural diffusion of metaphonic processes.⁴⁴ These considerations raise some problems: How shall we account for the unique features that we find in the Phlegraean area today?

The evidence offered by the toponomastic relics of Castro dei Volsci could provide some basis for the hypothesis that the Phlegraean area, together with the area around Naples and Caserta, including Giugliano and Casal di Principe, was once part of a wider territory with double metaphony of */a/* triggered by *-i* and *-u*. On the other hand, it is all too obvious that this characteristic does not today constitute (or perhaps never has constituted) a distinctive feature of the Adriatic-Tyrrhenian corridor, although Salvioni cited examples of metaphonic palatalization in the Neapolitan

area as part of his observations. The palatalization of /a/ through metaphony by -i in verb forms is a phenomenon characteristic of Abruzzo,⁴⁵ but not of Apulia.⁴⁶ The whole Adriatic area, however, exhibits palatalization as an entirely phonetic process, limited to open syllables, sometimes affected by stress patterns (strong oxytonic stress), prosodic factors (a strong dynamic accent), or simply the influence of near segments (an adjacent nasal, either preceding or following /a/, produces palatalization in Molfetta).⁴⁷

There are also no consistent traces of this phenomenon of double metaphony towards the west of Campania, in the direction of the Apennines. On the whole, Sannio shows palatalization of stressed /a/ in the following environments: gerundial forms, 1st sing., 1st and 3rd plur. forms of past perfect of 1st conjugation verbs (cf. *truvennà* 'trovando', *truvej* 'trovai', *spusemmà* 'sposammo', *spareṛonà* 'spararono'), as well as in a few forms of 'be' and 'have'.⁴⁸ These are presumably non-metaphonic morphophonological processes, with parallels not only in the Phlegraean area⁴⁹ but also in a broader territory in Central Italy.⁵⁰ Interestingly, however, evidence of a palatalization with a hybrid shape has been gathered in Cerreto Sannita. Here the process appears in potentially metaphonic contexts, both of the -i and the -u type (like the masc. sing. past participles, the fem. plur. noun *mānà* 'hands', the adverbs *kjānà* 'slowly', *assajō* 'very', *maj* 'never'), or in non-metaphonic contexts (like *kāsà* 'casa' and *pānà* 'pane').⁵¹

Although this evidence could further support the hypothesis that at some stages in the past the double metaphony from -i and -u had a broader geographical distribution, in itself it does not solve the questions about the origin of metaphonetic processes in the Phlegraean area. The high level of systemic regularity of the double metaphony in Procida and Monte di Procida could obviously be explained by local analogical developments, perhaps favoured and preserved by sociolinguistic factors like the strong cultural identity of the community and its inward-looking character (notwithstanding the traditional maritime economy). This hypothesis could also justify the difference with the island of Ischia, where the situation is more irregular and hybrid (in some respects it resembles that of Cerreto Sannita). Yet the picture presented so far does not ultimately account for how and why the double metaphony of /a/ took root in the Phlegraean area, or in particular for its indigenous or external causation.

4. Historical Data

Historical sources provide some interesting data that could contribute to our understanding of the linguistic situation outlined above. One must distinguish, at least partially, between the fortunes of the islands of Procida and Ischia and those of the mainland locations, such as Pozzuoli, Baia and Bacoli.

With regard to the islands, whatever may have been the social and demographic conditions of late antiquity and the Middle Ages, perhaps characterized by depopulation, which must periodically have affected a number of locations on the Tyrrhenian coast owing to Muslim invasions, famine, plague and volcanic eruptions, the situation at the beginning of the sixteenth century is of maximum interest to the linguist. For the year 1511, 783 households (*fuochi*) are recorded for Ischia, Procida

and Capri; the islands were thus declared *steriles* and were exempt from normal taxation.⁵² Particularly interesting are the fortunes of Procida in the years that followed. For most of the sixteenth century, plagues and Saracen raids caused the economy to remain predominantly within a modest agricultural horizon with few opportunities. Agriculture had for centuries been one of the principal activities of the island, as is demonstrated by the oldest inhabited settlements situated behind the Abbey of S Michele, the Benedictine monastery that owned the lands cultivated by peasant families who had taken to the highest points of the land to protect themselves from the numerous external dangers, as was the case in many urban settlements in Southern Italy during the Middle Ages. The unfavourable economic conditions kept the population stable for the whole century. In 1561, 460 households are recorded on the island, which has led the historian Di Taranto to hypothesize that the number of inhabitants fluctuated between 1700 and 2000; on the basis of the number of households documented for 1596, he estimates a total population of about 2300.⁵³

These estimates correlate closely with the figure of 1500 people indicated by some sources for the mid-sixteenth century. At the start of the following century a trend of demographic growth begins to emerge, alongside a revival of traditional local activities such as fishing and maritime activity, part of a changed socio-economic and political situation in the Mediterranean. There is proof of the traditional character of these activities in historical sources, which indicate that in the fifteenth century crews from Procida (and other places on the Campanian coast) were aboard ships from Genoa and Amalfi.⁵⁴ The demographic growth and economic prosperity of the island, where, between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, considerable naval bases were developed (second in the Kingdom of Naples only to Messina), would continue to increase, notwithstanding a few fluctuations until well into the eighteenth century. At the end of the seventeenth century the island is described in V. M. Coronelli's *Isolario* as 'one of the richest in the Mediterranean',⁵⁵ and a population of about 6000 inhabitants is indicated, a figure close to that attested in 1702, when the first available census of the parish counted 6786 inhabitants. Successive parish censuses show a constant growth in population until 1785, with a peak of more than 14,000 between 1785 and 1791, and between 10,000 and 11,000 until the mid-nineteenth century. The demographic growth that was presumably already in evidence at the halfway point of the seventeenth century⁵⁶ could have been an internal phenomenon, related to the improved and prosperous economic conditions. However, there is direct evidence of the fact that the island was the destination of 'numerous foreigners'. A 1664 document quoted by Di Taranto⁵⁷ attests the continual need for priests on the island, on which was situated a large number of churches: 'per causa della moltitudine di gente, della quale si è piena detta isola et anco per li forestieri, che di continuo capitano in detta isola di festa e di giorno di lavoro in ogni hora'.

But how can this evidence be interpreted, and what value does it have for the linguist? Migratory influxes from the islands (or from the nearby mainland) towards Naples or other ports on the Tyrrhenian or Adriatic coast are already documented in the sixteenth century.⁵⁸ It was not only the periodic devastation so characteristic of the Phlegraean area (such as the terrible eruptions of Monte Epomeo, and the emergence overnight of Monte Nuovo) that determined these migrations, but also

the search for seas richer in fish (substantial colonies from Procida and Ischia were spread out across the Mediterranean on the North African and French coasts, and even in North America) or for better economic conditions. The crucial point, of course, is the influx of foreigners to the islands or the Phlegraean coast.

For Procida we again have recorded data of some interest, as Di Taranto notes:

Procida, isola geografica, non è isola demografica. La mole dei traffici commerciali cui essa era interessata, infatti, comportava una elevata mobilità della sua popolazione. I forestieri che vi permanevano e ancor più i procidani attratti dai luoghi di approdo delle loro imbarcazioni non erano eccezioni. Né infrequenti erano i matrimoni in cui uno soltanto dei coniugi era originario dell'isola. A ciò va aggiunta la vicinanza di Napoli, che agiva da attrazione. (p. 164)

Some analyses of the *Libro dei Matrimoni*, which can be found at the Abbey of S. Michele, at intervals during the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as well as in the early part of the twentieth, confirm a percentage of constant exogamy peaking in certain periods. Also registered at times are a number of marriages in which neither party is from the island. For the period 1642–60, out of 226 marriages, 32 involved men from the following locations: Naples and outlying hamlets (*casali*) 15; Ischia 3; Baia 3; Gaeta 3; Messina 2; Genoa 3; Calabria 2; Salerno 1.⁵⁹

The brides who were not native to the island came from Ischia and Naples. In this period exogamy must already have been a significant phenomenon: for the years 1653–69, out of 100 marriages, 22 Neapolitan spouses are recorded, plus 11 from Ischia, 2 Sicilian, 2 from Gaeta, 2 from Baia, 1 from Pozzuoli, 1 Sardinian and 1 from Lazio.⁶⁰ In the first part of the eighteenth century the most common origin of one of the spouses was still Naples and its hamlets, or Ischia. But spouses from Calabria, Cilento, the Ligurian riviera, the Adriatic coast in Apulia and Abruzzo, the coast of northern Campania and Lazio, Sicily, and, in some cases, inland regions of Campania are still recorded. In the second half of the eighteenth century, we begin to see records of spouses from Malta and Pantelleria, and the number of spouses originating from the coast of Apulia rises.⁶¹ The tendency to marry someone who was not from Procida increases between 1800 and 1859, a period in which a significant number of marriages with people from Palermo is registered.⁶² Whether these people are Sicilians, or originally from Procida, or perhaps descendants of those who fled from Procida to Sicily following the events of the Neapolitan revolution in 1799, is difficult to say. It is interesting, nonetheless, that already in the second half of the eighteenth century, and to an even greater extent in the first half of the nineteenth, the number of those originating from the Adriatic coast or inland regions of Campania increases:

1750–99: 34 individuals in total, of which 20 are from the Adriatic coast;

1800–59: 65 individuals in total, of which 29 are from the Adriatic coast and the rest are from inland regions of Campania.

These figures must of course be handled with caution. As Di Taranto observes:

I non procidani potrebbero essere immigrati temporaneamente sull'isola, magari soltanto in occasione delle nozze e, perciò, contribuire, in seguito, al saldo migratorio negativo conducendo seco l'altro coniuge; oppure potrebbero essere immigrati da lunga data — o battezzati in altre parrocchie con genitori procidani

momentaneamente assenti dalla loro residenza — che rientrano, quindi, nelle quote di immigrazione, al pari di coloro che giunti nell'isola vi si stabiliscono definitivamente. (p. 167)

Di Taranto, therefore, maintains that 'più che tornare utile per l'analisi della mobilità [...] [la frequenza dei matrimoni con forestieri] può essere collegata alle notizie in nostro possesso circa la estensione ed il tipo di rapporti commerciali intercorrenti tra Procida ed altre località' (p. 167).

On the other hand, significant Apulian immigration is registered in the *Libro dei Matrimoni* for the period 1873–1908: out of approximately 490 marriages, 85 are registered in which at least one of the spouses (and in some cases both) is of Apulian origin (compared with 50 from Gaeta and 27 Sicilians). Trani, Alberobello, Andria, Monopoli and especially Molfetta are the cities of origin most frequently recorded. The Apulian immigration of the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth is within living memory on Procida. I have personally interviewed some descendants of Apulian families, who told me about the origins of their grandparents and great-grandparents, about their trades and way of life, about their acceptance into the society of the island. They were almost all manual workers who came to work as labourers on the fishing boats of Procida, coming initially on a seasonal basis and then eventually establishing themselves on the island. It was the men in particular who emigrated, but in many cases the entire family moved with them, or they came with their fiancées and married on the island, setting up a family there. The volume of commercial traffic must have been significant,⁶³ certainly higher than the usual levels, as one may deduce from the survey of marine life and fishing activity in the Tyrrhenian and the Adriatic, carried out for the Ministry in 1876 by Targioni Tozzetti, director of the Royal Zoological Museum in Florence. Furthermore, the fact that in some cases small ship owners also moved, with their fishing boats, seems to confirm that the island must have offered more promising economic opportunities than the ports of Apulia.

It is difficult to believe that this admittedly not irrelevant migratory influx⁶⁴ at the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth could have constituted a situation of dialect contact responsible for some tangible linguistic effect on the island. The use of a lexeme such as *guagnone* 'boy' is recognized by many on Procida as typical of the speech of the grandchildren or great-grandchildren of the Apulian fishermen, but the community's knowledge of phenomena of this type is extremely limited.⁶⁵ The descendants of the Apulian families whom I interviewed remember only a few different lexemes used by their grandparents; one particularly linguistically capable informant provided examples of pronouns such as *mai* 'me', *tai* 'you', used by his grandfather from Molfetta. In all these cases the person speaking demonstrated awareness of the differences between dialects, sometimes providing indirect evidence of the lack of linguistic integration of their relatives, even in the family. Even more interesting is the fact that these informants have shown through their own speech that no trace of hybridization has been preserved: their speech does not differ significantly from that of other individuals interviewed. If the phenomena with parallels on the Adriatic coast were to be attributed to linguistic contact (demographic movement), they would have to be from an earlier period. The phenomena of spontaneous diphthongization found among the fishermen of Pozzuoli and Forio d'Ischia,

structurally similar to those of the Apulian type, could instead lend plausibility to the hypothesis that the diaspora of Apulian fishermen towards the Gulf of Pozzuoli and towards Ischia left more noticeable traces there than on Procida.

In fact, historical sources exist that prove that contact between the area of the Phlegraean fields and Apulia dated back to ancient times and was still active in the mid-eighteenth century, because of other traditional fishing activities in the area, such as the cultivation of oysters and mussels.⁶⁶ Even more interesting with respect to the linguistic situation outlined above is that other sources attest demographic movements of unknown extent already at the beginning of the fourteenth century and again in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, towards the Phlegraean islands from the inland regions of Campania (La Terra di Lavoro) and the coast of Abruzzo and Le Marche (Ascoli and even Romagna).⁶⁷ In this case, the movement is of a peasant population called back to cultivate the depopulated land by the D'Avalos family, to whom the two islands had been conceded by Ferrante II of Aragon. This family were also Marquesses of Vasto and Pescara, and it is entirely possible, according to a common practice dating from medieval times, that there may have been movements of the peasant population between the feuds of noble families. It is not clear if and how this immigration has any connection with the demographic growth found in some areas (see above for discussion of that on Procida) right at the end of the sixteenth century, or if it should instead already be considered in connection with the scarce population documented on the islands at the start of that century. Such information is not readily accessible, and though it is not without interest, it can offer the linguist only indirect clues. The evidence related to the movement of the peasant population favoured by the D'Avalos family, and in particular the chronology and the area information contained within that evidence, corresponds surprisingly well with some of the results of the analysis that has been conducted. But it also acts as the starting point for further consideration, since the correspondence between linguistic characteristics and historical information is, for a variety of reasons, problematic.

5. Conclusions

Historical information can help assign greater plausibility to one of the scenarios that may be outlined purely on the basis of the examination of linguistic structures and processes: that of successive population movements from different locations, which, starting particularly in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and continuing in a fairly steady stream, came to add to a presumably pre-existing population. The areas of origin of the migratory movements confirm the relationship identified by linguistic means between the inland regions of Campania (in particular La Terra di Lavoro), the coastal areas of Abruzzo (and further north around Ancona and Romagna) and South-Central Apulia. On the other hand, the continuous migration between Naples and the Phlegraean area and the internal migrations within the Phlegraean area itself must also be taken into account.

Historical information, however, does not help in providing explanations for some of the problems that emerge from linguistic analysis: for example, that of the more subtle structural differences that are often disguised by the apparent resemblance of

the phenomena in the two areas, and that of the parallels and differences between the Phlegraean and Adriatic areas and the area of Naples.⁶⁸ In other words, such information cannot entirely lift the cloud that often obscures the reasons behind the differences or similarities between linguistic areas. Linguistic phenomena have their own complexity and independence from the admittedly important external factors, which means that even when one succeeds in demonstrating that contact is a historical reality, this cannot on its own constitute an explanation of the existence of a specific linguistic structure. In this case, too, there is still work to be done to interpret the (synchronic and diachronic) dynamic that characterizes it. One element or linguistic structure of variety A may enter into variety B, undergoing a series of changes that sometimes even render it unrecognizable; it may be restructured according to more or less marked principles, and so on. However, this does not, in my opinion, mean that the reasons for the origins and/or for the spread of a structure in an area are immediately or unilaterally to be identified as internal factors, relative to inherent properties of linguistic phenomena, or as general principles.

Lucien Febvre's proud claim — that history alone holds the key to the solutions glimpsed by the linguist, that it alone can confirm or reject the hypothesis of the latter — presupposes a factual conception of linguistics as much as of history. In this, the French scholar may have been supported by a viewpoint that has characterized linguistics for some time and that appears in the model of linguistic borrowing as a more or less mechanical introduction of lexemes or structures into a system B with a system A as its starting point. Each of these elements can be traced back directly to an agent outside the system, which is its carrier. This viewpoint has already faced difficulties when compared with the most sophisticated structural models: think of the classical work of Uriel Weinreich,⁶⁹ who, taking as his starting point an individual bilingual speaker intended as the locus of contact, demonstrated the complexity of internal features of linguistic structure that could result from it. But it is more open to criticism today, because of greater knowledge on the part of the linguist of the articulated dynamic of linguistic processes. Forms that are similar on the surface can be the result of different dynamics. Salvioni might perhaps have found parallels between the phenomena of the Adriatic area and those of the Tyrrhenian area to the north of Naples, but, when carefully observed, these may in the end melt away. The approach to linguistic areas in terms of processes makes linguistic parallels and direct explanations in historical terms highly problematic. And, of course, the basic problematic nature of the relationship between linguistic and historical data is heightened by a situation, like that of the Italian Centre-South presented here, in which population contact and contact between linguistic varieties has occurred several times and at various points over a long period. On the other hand, this approach in terms of process also shows how difficult the recourse to general principles may be.

Highlighting this problem should not lead us to conclude that the linguist should not look to historical sources or that the historian has nothing to learn from linguistic analysis. The tasks are different, but they can usefully overlap in order to facilitate independent verifications that allow scholars of both disciplines to return to their respective methodologies with a more multi-faceted approach. In this sense the scepticism expressed by Febvre, with the observation that on the basis of the

sum of two series of different hypotheses one cannot draw any certain conclusions, itself betrays an essentially positivistic idea of historical and linguistic research. If our final aim is not absolute certainty, but the coherence of a scenario that helps us to understand better the complexity of historical situations (and I include within that linguistic situations), we should be satisfied.

Notes to Chapter 10

A more comprehensive version of this study will appear in the *Rivista italiana di dialettologia*.

Abbreviations

- ADICA Archivio dei dialetti campani [*A corpus of spoken texts of the dialects of Campania*], at the Department of Modern Philology, University of Naples Federico II
- AISK Karl Jaberg and Jakob Jud, *Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz* (Zofingen: Ringier, 1928–40)
- ALI *Atlante Linguistico Italiano*, directed by Lorenzo Massobrio (Turin: Istituto dell'Atlante Linguistico, 1995–)
- LEI *Lessico Etimologico Italiano*, directed by Max Pfister (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1979–)

- Lucien Febvre, 'Histoire et dialectologie. Au temps où naissait la géographie linguistique', *Revue de synthèse historique*, 12 (1906); quoted from the repr. version in Lucien Febvre, *Combats pour l'histoire* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1992), pp. 147–57 (147).
- Salvioni, Carlo, 'Zur Lautgeschichte. Appunti per la storia del vocalismo tonico italiano', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 35 (1911), 486–88 (p. 487).
- Salvioni adds: 'Dei testi di Serrara d'Ischia stampati nel *Giambattista Basile* mi danno *manete*, *marete*, *manneto* (e *tenno* 'tando', allato a *quanno*); e altri esempi sono forniti da Giugliano di Campania (*seem* sano, *caudem* = -am caldaja, *chesu* cacio; oltre a *neus* avanti, *chelli* calli, *senti* santi). Per Pomigliano (Napoli) l'Imbriani afferma che l'a accentata si cambi spesso e volentieri in e larga. Ma l'esempio *lavenne* lavando, prova veramente poco (cfr. anche *juchenne* giocando), e non è assolutamente probante nemmeno *sarrè* = sarà. Ma più notevole parrà che il Vottiero ponga in bocca *eseno* asino, e *dievolo* diavolo, a degli abitanti di Procida.' These examples evidently demonstrate clear differences in their phonological and morpho-phonological properties, a matter I return to in paragraphs 3.1. and 3.2.
- For the use of this term see Edgar Radtke, 'Areallinguistik IX. Kampanien', in *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik*, IV: *Italienisch, Korsisch, Sardisch/Italiano, corso, sardo*, ed. by Günter Holtus, Michael Metzeltin and Christian Schmitt (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1988), pp. 652–61; see also Paola Como, *Monte di Procida. Uno studio sulla variabilità del dialetto* (Naples: Liguori, 2002).
- See Radtke, 'Areallinguistik IX. Kampanien'.
- Salvioni in fact added: 'La loro presenza anche all'infuori della sezione adriatica mostra poi, che se anche reggesse per questo lato quell'edificio, le conclusioni andrebbero estese alla regione meridionale intera; e taglierebbe le gambe in ogni modo a certe induzioni di carattere etnologico' (pp. 487–88).
- See Martin Maiden, *Interactive Morphology: Metaphony in Italy* (London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 111–34.
- In the Phlegraean area, the locations under consideration are Bacoli, Pozzuoli, Monte di Procida, Procida and also Barano, Serrara Fontana, Forio and Panza on the island of Ischia.
- See Gerhard Rohlfs, *Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten* (Berne: Francke, 1949–54), §12.
- See Rohlfs, §31.
- For Abruzzi, see Ernesto Giammarco, *Profilo dei dialetti italiani*, 13: *Abruzzo* (Pisa: Pacini, 1979), pp. 21–27; and, for Puglia, Clemente Merlo, 'Il vocalismo tonico del dialetto di Carbonara di Bari', *Italia dialettale*, 2 (1926), 85–99 (p. 87), and Vincenzo Valente, *Profilo dei dialetti italiani*, 15: *Puglia* (Pisa: Pacini, 1975), p. 41 n. 19.
- Giammarco, p. 116.

- This variability has been reported by V. Valente, p. 41.
- For a criticism, see Rosanna Sornicola, 'Alcune recenti ricerche sul parlato. Le dinamiche vocaliche di (e) nell'area flegrea e le loro implicazioni per una teoria della variazione', in *Scritto e parlato. Metodi, testi e contesti. Atti del Colloquio internazionale di studi, Roma, 5–6 febbraio 1999*, ed. by Maurizio Dardano, Adriana Pelo and Antonella Stefinlongo (Rome: Aracne, 2002), pp. 239–64; and 'Polimorfismo e instabilità strutturale. Un esame della dittongazione spontanea dell'area flegrea in una prospettiva romanza', in *Atas del XXIII Congreso internacional de lingüística y filología románica, Salamanca, 24–30 septiembre 2001*, ed. by Francisco Sanchez Miret (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2003), IV, 267–76.
- V. Valente, p. 40.
- Parallels also exist for the dynamic of the low-mid front vowel, although these offer us fewer insights. Owing to syllabic differentiation, it is predominantly found in closed syllables. The tendency for lowering and diphthongization, with a chromatism that in part follows the trajectories of the mid-high vowel, is also found in the Adriatic area (see Rohlfs, §103; Giammarco, pp. 21–22; V. Valente, p. 41).
- See Rohlfs, §62; Giammarco, pp. 21–22; V. Valente, p. 41.
- The main types of these trajectories can be represented as $\epsilon\alpha$, ϵ^{\wedge} .
- And see V. Valente, p. 41. Furthermore, /i/ diphthongizes to [ei] in Vasto, Palena, Ruvo, Alberobello, Castellana, [ai] in Gessopalena, Molfetta, [oi] in Popoli, Andria, Bitonto, [ui] in Tocco (Rohlfs, §31; V. Valente, p. 41). The vowel /u/ diphthongizes to [ou] in Barletta, to [au] in Martina Franca and Vico Garganico, to [öu] in Trani and Canosa (Rohlfs, §39).
- Rohlfs, §39.
- According to Rohlfs, in Pozzuoli this diphthongization occurs only in open syllables, but the data from ADICA display the opposite phenomenon, which emerges in the spectroacoustic analysis conducted by one of my students in Naples, Giovanni Abete, for his thesis on Puteolan diphthongs.
- Rohlfs, §39, recorded for Pozzuoli only the variant [eu] of /u/. The types of diphthong from /i/ are described in detail in Giovanni Abete, 'Dinamiche dittongali nel dialetto di Pozzuoli. Un'analisi a diversi livelli di microscopia' (unpublished thesis, University of Naples Federico II, 2004).
- I use both notations here because, as will be seen, the chronology of the word-final elements is not clear. However, for convenience, I shall hereafter use -i and -u as notations for -i (-i) and -u (-u) respectively.
- See Emuna Milano, 'La dinamica dei fenomeni di palatalizzazione della a tonica in una comunità dell'Area Flegrea', in *Bollettino linguistico campano*, 1 (2002), 199–238, with her analysis of its occurrence in spontaneous spoken texts.
- In Procida it occurs frequently, but to a lesser degree in Ischia and even less in Pozzuoli, at least during the interviews conducted for ADICA.
- The data reported here are from AIS, ALI and ADICA.
- And also in Casal di Principe: see ALI I, 24 and 27.
- See Ilaria Formicola, 'Dinamiche della palatalizzazione di /a/ tonica nel dialetto ischitano' (unpublished undergraduate dissertation, University of Naples Federico II, 2000); and Simona Valente, 'Le alternanze metafonetiche nel verbo ischitano', in *La dialettologia oltre il 2001. Atti del convegno, Sappada/Plodn (Belluno), 1–5 luglio 2001*, ed. by Gianna Marcato (Padua: Unipress, 2002), pp. 275–84.
- See Curtis Blaylock, 'Hispanic Metaphony', *Romance Philology*, 18 (1964), 253–70.
- See Rosanna Sornicola, 'Dialetto e processi di italianizzazione in un habitat del Sud d'Italia', *Italiano e dialetto alle soglie del 2000, Procida, 27–29 maggio 2004* (Lecce: Congedo, forthcoming).
- For the forms of the article the problem of the diachronic processes is different from that which arises with word-final elements: moreover, we cannot rule out the possibility that in both cases the high vowels may not constitute a continuation of the Latin forms but may instead be the result of more complicated developments in Romance which have had an obscuring effect.
- ALI I, 8 records *kapa* in Buonopane, an example that corresponds to the data collected by ADICA in the same place. The form without palatalization has also been recorded in Bacoli, while Pozzuoli shows vacillation between the types *kapa* and *kepa*.
- See Rohlfs, §354; LEI (forthcoming).

34. See Rohlfs, §354.
35. See Francesco Sabatini, 'Sull'origine dei plurali italiani: il tipo in -i', in *Studi linguistici italiani*, 5 (1965), 5–39; Pavao Tekavčić, *Grammatica storica dell'italiano*, II: *Morfosintassi*, 2nd edn (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1980), 49–52.
36. See Pietro Maturi, *Dialetti e substandardizzazione nel Sannio Beneventano* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 2002), pp. 37–38.
37. Vittorio Parascandola, *Véflo. Folk-glossario del dialetto procidano* (Naples: Guida, 2000), p. 200.
38. See József Herman, 'Évolution a > e en latin tardif? Essai sur les liens entre la phonétique et la phonologie diachronique', in *Acta antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 26 (1978), 37–48; repr. in his *Du latin aux langues romanes. Études de linguistique historique réunies par Sándor Kiss* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1990), pp. 204–16.
39. See Rohlfs, §8.
40. See Herman, pp. 204–08.
41. See Sornicola, 'Dialetto e processi'.
42. This refers to one of the towns on the island, today known as Serrara Fontana.
43. See Carlo Vignoli, 'Il vernacolo di Castro dei Volsci', in *Studi romanzi*, 7 (1911), 116–296 (p. 126).
44. See Martin Maiden, 'New Perspectives on the Genesis of Italian Metaphony', *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 85 (1987), 38–72; and *Interactive Morphology*, p. 115.
45. See Rohlfs, §538; Giammarco, pp. 164–65.
46. See V. Valente, p. 34; and Maiden, *Interactive Morphology*, p. 115.
47. See Rohlfs, §23; Giammarco, p. 25; and V. Valente, p. 41.
48. See Maturi, pp. 37–39; and Maria Cristina Di Sciscio, 'Mondo contadino e dialetto a San Marco dei Cavoti' (unpublished undergraduate dissertation, University of Naples Federico II, 2002).
49. See Formicola 'Dinamiche della palatalizzazione di /a/ tonica'; S. Valente, 'Le alternanze metafonetiche'; Valentina Retaro, 'La variabilità del dialetto in una comunità dell'area flegrea. Il borgo di Centocamerelle a Bacoli' (unpublished thesis, University of Naples Federico II, 2004).
50. See Rohlfs, §§ 530, 618.
51. See Maturi, p. 41.
52. See Giuseppe Di Taranto, *Procida nei secoli XVII–XIX* (Geneva: Droz, 1985), p. 145 n. 37.
53. See Di Taranto, p. 147.
54. See Di Taranto.
55. See Di Taranto, p. 148.
56. See Di Taranto, p. 148 and n. 47.
57. See Di Taranto, p. 148 n. 47.
58. See Di Taranto, pp. 145–46; for Procida and Ischia, see Giuseppe D'Ascia, *Storia dell'isola d'Ischia* (Napoli: Stabilimento tipografico di Gabriele Argento, 1867, repr. Bologna: Arnaldo Forni, 1998), p. 126. For population movement from Pozzuoli and the Phlegraean coast towards towns on the Gulf of Naples, see Marco Antonio Delli Falconi, 'Dell'incendio di Pozzuolo', in *I tre rarissimi opuscoli di Simone Porzio di Girolamo Borgia e di Marcantonio delli Falconi*, ed. Lorenzo Giustiniani (Napoli: Marotta, 1817), pp. 289–90; Simone Porzio, 'De Conflagratione Agri Puteolani', in *I tre rarissimi opuscoli di Simone Porzio di Girolamo Borgia e di Marcantonio delli Falconi*, ed. by Lorenzo Giustiniani (Napoli: Marotta, 1817), pp. 43–51 (43–44); and Angelo D'Ambrosio, 'La formazione del Monte Nuovo secondo il racconto di Francesco Marchesino', in *Aspetti ed itinerari naturalistici dei Campi Flegrei*, ed. by M. Calzone and others (Naples: Gallina, 1985), pp. 83–93 (86). I am indebted to Giovanni Abete for information on the sources attesting migrations from Pozzuoli towards Naples.
59. See Di Taranto, p. 168.
60. These statistics are provided by my colleague Gianni Romeo from his research on the Phlegraean area.
61. See Di Taranto, p. 168.
62. See Di Taranto, p. 169.
63. Today, though, Procida has yielded its importance as a fishing port to Pozzuoli.
64. We can calculate that in the period mentioned the marriages with at least one Apulian spouse made up about 20% of the total number of marriages in any one year. Even bearing in mind the possibility

that in some of these cases the ceremony alone may have taken place on the island and the family unit may have then moved elsewhere, the movement cannot have been negligible.

65. Note, however, that *guagnone* is also a word documented in Old Neapolitan. It is a French loanword from the Angevin period: see Franco Fanciullo 'Italiano meridionale guaglione "ragazzo"', in *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 107 (1991), 398–410.
66. See Adolfo Targioni Tozzetti, *Relazioni sulla pesca a S. E. il Ministro di Agricoltura, Industria e Commercio* [= *Atti della Società Italiana di Scienze Naturali*, 15.5 (1872)] (Genoa: Tipografia del R. Istituto Sordo-Muti, 1872), pp. 47–48 and note, with data from classical antiquity, attesting flows of traffic between Baia, the Lucrine Lake and Lake Averno and cities in Puglia (perhaps Brindisi), for the purpose of seafood farming. He further notes (p. 65, n. 1) that in 1784 Ferdinando IV ordered that oyster farming, which had gone to ruin, should be revived on Lake Fusaro, providing 'custodi di Taranto, animali, apparecchi e pratiche de' tarentini medesimi'.
67. See D'Ascia, pp. 127, 360.
68. The fuller version of this article discusses the latter point in more detail.
69. Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*, with a preface by André Martinet (New York: Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York, 1953; repr. The Hague: Mouton, 1966).