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The location

- Geographically, Pescara is located in mid-eastern Italy.
- However, having been part of the Kingdom of Naples, it shares the cultural and linguistic heritage of Southern Italy.
Goals

• To describe the intonation system of the variety of Italian spoken in Pescara (Abruzzi, Eastern Italy).
• To set up the inventory of nuclear pitch accents and boundary tones for this variety according to the ToBI labelling conventions.

• To describe the intonation system of the local Romance dialect spoken in Pescara.
• To set up the inventory of nuclear pitch accents and boundary tones for this language according to the ToBI labelling conventions.

• To analyze the prosodic mutual influence between the two languages.
• To test to what extent the native (Pescara dialect) intonation characteristics (substratum characteristics) pass through to Italian.
### The Italian sociolinguistic distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Oral (segmental level)</th>
<th>Surasegmental level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian (Standard, correct, ideal)</td>
<td><img src="chart1" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>Does not exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian (actual)</td>
<td><img src="chart3" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="chart5" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian-dialect pidginization</td>
<td><img src="chart6" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="chart7" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="chart8" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialect</td>
<td><img src="chart9" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="chart10" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="chart11" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## What is influence of substratum?
The case of “raddoppiamento fonosintattico”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oral (segmental level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian (Standard, correct, ideal)</td>
<td>Non lo vuoi dire?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pescara Italian</td>
<td>No ‘llo vuoi dire?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian-dialect pidginization in Pescara</td>
<td>No ‘llo vuoi di?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pescara Dialect</td>
<td>Nnì vu dice?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Things to pay attention to:
- Not all Pescara Italian peculiarities come from substratum
- Substratum is not only current substratum
- Not all substratum influence is by similarity
ToBI analyses of Italian intonation

• We take into account previous ToBI analyses of Italian, for the southern varieties spoken in Naples (D’Imperio, 1997 and 1999, Crocco, 2006), Bari (Savino, 1997, Grice, 1997), Palermo (Grice, 1995), Cosenza (Sorianello, 1994-1995, 2001, Sorianello, in print), Catanzaro (Sardelli and Marotta, 2007), central varieties such as those spoken in Pisa (Gili Fivela, 2003), Siena (Marotta-Sorianello, 1999), Firenze (Avesani, 1995, Avesani-Hirschberg, 1997), Roma (Giordano, 2005, 2006, Sardelli, 2006, Sardelli and Marotta, 2007), Perugia (Giordano, 2006) an northern varieties such as Milan (Sardelli, 2006) and Turin (Besana, 1999).

• We take into account a recent ToBI-Italian general proposal that integrates the analysis of different dialects of Italian (e.g., Gili-Fivela et al. 2010).

• We also consider the ToBI analysis of those varieties that are genetically more related to Pescara Italian like Neapolitan Italian (D’Imperio 1997, Crocco, 2006), and Bari Italian (Savino 1997), as well as those which are geographically closer, like Rome Italian (Giordano, 2006).
The corpus

- The elicitation of the data was done through an established survey based on that proposed by Prieto (2001) and re-adapted to Standard Italian by the group coordinated by Barbara Gili-Fivela. The same survey has to be translated and readapted to the dialect (only oral version).

- The survey contains 57 situations that are designed to evoke everyday situations by presenting the subject with a series of situations. It contains a variety of sentence-types (statements, yes-no questions, wh-questions, imperatives) that convey different pragmatic meanings (incredulity, confirmation, obviousness, etc.)

- For each speaker, the survey was presented twice. In the first presentation, the interviewer was reading the situations and the subjects were answering first in a spontaneous way and second by reading the proposed response. In the second presentations, subjects read the target situation and the response was given both spontaneously and by reading.
Speakers

- Seven female and six male L1-speakers of Pescara Italian were interviewed. Eight of these speakers aged between 23 and 37, and five of them between 60 and 75.
- A total of 2914 utterances were elicited: 57 situations x 13 speakers x 4 elicitation types.
- So far, we analyzed the eight young speakers and we limited ourselves to analyzing 33 target situations (the same used in other Romance varieties), for a total of 33 x 8 x 2 = 528 sentences analyzed with Praat and labelled.
Previous work on contact

Colantoni & Gurlekian, 2004: Contact of Spanish and Italian in Argentina, pre-nuclear and nuclear pitch in statements.

Hypothesis:

1) Italian immigrants transfer their L1-prosodic patterns to Spanish (L2) and create their own intonational variant of Spanish.

2) Spanish monolinguals “accommodate” their L1 features to this variant which reaches the status of Argentinian Spanish.
Previous work on contact

Simonet 2008, 2010:
contact of Spanish and Catalan in Mallorca, study on statements, on bilinguals

1) Spanish-dominant bilinguals have one intonational strategy which they use for speaking both Spanish and Catalan. It is still more similar to the Spanish monolingual strategy than to the Catalan monolingual strategy, but it has moved towards the latter.

2) Catalan-dominant bilinguals have two strategies: one for speaking Catalan (similar to monolinguals) and one significantly different for speaking Spanish (still closer to the Catalan than to the Spanish monolingual one, but it has moved towards the latter).
Previous work on contact

Elordieta-Romera (submitted): contact of Spanish and Catalan in Mallorca, study on statements and questions, on monolingual Spanish speakers having moved to Mallorca

1) In questions, Spanish monolinguals accommodate their intonational strategy to the Catalan strategy
2) In statements, Spanish monolinguals do not accommodate their intonational strategy to the Catalan strategy
Pescara Italian: the pitch accents

- $H+L^*$
- $\hat{H}+L^*$
- $H^*+L$
- $L+H^*$
The pitch accents: H+L* and its (phonetic?) variant, ¡H+L*

Broad focus statement:
“Beve una bibita” $H+L^* L\%$ vs ¡$H+L^*$ $L\%$
Other uses of H+L* and specific uses of ¡H+L*

- Broad Focus Statement
- Imperative Sentence
- Last item in declarative list
- 2nd tone in disjunctive question
- Surprise Y/N questions
- 2nd tone in Wh-question

- Answer
- Categorical
- Evident
- Narrow focus
- Confirmation seeking Y/N questions
- Vocative (1st type)
The pitch accents: H*+L

Information seeking yes/no question: “Avete dei mandaRlni?” (“Have you got tangerines?”) H*+L LH%

Contrastive narrow focus: “Vorrei dei liMOni” (“I would like lemons”) H*+L L%
Other uses of H*+L

With a high (LH%) boundary tone:
- Information Seeking Y/N questions
- Echo Y/N questions
- Echo Wh-questions

With a low boundary tone:
- Contrastive narrow focus statement
- Exclamation
- Exhortation
The pitch accents: L+H*

Itemizing in list (except for last item): L+H* H%
“Cocco, melone, Mela, anguria, arancia, mandarino, limone”
(“Coconut, melon, apple, watermelon, orange, tangerine, lemon”)
Other occurrences of L+H*

With a high boundary tone:
- Item in list
- First tone in disjunctive question
- First tone in wh-question

With a low boundary tone:
- Item in list conveying a “bored” attitude
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H+L*</th>
<th>¡H+L*</th>
<th>H*+L</th>
<th>L+H*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H% (LH%)</strong></td>
<td>-We think in some surprise/defy Y/N question -Probably in some issue of offer or confirmation seeking question</td>
<td>-2nd tone or unique tone in Information Seeking Y/N question -Echo Y/N questions -Echo Wh-questions -Offer</td>
<td>-Item in List (before-last), -First tone in disjunctive question -First tone in wh-question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Vocative (second type) -Doubt (special utterances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L%</strong></td>
<td>-Broad Focus Statement -Imperative Sentence -Last item in declarative list -2nd tone in disjunctive question -Vocative (First type)</td>
<td>-Answer -Categorical -Evident -Narrow focus -Confirmation seeking Y/N question -Vocative (first type) -Surprise Y/N questions</td>
<td>-Contrastive narrow focus Statement -Exclamation -Exhortation -1st tone in Inf seeking Y/N</td>
<td>-Item in list (special, annoyed, second -before-last)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contact issues: calling contours

“Domenico!” Vocative (Italian type)

“Domenico!” Vocative (dialect-type)

“Domé!” Vocative (Dialect)

“A Già!” Vocative (Dialect, Anacrusis)
Contact issues: polar questions
Contact issues: polar questions

Information seeking yes/no question: “Avete dei mandarini?” (“Have you got tangerines?”) \( \text{H}^*\text{+L LH}\% \) vs \( \text{H}^*\text{+L L}\% \)
THANK YOU!  GRAZIE!  GRACIES!