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ABSTRACT

This thesis project investigates a language contact situation in Pescara, Eastern Italy, between two language systems, namely, the regional variety of Italian spoken in the area of Pescara, and the Romance native dialect from the same area, nearly extinct and only spoken by old people. Even though there are several descriptive studies on the intonational systems of regional Italian varieties and some work on the most alive regional dialects (such as Sardinian and Friulan), to our knowledge no studies have dealt with Pescara Italian, nor with the Pescara dialect so far. Also, to the present state, little work has been done on language contact in the prosodic field (Elordieta 2003, 2006; Colantoni and Gurlekian 2004; Mennen 2004; O’Rourke 2005; Simonet 2008, 2010, inter alia) and in particular on an Italian situation of contact with substratum (Romano, 2000).

An elicitation experiment was planned in which we shall record 8 young native speakers of Pescara Italian, 6 old native speakers of Pescara Italian and 6 old native speakers of the Pescara dialect. The language tasks were the following: a role-play questionnaire presenting 57 different situations to which the speaker was asked to react orally, in order to record spontaneous and read versions of various sentence types; the Map Tasks, a game-like interview used to elicit spontaneous questions, and finally a set of board games and card playing sessions.

Results from the first interviews with 8 young speakers show that Pescara Italian intonation is influenced by its substratum dialect but also from central Italian varieties, not genetically related to it: on the one hand the original dialect intonational patterns (in polar questions, for instance) are being substituted over time by other intonational strategies (which we may call “more standard”, for they can be observed in many varieties of Italian, as well as in Romance languages outside of Italy), often introduced by social groups representing prestige (women) and future tendency (young people); on the other hand, we also observe double intonation patterns (those of vocative sentences, for instance), coexisting even within the same speaker, one of dialectal origin and a more standard one, with no sign of evolution of one towards another, and possible pragmatic value shifts. A special dialectal feature is found, which has been integrally transferred to regional Italian, while others have suffered modification. We also find, in dialect, a very special context type in which intonational needs are strong enough to modify the segmental material in order to fit its needs. This PhD thesis will investigate the interactions between L1 and L2 prosodic patterns in the light of previous investigation in the area of prosodic contact.
ABSTRACT

Aquest projecte de tesi investiga la situació de contacte lingüístic a la zona de Pescara, Itàlia, entre varietat regional de l'italià parlat a la zona de Pescara, i el dialecte romaní nadiu de la mateixa zona. Tot i que hi ha diversos estudis descriptius en els sistemes entonatius de les varietats regionals italianes i alguns estudis dels dialectes regionals més vius (com el sard i el friülà), fins al moment cap estudi no ha investigat els patrons prosòdics de l'italià de Pescara ni del seu dialecte. També comptem amb pocs estudis que analitzin el comportament de la prosòdia en situacions de contacte lingüístic (Elordieta 2003, 2006; Colantoni i Gurlekian 2004; Mennen 2004; O'Rourke 2005; Simonet 2008, 2010, entre altres) i, en particular, de la situació de contacte de llengües a Itàlia (Romano 2000). Els materials empírics per a la tesi constaran de dades orals de 8 informants joves i 6 informants grans amb clara dominància de l'italià de Pescara, més 6 informants d’edat dominants en el dialecte nadiu de Pescara. Per a cada informant, s’enregistraran les següents tasques: un qüestionari de joc de rol que presenta 57 situacions diferents, un Map Task, i diversos jocs. Els resultats de les primeres entrevistes mostren que encara que l’entonació de l’italià de Pescara està fortament influenciada pel seu dialecte de substrat, també té tres de l’entonació de les varietats italianes centrals que no estan genèticament relacionades amb el dialecte de substrat. Aquesta tesi doctoral pretén investigar les interaccions entre els patrons prosòdics d’L1 i L2 a la llum de la investigació prèvia en el camp del contacte prosòdic.
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1.1 The Italian case: a historical introduction

Italy shows a great sociolinguistic variety, due to its recent history as a unified country. In modern history the Italian peninsula has been divided up into various and variously sized states, the largest of which were the Kingdom of Naples, embracing the whole South and the under the Spanish and French influence, and the Stato Pontificio, the seat of Catholic Church. In Northern and Central Italy, along with average sized states (Granduchy of Tuscany, Republic of Venice, Duchy of Milan, Duchy of Savoy, including Piedmont and Sardinia), were a bunch of fragmented small city states. One of the important steps towards unification dates back to 1847, when the states belonging to Savoy were unified under the Regno di Sardegna. This state basically represented the nucleus of the Italian Monarchy, born in 1861.

The Italian language was born as a written language after the unification of Italy, as an attempt of politicians, university professors, writers, main cultural characters and schoolbooks publishers to make a unique standard version out of the romance languages (which from now on will be referred to as “dialects”) which were spoken all over the peninsula since the failure of Latin in passing on to illiterate people. In its written form and rules, standard Italian was shaped on the Florentine dialect, which was famous to the press since Dante Alighieri’s 14th century, and later it included nuances and lexical enrichment from other dominating varieties, especially Roman. However, nobody set the rules for standard oral Italian, until required by the first expressions of art, such as theatre and cinema, which sought, through the establishment of the diction, a national norm.
on the pronunciation of phonemes\(^1\) and segmental items, which gained its status over time and was later agreed on by all dictionaries. This norm would not include prosody, and in fact there is no objective norm regulating what the referential and standard intonational or rhythmic features should be. Nevertheless, in schools, since teachers did not know diction, most people, non specifically trained, were only exposed to written standard Italian, which they would pronounce and read according to a process of adaptation of their regional language background, not only at a suprasegmental (prosodic) level, but also at a segmental (pronunciation of single phonemes) level, because diction was ignored, ending up creating the so called “regional accents”.

Some suprasegmental features, however, became more widespread in the second half of the 20th century, through the television: initially those of TV speakers and news announcers, mainly coming from Rome and later from Milan. Although trained to strictly follow the segmental rules for TV speakers and the “correct” pronunciation at the segmental level, they spread the intonation patterns coming from their own linguistic heritage to the whole nation. Similarly, whenever possible, Florentine and Tuscan people were recruited on purpose, in the view of segmental phonetic correctness of their speaking, and Florentine intonation also became known as a by-product of this. This mixture of intonational patterns has contributed to creating an impression on the possible existence of a Standard Italian intonation or, at least, represented a model speakers began to refer to. One may try to define “Standard Italian intonation”, under a subjective point of view, as the set of intonational features that are perceived as not being regionally connotated. But it is clear that, beyond this approximate and subjective definition, we cannot speak of a Standard Italian intonation as a complete and unified system.

At a general level there is a certain agreement that regional Italian prosody arises from substratum, many linguists even use the term “regional” to refer to the features arising from local dialect. Quoting Canepari (Canepari, 1979): “Often those who got rid of strongly regional articulatory features of their pronunciation\(^2\) preserve their native speaking\(^3\) intonational structures: for those are the hardest to modify” Many Italian linguists share the opinion that a certain amount of dialectal features is found in regional Italian. We may quote G.B. Pellegrini (Pellegrini, 1960) “Pronunciation of regional Italian nearly always reveals an insinuating dialectal background”, or T.

---

1 We must observe that, if we look at the way an Italian word is pronounced in a given area, phonetic regional variants almost never produce ambiguity in meaning, basically they introduce new allophones which are unknown to Florentine or not used in the same neighboring context (”schwa” for final “e”, interchanging open and closed “e” and “o”, intervocalic non-geminated unvoiced “s”, higher articulation of “u”, uvular “r”). Thus, if we consider the union of phonetic inventories of all Italian varieties as a big system, we may claim that diction is nothing but the choice of one “correct” allophone to represent each phoneme of this big system in each context.

2 Here meaning: at a segmental level

3 In the original text: “le strutture intonative della loro parlata originaria”: here the word parlata refers to dialect. Everything which is “originary” is understood as to be coming from dialect; the author clearly wants to point out the
De Mauro (De Mauro, 1970) “Persistancess of dialect prosody in the regional use of Italian creates, at a pre-scientific level, the easy and immediate possibility of recognizing the speaker’s regional provenience”. The goal of this thesis will be to contribute to deepen our understanding on the behavior of intonation in a language contact situation through the analysis of the patterns of intonation found in the Pescara region, and try to tease out to what extent Pescara dialect speakers transfer their own original dialect’s intonational features directly to Italian.

1.2 A look at the linguistic situation of Pescara.

Our contribution is limited to one specific area, that of Pescara, located in the mid Adriatic Italian seashore (fig 2, 3), in the region of Abruzzo. The author in charge of this project comes from this area and is a native speaker of the local Italian variety. Even though he has a good command of the local dialect and the learning process started during childhood, he could be defined as an L2-speaker.

Pescara shares the cultural and linguistic heritage of upper Southern Italy, and more specifically, the macroscopic features of the Neapolitan area. As far as we know, to date there is no literature on intonation of Pescara Italian. As for the Pescara dialect, while it has been described morpho-syntactically and phonologically (Maiden-Parry, 1997), to our knowledge no studies have dealt with the systematic description of its prosodic system, as it is the case for most Italian dialects.
Fig. 2
The location of Pescara

Fig. 3
A city Map of Pescara: neighborhoods “Colli” and “Marina” are enlightened
As in almost all areas of Italy, we find a bilingual situation in Pescara, also referred to as “dilalia”, namely the co-presence of the local variety of Italian, together with that of the native language, which is genetically related to the Neapolitan dialect family. By now, Italian has almost completely replaced the native language (the so-called “dialect”), and young and middle age people no longer speak the dialect. Pescara dialect nowadays has reached the status of endangered language and can be heard, in its purest and original form, only among old people, mainly old fishers from the harbor neighborhood (“Marina”, enlightened in blue in Fig.3) or in some more isolated residential area (“Colli”, in red in Fig.3), two areas where the replacing process has started later.

Using evidence from first-hand experimental/interview work and existing studies, we will explore the role of contact in explaining the intonational patterns found in both Pescara Italian and the Pescara dialect. Our central question is in what ways and to what extent Pescara Italian intonation is distinctive relative to other varieties of Italian, and whether that distinctiveness can be directly related to the properties of the substratum.

1.3 Prior work on prosodic contact

Recently there have been studies on prosodic aspects in situations of language contact, but it remains a relatively understudied area. We can quote a few papers exploring the behavior of intonation in language contact situations, some of which are better described in the section on annotated references and will serve as a framework for us to proceed in the present study. In general, these studies defend that prosodic features can be transferred between two languages in contact. (cf. Ueyama & Jun 1998; Gut 2000; Chun 2002; Elordieta 2003, 2006; Colantoni & Gurlekian 2004; Mennen 2004; O’Rourke 2005; Raiser & Hiligsmann 2007; Trouvain and Gut 2007; Nguyên et al. 2008; Lleó et al. 2008; Simonet 2008, 2010; Swerts and Zerbian 2010; Lleó and Cortés 2010, inter alia). The majority of this work claims that the general transfer holds from L1 to L2. Only Mennen (2004) claims that the adoption of L2 features by L1 is also possible. We believe that this difference in the number of reports of L1 to L2 and L2 to L1 transfer is not an arbitrary one, as we will discuss in section 2.

For example, the work by Colantoni and Gurlekian (Colantoni & Gurlekian, 2004) deals with peak alignment of Argentinian Spanish pre-nuclear accents and utterance-final broad focus declarative sentences, which seem to have been influenced by Italian intonation, or better, by Italian Spanish intonation, namely the Spanish which was spoken by the numerous Italian immigrants and their descendants in Argentina during the late 19th and 20th century. The fundamental frequency
peak of those accents in Buenos Aires seems to be aligned much earlier than in most varieties of Spanish, including peninsular Spanish, and this differentiation was not visible before and during most of the 19th century, when Buenos Aires Spanish most probably resembled Andalusia Spanish. The conclusion the authors found most probable is that Italian intonational features have been transferred by those immigrants to their L2 Spanish, and this Spanish variety spoken by Italian immigrants, for several reasons, has gained a status of Argentinian accent, so that even Spanish monolingual speakers have tended to conform to it over time. What took place has later been defined as an “accommodation process” (Elordieta-Romera, submitted). L1 monolingual Spanish people have begun to conform to and imitate a peculiar variety of their own language, namely the Italian Spanish, and their sons started to pick up “the full package”, together with the intonation. In this case, we are dealing with two varieties which were already similar and with two patterns, representing the same pragmatic sentence type in the two varieties, which only differed in a shift in alignment, one of which undertook accommodation towards the other. However, we also should not forget, as the authors point out, that the early Italian peak alignment was already present in Spanish, but with another specific pragmatic value (contrastive focus) and this might have helped Spanish monolinguals pick it up and start to use it for broad focus statements, in what could have been nothing but a pragmatic value shift within their language.

The study by O’Rourke (2005) on the Southern American variety of Spanish spoken in Cuzco shows how the peculiar falling intonational pattern attested for broad focus statements is nothing but Quechua intonation, transferred by Quechua speakers to their L2 Spanish and picked up later on by the whole Cuzco community.

More recent investigations have tried to answer this question by studying bilingual individuals, indeed the best candidates to develop a double intonational structure. It is the case of the study by Robin Queen (Queen, 2001) which sets the basis for a discussion on the peculiarity of bilinguals’ intonation. She observes two particular rising patterns in Turkish-German bilingual subjects and argues that these rising patterns are present in both German and Turkish monolingual intonation, although they are not employed with the same pragmatic uses. Also in this case, then, we observe sort of a pragmatic value shift, rather than an intonational shift.

Pragmatic value shift in bilinguals has been also observed by a more recent and very extensive study on Catalan-Spanish bilinguals in the Majorca island, recently carried out by Miquel Simonet (Simonet, 2008 and Simonet, 2010), which will serve as point of departure for our research. As in our case, the linguistic history of Majorca is quite a complex one, and historical social factors have to be carefully taken into account. Monolingual Spanish speakers have arrived in the Island since the 1950s, when it was mainly inhabited by L1 Catalan speakers who, nevertheless,
only learnt Spanish in school. This study focused on a single intonational pattern, namely the final (nuclear) pitch accent in declaratives, for this feature seems to show a tonal dichotomy between a typical Spanish accent (a rising or a non falling contour within the stressed syllable, with a concave overall contour shape), attested in almost all varieties of peninsular Spanish and a Catalan one (a steep fall in the nuclear syllable, with a convex curve shape).

As it is extensively claimed in the literature, prosodic L1 features are the most difficult to abandon in learning L2, and the author wonders whether this may happen with a high degree of bilingualism, and whether the interviewed have correctly acquired a second intonational package from their non-native language, or, instead, transferred their L1 patterns to L2, or, finally, created a new personal in-between intonation. Although there is evidence that picking up L2 intonation may occur when the speaker loses contact with the L1 languages (Flege et al., 1997), this is not the case here, as both Catalan-L1 and Spanish-L1 speakers interviewed use both languages daily and productively. Besides intonation comparison of the two groups speaking the same language, which is L1 to one group and L2 to the other, in order to check the effects of L1 intonation on L2, the author stresses the importance of comparison between the two languages within the same speaker (or speaker type group), to check whether, at a personal level, intonational bilingualism is possible or individuals show a tendency to own a single set of intonational features, to be used for both languages. Another goal of this study is the search for a possible backward effect, that is, what happens when features of one’s L2 language are learnt and transmitted to L1, leading to modification of their very L1 core through contact.

Results are very significant, because even though overall transfer of L1 intonational patterns to L2 is confirmed, we may observe, at a merely phonetic level, some degree of accommodation and a certain approximation phenomenon, mainly of Spanish towards Catalan. Spanish-dominant bilinguals, tend to have a single intonational strategy, which they apply to both languages: this strategy is mainly Spanish-like, but not completely, it does slightly move towards the Catalan type. This process is led by young females, as it often happens in sociolinguistics with language change, especially towards varieties of prestige (or renewed prestige, as it seems to be here). On the contrary, Catalan-L1 bilinguals seem to split their intonational behavior into two systems: they stick very strictly to the monolingual Catalan strategy while speaking Catalan, and move towards the Spanish-monolingual Spanish only while speaking Spanish.

Though very consistent and enhanced by diachronic change considerations, this study has a limit: it just deals with declarative sentences, and we have to take into account the possible misleading of inferring theoretical evidence from a study dealing with intonation of just one sentence type. In a similar situation Romera and Elordieta (Romera, Elordieta, submitted) collect
other data from Majorca informants and are able to show a difference in behavior between two pragmatic patterns, with respect to language contact. The study deals with monolingual Spanish speakers, plunged into Majorca since many years, and reacting to contact with Majorcan Spanish and Catalan. They all seem to totally accommodate their features only and exactly in interrogative sentences, but not in declaratives. The reasons for this difference is believed to reside in the different degree of salience of native features in the two sentence types. Unlike in declaratives, where the native falling Majorcan pattern is not unknown to Spanish, Catalan and Majorcan Spanish interrogative falling accent shows a conspicuous fall from a pre-tonic high pitch, which makes it very salient to the ear of non-Majorcan Spanish speakers, who would notice, imitate and absorb it as a distinctive sign of belonging to the community. It is also observed in the study how a strong desire of integration is also an important trigger in intonation pattern acquisition by this people. The authors claim the possibility of an indirect change, that is, Spanish monolinguals would not pick up this feature directly from Catalan, but from L2-Spanish spoken by Catalan native speakers. Indeed, change would include two stages: first Majorcan L1-Catalan speakers perform prosodic transfer of L1 features into their L2-Spanish, creating a local variety of Spanish; then L1-Spanish monolinguals would undergo accommodation to this local variety of Spanish. A possible explication for higher accommodation rate of questions, and in general, their tendency to be more subject to undergo change due to contact, that we suggest here, is that interrogatives form an “incomplete” pragmatic type, which entails more interaction between the speakers, and this would call for, literally speaking, constant “accommodation” of the speaker’s most deep and unconscious linguistic behaviors, as suprasegmental phonology is believed to be.

In the Italian context, Antonio Romano’s study (Romano, 2000) assessed the intonational patterns found in several communities of Salento, Southern Italy. The results of this study showed that “incomplete” and listener-addressed pragmatic speech acts such as questions or courtesy-like forms, such as moderate surprise, are more likely to show a difference between the two linguistic codes and occasionally, especially in formal situations, substratum dialect patterns of these pragmatic types are not transferred to Italian. Rather speakers tend to look for a more prestigious solution.

To conclude, we would like to stress the importance and need of our contribution in the current landscape of studies on prosodic contact and language change. With respect to the Italian situation, apart from some observations in Romano’s study on Salento, we lack comparative studies of language contact situations between Italian variants and their relative substratum dialects: too often the dialectal origin of Italian variants is taken for granted, without a scientific assessment of
whether, how and when prosodic transfer actually takes place. In general, we believe that the function of the style\textsuperscript{5}, and the history of linguistic prestige, could be the right indicators to follow, in order to provide a justification for the actual contact situation.

1.4 Prior studies on Italian intonation and their relevance

Early research on Italian intonation has dealt with the description of intonation patterns use in the main pragmatic sentence types. In this respect, we can cite Lepschy’s classification of tunes (Lepschy, 1978), later evoked by Canepari (Canepari, 1980), consisting of rising, falling, level or suspensive, falling-rising and rising-falling tunes, denoting respectively completeness and statements, questions, incompleteness, doubt or surprise and contradiction. Since the decade of the 1990s, ten years after the start of the autosegmental metrical system for intonation (henceforth, AM model of intonation), can we see the first attempts at classifying complex pitch configurations in terms of pitch accents and boundary tones, following this prosodic model (Avesani, 1990). This study relied on the Tuscan variety of Italian to address issues concerning the speech synthesis of Italian as a whole. To a certain extent we could get an impression that the underlying assumption was that “Standard Italian” intonation should be based on this variety. As time went on, descriptive research on Italian intonation became aware of the strong effect of the regional area. Studies on regional variants are the ones that we will be mainly concerned with. They have been carried out in several parts of the Italian Peninsula, especially in Central Italy, with particular focus on Tuscan varieties such as Florence (Avesani, 1995, Avesani & Hirschberg, 1997), Pisa (Gili Fivela, 2003, 2008), Siena (Marotta & Sorianello, 1999) as well as Rome (Giordano, 2005, 2006, Sardelli, 2006, Sardelli-Marotta, 2007, De Dominicis, 2002), and Perugia (Giordano, 2006), and in Southern Italy, with Naples (D’Imperio, 1997 and 1999, Crocco, 2006), Bari (Savino, 1997, Grice & Savino, 1997, Grice & Savino, 2003), Palermo (Grice, 1995), Cosenza (Sorianello, 1995, 2001, Sorianello, 2010), and Catanzaro (Sardelli & Marotta, 2007). Literature on the intonation of northern Italian varieties is definitely scarce: we may quote studies on Milan (Sardelli, 2006) and Turin (Besana, 1999).

A simple look at the intonational strategies described for polar questions throughout Italy (Grice et al., 2005), gives an idea of its great dialectal variety; moreover, we come across the same intonational pattern which is used for two different pragmatic types by different local communities (see Grice et al., 2005 on Neapolitan narrow focus statements and Bari’s y/n questions). Even

\textsuperscript{4} Unlike Pescara, Salento linguistically belongs to what is generally referred to as the “Extreme Southern Italian family”, with a heavy Greek and non-Romance influence.

\textsuperscript{5} Style is a sociolinguistic parameter which varies within the individual and refers to the speaker’s attitude and its degree of formality towards the addressee, whether it be formal or informal. Language variation as a function of the style is also called diaphasic variation.
though D’Imperio’s (2002) study posed general questions for Italian intonation such as the definition of nuclear pitch accent in Italian, the existence of a phrase accent, or the role of downstepped patterns, it was clear that more Italian varieties had to be taken into account. At this point, comparative research has begun and the production of an intonational Atlas of Italian varieties (Gili-Fivela 2011 coord.), as well as the establishment of an inter-regional system of AM labeling conventions are the main concerns of current researchers in the field. 

As mentioned before, the Pescara dialect genetically belongs to the Neapolitan area, and more in general to the family of upper southern Italian dialects. But we also want to establish a comparison between the Pescara intonation system and central Italian varieties which could have had an influence, due to geographical proximity. At this point I will review some selected papers which can be especially interesting for this comparison, especially the ones using Map Tasks, a specific technique to elicit polar questions. The central Italian variety that is more closely related to Pescara, among those studied, is that spoken in Rome. A survey by Rosa Giordano (Giordano, 2006) describes a rising-falling pattern on the last stressed syllable for information-seeking yes-no questions present in Rome and Perugia, Umbria (north-west of Abruzzo), which we also find in Pescara. As for sentence-final patterns, she finds a typical rising final tune both in Rome and Perugia, which in Rome is sometimes alternating with a falling tune. Another Map Task study comparing questions in a central and a southern variety, was carried out by Patrizia Sorianello (2010) who, in her survey on Siena and Cosenza varieties, introduces the idea that interrogative intonation patterns are somehow “marked” with respect to statements in that they have rising intonation features. The rising features would appear once in the sentence and the regional difference would reside in where this feature is located. In Siena (Central Italian) we have a falling (unmarked) tune on the stressed syllable and a rise (marked) at the end. On the contrary, in Cosenza (southern Italian) we have a rising (marked) tune on the stressed syllable and a fall (unmarked) at the end. Studies on Neapolitan Italian intonation (D’Imperio, 1997, Crocco, 2006) also show the presence of a rising tune on the stressed syllable with a fall at the boundary, although Caputo (1996) in another study says, “[...]although the occasional presence of a final rise has been noted”. Another Southern Italian system which has been object of extensive study is Bari: Grice and Savino (2003) study of Map Task data described the presence of a rising-falling tune on the stressed syllable, although the rising part is considered to be phonologically more significant. In another study on Bari’s lists, Savino (1997) described intonational patterns which are present in Pescara too. Rising patterns in questions are also observed in Palermo questions (Grice, 1995). As far as the final movement is concerned, Southern varieties usually show a final fall whereas some extreme southern
varieties (Lecce), behave like Central Italian and display a final rise, for instance in yes-no questions (Stella and Gili Fivela, 2009). Finally, we lack prosodic studies on the region of Marche, bordering Abruzzo from North, whose language belongs to Central Italian.

Therefore, as a general tendency, it seems that many central varieties (Siena, Rome, Florence) mark questions with a rising tune at the end of the sentence, or with a tune which include a rising movement, whereas many southern varieties mark questions through a rising pitch accent associated to the last stressed syllable. However, neighboring areas can show reciprocal influence and alternating features: Rome shows a few occurrences of final falls and Naples a few ones of final rises (Giordano, 2006, Caputo, 1996). In general, Pescara behaves like central varieties, with respect to polar questions, in that it has a final rise and falling movement on the stressed syllable, but at a closer look, we will see that the peak of this movement is shifted backwards and is preceded by a rise, thus resembling something in between the Southern and Central patterns (Barone, M., 2010 Pre-workshop on ToBI). Based on the results analyzed so far, we claim that Pescara intonation is affected by two competing influences, giving birth to parallel intonational strategies, perceived as more “Italian-like” and more “dialect-like”, respectively. The first one comes from Rome and Central Italy, and is characterized by a final rise in polar questions, the second one, instead, shows a final low plateau at the end of questions.

This dissertation will provide with new Pescara Italian intonation data which will be incorporated into the Atlas of intonation of Italian varieties (Gili-Fivela coord.), a collection of Italian prosodic data recorded in a variety of regional sites. The comparison with other varieties will help us understand the overall map of Italian intonations and their evolution. With respect to the Pescara dialect data, it will be incorporated in the Atlas of Romance Intonation (Prieto, Roseano & Borrás-Comes coords.) in the hope to document its prosodic peculiarities. The collection and storage of data on those endangered languages should be considered as an urgent and important objective for Italian research. As long as the study proceeds, we mean to acquire some arguments to enter the debate on whether and to what extent we may talk of a (possibly future) Standard Italian intonation or of centralizing tendencies and on setting the rules for an autosegmental metric system of labeling for all varieties of Italian.

1.5 Goals

This thesis project has two main purposes. The first aim is to provide a description of the intonational phonology of two intonational systems in a situation of language contact, Pescara

---

6 When referring to Central Italy, I tend to prefer the word “variant” to “dialect”, since Florentine belongs to this family
Italian and Pescara dialect, using the autosegmental metric system and ToBI labeling conventions. The second goal of the project, which comes as a very innovative task in current research, will be to compare the two sets of data from the two languages in contact and address specific hypotheses on intonational pattern transfer from one language to another, as it is often the case in many situations of language contact and first-second language coexistence. Such a comparison is key, in that it will provide us with clues to reconstruct different stages of proto-Pescarese intonation and will help us trace back the historical evolution of Italian (and dialect) in Pescara. Our study also includes a methodological goal, which will be achieved along with data retrieval and whose evidence could force us to readapt our methodology: testing the validity of some special elicitation strategies such as Map Tasks, role-play interviews, card and board games, which will be described in the following sections.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODS

2.1 The autosegmental metric framework and the ToBI labeling system(s)

The autosegmental metrical framework (AM model) is a theoretical system and a method for phonological analysis of prosody and its relationship with the segmental phonological material of given speech data. Its origins can be traced back to three key articles, namely, Bruce (1977), Goldsmith (1979) and Liberman & Prince (1977) which first introduced the concept of a new (suprasegmental) tier, independent of the segmental one, which would contain tonal specifications, and that of a metrical structure. In his work on Swedish accents, Bruce talks about alignment, in order to distinguish two accents based not on the tonal movements themselves, but in the way the association with segmental material is made. Goldsmith, in an article on African tonal languages was the first to theoretically argue about the existence of two phonological layers, one containing tones and the other containing vowels and “tone bearing units”, and a linkage between the two. Finally, Liberman explored the relationship between prosody and syntactic constituency, and laid out some restrictions on the behavior of tone bearing units. He introduced the concepts of strong and weak syllables, nucleus and nuclear stress, associated to the strongest and terminal syllable in a constituent.

In her 1980 PhD Dissertation and in her later works Janet Pierrehumbert (Pierrehumbert, 1980, Pierrehumbert & Beckman, 1986, Pierrehumbert & Beckman, 1988) proposed a model for analyzing an intonational contour in English as a series of tonal movements, called pitch accents and therefore its dialects may be thought of as variants of Florentine dialect, that is Italian.
and edge tones, belonging to a finite family of possible types, and whose interpolation by connection lines could give rise to the intonation contour. Each tone can be a low tonal target point (or “L”) or a high one (“H”). Pitch accents are associated (aligned) to metrically strong syllables and could be composed of one (monotonal) or two (bitonal) tonal targets. In bitonal pitch accents, the two tones are separated by a “+” sign, only one of them is associated with the stressed syllable, it is followed by a “*” sign and is called “starred tone”, the non-starred tone is called leading tone if it precedes the starred tone and trailing tone if it follows it. This gives rise to a variety of possible combinations, namely L*, H*, L+H*, H*+H, L*+H, H*+L, among others. Edge tones are of two types: phrase accents, to be put between the last pitch accent and the end of its prosodic constituent, marked by a hyphen (“L-” or “H-”), and boundary tones, to be located at the end of the sentence, marked by a percentage sign (“L%” or “H%”). Later discussions have questioned the existence of phrase accents, the identity of last pitch accent and strongest pitch accent, agreed about never allowing tritonal accents, posited the existence of a mid boundary tone and upstepped and downstepped H tones, respectively denoted as ![H] and ¡H, which signal the existence of a syntagmatic long-distance relationship between two equal pitch accents.

In Pierrehumbert-Beckman (1986) the authors introduce the concept of “intermediate phrase”, a prosodic unit whose final boundary is marked by the phrase accent, settling the basis for the implementation of the ToBI transcription system (Silverman et al. 1992). According to ToBI (Tone and Break Indices) we can annotate the prosody of any speech event by specifying, together with the segmental layer, called “orthographic tier”, the tier of tonal events, containing pitch accents and boundary tones, and that of break indices, containing the points and levels of separation between prosodic units, which could range from “0” (no prosodic break between words), all the way up to “3” (the afore-mentioned intermediate phrase) and “4” (boundary of the whole intonational phrase). Each intermediate phrase would then contain at least one pitch accent and a phrase accent at its end, and the last intermediate phrase within the intonational phrase always contains the nuclear pitch accent, a phrase accent and a boundary tone, at the end of the intonational phrase.

The ToBI systems, based on the AM model of intonation, have had the goal of the proposing an inventory of pitch accents and edge tones for each language (e.g., Beckman & Ayers 1994 for English). Based on this proposal, many language-specific ToBI systems have started to appear. As

---

7 In Italian, D’Imperio (D’Imperio, 2002) shows that this relation can overcome the boundary of the intermediate phrase. Some systems allow the use of downstepping and upstepping in a paradigmatic contrast with H and L, as an option to avoid the use of the mid tone, understanding that this mid tone in not a third independent variable, but that there is a conceptual in-absence link with the tone they are substituting.

8 The last two may often be merged together and specific production and perception experiments are needed in order to analyze them separately.
far as Romance languages are concerned, we highlight the Cat_ToBI system for Catalan (Prieto, 2002, Prieto et al., 2007), Sp_ToBI for Spanish (Beckman et al. 2002, Face and Prieto, 2006/2007), Portuguese (Frota, 2000), French (Jun and Fougeron, 2000), Oc_ToBI for Occitan (Hualde, 2003, Prieto and Sichel-Bazin, 2007-2010)

In the Italian case, Avesani’s ToBI (Avesani, 1995), establishes an inventory of 5 possible nuclear pitch accents and 4 edge tones on the basis of the analysis of Florentine Italian, as a step towards what she calls “a transcription system for Italian intonation” Her attempt was followed by analyses of local varieties of Italian, each one limited to one specific regional system. Grice et al., (2005) has proposed ToBI conventions which could account for the intonational analysis of four Italian varieties, spoken in Bari, Palermo, Napoli, Firenze.

2.2 Methods of the study: Materials and elicitation procedure

The main database for this study will consist of two parts. First, an intonation survey was used, which is based on that used by Prieto (2001) and is designed to evoke everyday situations. It is an inductive method in which the researcher presents the subject with a series of situations (such as “You go into a shop you have never been in before and ask the shop assistant if they sell sugar”) and then asks him or her to respond accordingly. This method is especially useful because it allows the researcher to obtain a wide range of intonation contours that are difficult to obtain with other methods. This role-play interview is made up of 57 different situations corresponding to different pragmatic sentence types. In the case of Italian, the situations were presented twice: once orally, by the interviewer and once by showing a written text. For each presentation, the speaker will be elicited twice, once spontaneously, by reacting his or her own way to the situation and using his or her own words, and once, right afterwards, by reading the suggested sentence, still bearing in mind the same pragmatic intention. Thus we will have a total of 57*2*2 = 208 elicited sentences per speaker. The target sentences include questions (confirmation seeking and information seeking ones, biased or not, according to the associated situation, yes/no and wh- questions), statements (categorical, dubitative, with broad focus, contrastive or non-contrastive narrow focus), vocatives, imperatives, exclamatives, with several semantic and pragmatic nuances too, which are usually relevant to intonation, such as surprise, offer, politeness, exhortation, doubt. This way we will have a uniform lexical basis of comparison (suggested sentences) and the most natural possible intonation associated to it (that which echoes in the speaker’s mind after pronouncing his spontaneous version). In the case of dialect and L1-dialect speakers we cannot forget that we are mainly dealing with unalphabetized people and the role-play interview and elicitation of all nuances
will not always be easy. Furthermore the contexts will only be presented orally, as dialect is no written language. I would like to observe that, thanks to the choice of lexicon it includes, especially words with much pre-tonic and post-tonic material (multi-syllable and pre-paroxitotone words), our questionnaire may be able to disambiguate between tonal targets and phrase accents and tell us, for instance, when a trailing tone exists and is anchored to the tonic syllable or when it is an acoustic interpolation phenomenon due to a farther-located target. In this respect, I must mention that, for the same purposes, in order to catch and account for a particular behavior of vocatives in Pescara, which will be described in the section on preliminary results, we need to slightly modify the questionnaire, and indeed add elicitation of more vocative sentences, in which a certain name to be elicited will be chosen to be initially-stressed. Also the dialect questionnaire, only oral, required some adaptation to the characteristics of Pescara dialect. The Italian questionnaire can be found in the Appendix.

Second, we will make use of a powerful elicitation tool, the so-called Map Tasks (Anderson et al., 1991), an interactive game-like interview that has proven to be very useful in triggering performance of different pragmatic kinds of spontaneous interrogative sentences (information-seeking and confirmation-seeking questions). In this validated technique, each of the two subjects has a map of an imaginary town marked with buildings and other specific elements, such as fountains and monuments. A route is marked on the map of one of the two participants, and that person has the role of the instruction-giver. The version of the same map held by the other participant differs from that of the instruction-giver in that it does not show the route to be followed. The second participant therefore has to ask the instruction-giver questions in order to be able to reproduce the same route on his or her own map. In using the Map Task technique, we will try to follow the steps of the extensive work carried out by the “GREP - Grup d'Estudis de Prosòdia” (based at the UPF and the UAB in Barcelona) regarding internal comparison framework and some elicitation strategies. The group at the host institution is concerned in the creation of a typological Romance Atlas which already includes varieties of Catalan, Occitan, Spanish, Sardinian, and French. Some of our guidelines will be a recent work on interrogative sentences (Pérez-Broncano, Prieto, Estebas-Vilaplana and Vanrell, in press; Vanrell, Mascaró, Prieto & Torres-Tamarit, 2010), especially in using the method of elicitation through the Map Tasks. Testing the validity of Map Tasks as a specific elicitation strategy is also one of our specific objectives.

2.3 Methods of the study: speakers
In order to get enough information on prosodic variation as a function of social variation, as well as diachronic data and evidence of change, we need to cross some sociolinguistic parameters in our study, such as age, style and gender, and establish the L1 or dominant language of each speaker. The potential overlap of more socio-linguistic variables in the same groups of subjects requires that we be careful about the way we treat the parameters according to which we choose our groups and might prevent us from drawing conclusions about which parameters influence certain phenomena observed. For instance, high degrees of illiteracy and older ages coincide in the dialect-dominant speakers. Furthermore, due to urbanization, it is increasingly difficult to find a statistically significant sample group of young L1-dialect informants from this restricted metropolitan area. Young individuals, especially from the urban area of Pescara, are typically proficient only in Italian and use dialect in a few and somehow laid-back contexts (such as talking to elderly people or to people from the country-side) whereas older subjects usually fall into two categories: those who have spoken Italian in their family, whose L1-language is thus Italian and make little use of dialect, and the L1-dialect natives, which have been learning Italian as a second language but under a real stimulus of useful communication.

The data collection phase in this study includes recordings of (1) native L1-dialect old speakers from Pescara and the surrounding metropolitan area, both in Pescara dialect and Pescara Italian, and (2) young and aged L1-Italian speakers, just in Pescara Italian. L1 dialect subjects are usually illiterate and have a moderate L2-knowledge of Italian, used for everyday communication in formal contexts, they understand Italian, but can’t speak it properly. L1-speakers of Italian understand dialect and usually can speak a mixture of it with Italian.

Here is the multi-faceted comparison we want to carry out:

A) aged L1-Italian speakers from Pescara speaking Italian vs young L1-Italian speakers from Pescara speaking Italian,
in order to identify a possible greater influence of dialectal intonation on the variety of Italian spoken by aged L1-Italian speakers, because of the greater contact in the two language these speakers experienced, and to see which diachronic differences should be taken into account in future studies, when Italian spoken by those young people will be the only variety left

B) aged L1-Italian speakers from Pescara speaking Italian vs aged L1-dialect speakers from Pescara speaking Italian
in order to investigate whether, taking for granted the assumption that L1 intonation features are mainly transferred to L2, we can clearly distinguish a Pescarese non-dialectal intonation: we will also investigate potential effects of L2 over L1.

C) aged L1-Italian speakers while they speak Italian vs aged L1-dialect speakers while they speak dialect, i.e., each one speaking their own native language
as in the previous comparison, the goal is to investigate the possible existence of a non-dialect Pescara intonation. This time we do not need the assumption that L1 intonation is brought into L2, but we can only compare those contexts where the syntactic structures of the two languages are the same and intonational segmentations are compatible.

D) aged L1-dialect speakers from Pescara speaking Italian vs the same aged L1-dialect speakers from Pescara speaking dialect
to check, where segmental structures are compatible, possible personal tools of adaptation and internally-induced change from L1 to L2 and test whether the subjects are more likely to maintain one personal intonational code or split into two systems.

We are planning on interviewing 8 young speakers between 23 and 38 (4 male and 4 female), all with high school education, 6 aged L1-Italian (3 male and 3 female) speakers, between 65 and 80, mainly with high education and 6 aged L1-dialect (3 male and 3 female) speakers, mainly illiterate. The young speakers and some of the aged L1-Italian speakers have been already recorded

2.4 Methods of the study: recordings, digitalization, phonetic transcription in Praat and data storage

The data recordings will be carried out in Pescara with 2 professional different sets of recording and microphone equipment (Marantz digital recorder and professional directional microphones, Sony TCD-D100 DAT and Shure SM58 unidirectional dynamic microphones). We will transfer our data to a computer; in the case of DAT recording, data will be acquired by means of the audio processing software Goldwave Editor Pro. Later we will employ the software PRAAT (Boersma and Weenink, 2009) for splitting up the audio clips, look at their spectrograms and F0 contours and getting them ready for acoustic analysis. Still within the PRAAT environment, when needed, we will be able to create text grids for text transcriptions and labeling over the F0 contour graph.
As to the way to proceed in the classification and storing of data, bearing in mind the sociolinguistic reality we are trying to photograph in all its possible facets, we will cross two types of orderings. We will group the data by speakers and groups, but we will also classify the corpus by sentence type, putting together all sentences of just one given pragmatic type, uttered by all possible speakers of one given language, in order to be able to identify the tone and accent sequence (or sequences, in some cases) associated to that type. We will use this method to create our intonational dictionaries. The labeled clips produced in PRAAT, endowed with transcriptions of all syllables, will be included in the second archive.
3. PRELIMINARY FINDINGS AND EXPECTED RESULTS

3.1 Pitch accents and boundary tones in Pescara Italian: a ToBI proposal

For the first part of our study, we have analyzed Pescara Italian questionnaires with young people, gathered and analyze the results, and presented them at the Pre-ToBI workshop meeting which was held in Barcelona, in December 2010. 7 young speakers, 33 sentence types per speaker had been recorded and analyzed at that time. The goal of this study was to establish a possible set of pitch accents and boundary tones that fits the system observed. This set of data and its ToBI annotation will offer a quick overview on intonation in current Pescara Italian spoken by people between 25 and 35. The general proposal for the Pescara Italian ToBI inventory is that it has three main bitonal pitch accents, L+H*, H*+L, H+L*, plus a variant of the latter, which we claim to be phonologically distinct and we have labeled for the moment as ¡H+L*, for it shows a phonologically distinct pre-tonic rise. As for boundary tones, we have high and low intermediate and intonational boundary tones, as well as mid tones, labeled as !H%.

The falling pitch accent H+L* so far has been attested only in combination with a low boundary tone and is found, unsurprisingly, in broad focus statements. However, there are some cases in which this accent shows a rise on the pre-tonic syllable. We label this variant as ¡H+L*: it is also found (and here it is not replaceable by the simple H+L*) in categorical and narrow focus statements, as well as in confirmation seeking questions and in a peculiar type of vocative sentence, which we will call “dialect-type” vocative, for we believe it comes from substratum. In the case of broad focus statements, the tendency to prefer this variant rather than simple H+L* is associated to the sentence being an answer to a question or somehow a “reaction” rather than an “out-of-the-blue” utterance. We also have one occurrence in which this pitch accent is combined with a high boundary tone. We believe that this pitch accent comes from dialectal substratum and hope the following analyses will confirm it. Simple H+L* is also attested in imperative sentences, partial questions and surprise questions. The pictures below show the difference between these two pitch accents:
Figure 4: H+L* vs ¡H+L* “Beve una bibita” (“She’s having a drink”) uttered by the same speaker in two different ways.

The H*+L pitch accent in Pescara is prototypically associated with information-seeking questions. It shows a concave shape, consisting of a gradual rise towards a high peak located at the beginning of the stressed vowel, followed by a low target which is bound to the nuclear accented syllable. This pitch accent has been observed both in combination with both high and low boundary tones. We find it in information seeking and echo questions with a high boundary tone (See Fig. 6), and in contrastive focus statements with a low boundary tone (See Fig. 5).
Fig. 5 H*+L L% and a prototypical sentence type: contrastive focus statement: “No, vorrei dei liMOni!” (“No, I would like lemons!”)

Fig.6 H*+L H% and a prototypical sentence type: information-seeking polar question: “Avete dei mandaRIni?” (“Have you got tangerines?”)

The third pitch accent, L+H*, is used for itemizing in lists. It usually has a convex or convex-to-concave shape, reaching a high target (or plateau) at the end of the stressed vowel, or after it. Except one special case, where the speaker is trying to convey boredom, it is followed by a
high boundary tone. This is also the case of the first item in a disjunctive question. Followed by a medium (or downstepped) boundary tone, instead, it can be found in one type of vocative sentences, the so called Italian-like vocative, for it is present in many Italian varieties and we believe it was not originated by the substratum. This accent is commonly found in pre-nuclear position too.

Fig. 7 L+H* H% and a prototypical sentence type: item in list: “Cocco, melone, MEla, anguria, arancia, mandarino, limone” (“Coconut, melon, apple, watermelon, orange, tangerine, lemon”)

The following table displays the full Pescara Italian ToBI inventory proposed so far:

<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>H%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Information Seeking Y/N questions -Echo Y/N questions -Echo Wh-questions</td>
<td>-Item in list -First tone in disjunctive question -First tone in wh-question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!H%</td>
<td>-Broad Focus Statement -Imperative Sentence -Last item in declarative list -2nd tone in disjunctive question -Surprise Y/N questions -2nd tone in Wh-question</td>
<td>-Answer -Categorical -Evident -Narrow focus -Confirmation seeking Y/N questions -Vocative (1st type)</td>
<td>-Contrastive narrow focus statement -Exclamation -Exhortation</td>
<td>-Item in list (special, bored)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Selecting some test cases: interrogative and vocative intonation

As mentioned before, the Pescara-Italian contact situation involves a bilingualism. We would like to investigate whether the original dialect pattern is being substituted over the time by other intonational strategies, which we may call “more standard”, because they can be observed in many varieties of Italian, or whether the dialect intonation patterns may remain in the community’s system and pass on to regional Italian, or a combination of the two. The important next step will be to select intonation patterns that will be the target of our investigation.

Since we do not have our dialect data yet, we will start a selection of those intonation patterns found in the Pescara Italian corpus that are not shared by other varieties of Italian, since they will be likely to come from substratum\(^9\). We will also pay attention to those pragmatic types who may possibly show alternative intonational strategies, for the individuals might have developed a double linguistic code, and to those who show a main strategy with many exceptions, or a big variety of strategies, which could be those in which substitution is taking place.

3.2.1. Polar questions

Polar questions are a pragmatic type which has often been object of investigation in Italian regional studies, and even for comparative studies, because it is possibly the type of sentence which shows the greatest variation among Italian varieties. In Elordieta and Romera’s study on Majorcan Catalan and Spanish (Elordieta, Romera, \(submitted\)), we have also seen how polar questions are the pragmatic type which is mostly subject to undergo modification due to contact, and we commented that speakers are most likely to “accommodate” their intonation to the listener’s intonation, while performing a question, because it is a situation of closer interaction. That is why we decided to focus our analysis also on Pescara’s polar questions. Moreover, they show a peculiar type of nuclear pitch configuration in the Pescara Italian system described above. The target \(H^*+L\) intonation pattern is not found in most of the genetically more strictly related Southern varieties. In their survey, Grice et al. (2005) find a \(L^*+H\) nuclear pitch accent in Naples and Palermo, \(L+H^*\) in Bari and \(H^*\) in Florentine. We found this tonal configuration in all kinds of polar questions in Pescara Italian, where we may observe occurrences of \(¡H+L^*\) too, and alternation in the use of boundary

---

\(^9\) When talking about substratum, I do not only mean dialect, but dialect plus the dialectally-origined linguistic core which has been maintained by the community and possibly, referring to intonation, got to become part of the local Italian intonational system
tones. As for the Italian data, high boundary tones and the use of H*+L, rather than ¡H+L*, is more attested in those social groups who represent, in sociolinguistics, prestige (women) and future tendency (young people). This is why we expect to find only low boundary tones and more occurrences of the ¡H+L* pitch accent in dialect data. Our hypothesis is that there have been many influences from some Central varieties on the way of uttering polar questions in Pescara. The use of H*+L, might have come at an earlier stage, and influenced dialect, whereas the tendency to use high boundary tones came later.

As we have already observed, a very peculiar Pescara pattern is the descending pitch accent with a pretonic rise, ¡H+L*. We already mentioned that there seem to be two parallel intonational strategies for performing a vocative sentence and this accent appears in one of them. This leads us to choose this sentence type as one of those to put under observation for our analysis.
As mentioned before, in Pescara Italian, the unmarked pattern for information-seeking polar questions is H*+L H%, and if we add post-tonic material (see Fig. 12), we can observe a low plateau from the trailing tone until the end of the sentence and a sudden rise at the boundary. This leads us to posit the existence of a compound edge tone: LH%. If the speaker wants to express a certain degree of confidence (confirmation-seeking questions) he/she usually lowers the boundary tone, thus producing an H*+L L% sequence. There are cases, however, of information-seeking questions with a low boundary tone (see Figure 13, 14), and other cases showing a descending pitch accent with a low boundary tone (see Figure 15), usually expressing a nuance of disagreement. Finally, we found some cases of ¡H+L* in combination with a high boundary tone (see Figure 16).

Fig. 12 The standard configuration H*+L LH% for polar questions. “Avete delle MANdorle?” (Have you got almonds?)

Fig. 13 Information-seeking question with low boundary tone: “Ma Susanna, alla fine, l’ha troVAto?” (“Did Susan finally find him?”)
Fig. 14 Another instance of information seeking questions with a low boundary tone: “Avete dei mandarini?” (“Have you got tangerines?”). Notice that the focus is on the verb which therefore carries another pitch accent.

Fig. 15 Descending question “Ma Loredana è andata a vivere da Davide?” (“Did Loredana go live at David’s?”) with a nuance of wonder.
What we can observe is that the use of dialect and descending patterns, in general, expresses self-confidence and authority in the way the question is posed and sort of a looking down attitude towards the listener. In the case of young people, we believe they resort to either lowering the boundary tone, or using the Ê+L* pitch accent, in order to express such self-confidence, and we believe they are retrieving a dialectal pattern.

Here we have to be very careful in distinguishing the sentences based on the number of pitch accents: the same sentence “Avete dei mandarini?” (“Have you got tangerines?”), may or may not display a pre-nuclear accent, according to the focus.
Fig. 17a and 17b Double and single pitch accent respectively, “Avete dei mandarini?” (Have you got tangerines?”)
But only in the presence of a double accent do we find some occurrence in which the speakers slightly lower the boundary tone (see figure 14 and 17a above). We believe that in dialect we had the ¡H+L* L%, in the case without pre-nuclear accent, which has totally changed to H*+L H% in Italian, and H*+L L% where the pre-nuclear accent (¡H+L*) was present, which has only (and still not always!) raised its boundary tone, instead. If this hypothesis is confirmed by studies on elder people and by dialect data, we would have that the dialect pattern which has remained similar (preceded by pre-nuclear accent) still attracts L1-Italian speakers to the point that they end up using dialect intonation, whereas another pattern which has already become too different, has been totally replaced and forgotten and is unable to produce such influence.

By these assumptions, as one can notice, I am understanding that H*+L belongs to the dialect inventory too. The only thing the dialect system would lack is a high boundary tone. We expect, with older people and L1-dialect speakers, and in a less controlled elicitation context, to find a wider occurrence of low boundary tones.

Fig. 18 The standard configuration H*+L L% for confirmation seeking questions: “Vuoi le mandorle?” (“You want almonds?”)

Besides occurring, as in the picture above, after the H*+L accent and along with a higher degree of confidence by the speaker (confirmation-seeking), when following a descending accent, the low boundary tone can be thought of as a reminiscence of a dialectal strategy resorting to syntactic
means, mimicking this way a wh-question. Our idea is that in dialect, instead of a real dichotomy information vs confirmation-seeking questions, there is a competition between a more conservative form of Southern heritage with a low boundary tone and a more Standard one, coming from Rome and from Central Italy, and representing at the moment the most common configuration in Pescara Italian for polar questions, that is, H*+L LH% (here the boundary tone is marked but also the pitch accent is aligned differently from central Italian varieties).

Another idea about lowering of the boundary tones is that often southern dialects omit what would be the last syllable appearing in the corresponding Standard Italian expression. When translating into Italian, then, speakers would be forced to add an artificial syllable which is incapable of bearing intonational features (and therefore markedness, and therefore a high boundary tone).

\[10\] In Pescara dialect, the “che”/“chi” particle may introduce a question, which takes on a \( \mu H+L\) pitch accent: while speaking Italian the speaker has to omit it, and the resulting pattern remains that of the substratum.

\[11\] Here, I mean Southern as distinguished from extreme Southern, and specifically within the Neapolitan influence.
3.2.2. Calling contours

As we already mentioned, within each speaker we can find two completely different contours associated to the utterance of a (calling) vocative sentence. One of them is labeled as L+H* !H% and is found in many Italian varieties. It is kind of a “chanting” pattern used to call somebody and it can be considered as an Italian-type vocative. Its fundamental frequency contour is illustrated in the following figure:

![Fig. 9 “Domenico! DoMEnico!” Italian-like vocative L+H* !H%](image)

On the other hand, we have a special vocative realization which makes use of a descending pitch accent with pretonic rise and a low boundary tone, and I would claim that this is strictly connected to the dialectal linguistic code. This second vocative pattern is labeled as !H+L* L% and referred to as the dialect-like vocative sentence.
Fig. 10a and 10b “DoMEnico!” and “DoMÉ’!” Dialect-like vocative strategy: ¡H+L* L%

We presented a situation in which the speaker pretended to call aloud “Domenico!”, to check whether Domenico is at home and repeat the calling after a while (insistent vocative). We can see the indistinct use of the two patterns: although there is a tendency of the dialect-like one to be used as insistent, sometimes it goes the other way around. Therefore we can not claim anything about specific patterns associated to insistency. Although not always, while realizing the dialect-type vocative, the speakers perform truncation of post-tonic material (see example in fig. 10b), a typical Pescara dialect segmental rule for vocative and thus, although they have been asked to speak Italian, end up performing a sentence which belongs to dialect, at a segmental level too. Surely, no utterance undergoing truncation carries the Italian-type intonation. By contrast, in our data, occurrences of dialect-type vocative without truncation as in Fig. 10a are very rare. Although the “chanting” vocative is perceived as more polite and preferred by women, we can fairly claim, in terms of language contact, that each Pescara speaker has developed two parallel intonational strategies, reflecting two different codes, one associated to Italian, and another one to the dialect. As the ¡H+L* L% pattern for vocative is significantly associated with truncation and perhaps coming from the Pescara dialect, we may wonder whether the ¡H+L* pitch accent itself, indeed a peculiarity of Pescara Italian, comes from substratum.

We have noticed a curious phenomenon, which may serve as an indicator of the possible dialectal origin of this pitch accent and at the same time gives us a very special example of anchorage between stress tier and tone tier. We have observed that the ¡H+L* pitch accent has a pretonic rise, which is often realized within the pretonic syllable. As it is commonly the case in intonational literature, leading and trailing tones have to be preceding or following the starred tone,
anchored to the stressed syllable, but they do not themselves have to be anchored to the pretonic or post-tonic syllable and, in the absence of such syllables, they can adapt to shrink and fit at the beginning or at the end of the stressed syllable. This is also the case of edge tones in oxotone sentences, for instance, and some instances of final oxotone words merging trailing tone and edge tones in southern varieties (Grice et al., 2005). Nevertheless, what happens in Pescara seems to contradict this fact. In absence of pretonic material, while performing dialect-type vocatives, the leading tone seems to be unable to shrink and adapt to the poorness of segmental material. We have tried to substitute the name “Domenico” with an initially-stressed one, “Giacomo” or “Stefano”, and the result is that, while the Italian-like realization can omit the low leading tone, the dialect-type vocative, having become monosyllabic after truncation, adds on one artificial syllable, “A’”, on which the speakers can perform the pretonic rise. In music and poetry, the addition of material right before the stressed unit (or the strong beat) is referred to as anacrusis and we will use this term to denote our phenomenon, in line with other works in the literature (Cruttenden, 1986).

Fig. 11 ¡H+L* in initially-stressed words and the anacrusis. Compare “A’ GIÀ’!” with “DoMÉ’!”
We believe that the systematic occurrence of anacrusis could be very important in overall intonation theory first of all because, if confirmed, it may show a case of adaptation and reshaping of the morpho-syntactic and segmental form to a specific intonational need. Secondly, it would tell us that there is some linkage or bound, which goes beyond pure matters of alignment, between the presence of this leading tone and the segmental material strictly preceding the whole stressed syllable, that is, the pretonic syllable. Notice that anacrusis does not happen in other varieties from Abruzzo, which manage to fit the rise at the beginning of the stressed syllable.
4. WORK PLAN

A brief working schedule, subject to modification, can be sketched as follows:

PAST STAGES OF THE STUDY: Recording of 8 Italian young speakers (questionnaire), for a total of 1824 sentences (57 sentence-types * 8 speakers * 4 repetitions), data analysis on a subset of 31 basic sentence types and presentation of a first draft project in the Pre-ToBI workshop in Barcelona. Recording of some Italian old informants (questionnaire)

JUNE-JULY 2011 Preparation of the Map Tasks, recruiting of L1-dialect informants and audio material. Participation in the Romance workshop on intonation in Tarragona. Recording more old informants. Recordings of the first Map Tasks.

AUG 2011-NOV 2011 Preparation of a first description of Pescara Italian intonation based on all situations in the questionnaire, analysis of Italian older informants. Preparation of a first paper describing the whole first phase on Pescara Italian. Preparation of dialect Map Tasks and questionnaires.

DEC 2011-FEB 2012 Second recording phase: elicitations of L1-dialect informants from Pescara, both in dialect and in Italian: the questionnaires and the MapTasks. Card playing recordings.

MAR 2012-JUN 2012 Data analysis and annotation, description, first evidences from intonation comparison between regional Italian and dialect.

JUL 2012 Presentation in congresses of the first descriptive results on dialect and confrontation with experts on bilingualism and intonation transmission. Integration of supplementary data where needed.

AUG 2012-NOV 2012 Analysis of studies on intonation in other languages, in bilingualism, in language contact and production of new material on bilingualism and intonation transition, with a hypothesis about the existence or non-existence of a non-dialect Pescara intonation.

DEC 2012-FEB 2013 Presentation of papers and results.
FEB 2013-JUN 2013 Preparation of the thesis in its overall framework, including previous studies and theoretical reflections on contact issues, and a possible further analysis of data in a wider comparative perspective of a romance theory of intonation.

JUL 2013 Presentation and defense of the final thesis.

5. APPENDIX: THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. intonazione dichiarativa

1.1. tipo neutro

Una unità tonale

1. Ti hanno chiesto se preferisci le pere o i mandarini. Tu rispondi mandarini.

*I mandarini.*

2. Guarda la figura e dimmi che cosa fa Maria.

![Maria mangia il mandarino.](image)

*Maria mangia il mandarino.*

3. Guarda il disegno e dimmi che cosa fa Maria.

![Beve una bibita.](image)

*Beve una bibita.*

Liste

4. Elenca i frutti che ti piacciono di più.

*Fragoline angurie mandarini banane mandorle amarene e limoni.*

5. Dimmi i giorni della settimana.

*Lunedì martedì mercoledì.....*
Periferia della frase
6. Immagina di aver appena incontrato un conoscente di Modena e, chiacchierando, tu gli dici:
   
   *Mia nonna ci ha vissuto per molti anni a Modena.*

1.2. tipo non neutro

Focus Contrastivo

7. Entri in un negozio dove c’è una commessa. Le dici che vorresti un paio di limoni. Lei
   annuisce e ti dice: “Bene, le prendo subito delle arance”. Dille di no, che ciò che vuoi sono i
   limoni.
   
   *No! Vorrei dei limoni.*

Esclamativa

   
   *Ma che buon odore di mandorle!*

Dichiarative categoriche

9. Tu ed un tuo amico state parlando di alcuni vostri conoscenti che vogliono comprare un
   appartamento, ma non sanno con certezza dove comprarlo. Tu sei convinto/a che questi
   conoscenti abitino a Milano, ma il tuo amico ti dice di no, che vivono a Ravenna. Tu lo
   contraddici, con convinzione, affermando che, no, loro vivono a Milano.
   
   *No no no. Guarda che vivono a Milano!*

Dichiarativa dubitativa

10. Il tuo amico Domenico ti ha chiesto il favore di chiedere alla sua ragazza, Loredana, di
    venire con voi a fare un’escursione. Tuttavia tu che la conosci pensi che lei non ami fare
    escursioni. Fai presente al tuo amico, quindi, che forse lei non vorrà venire.
    
    *Forse Loredana non vorrà venire.*

Dichiarativa palese

11. Sei con il tuo amico Giovanni, cui fai la confidenza che il vostro amico Stefano ha una
    relazione clandestina. Il tuo amico ti chiede chi sia l’amante. Sei molto sorpreso che lui non lo
    sappia perché tutti sanno che l’amante è Loredana.
    
    *(Giovanni! Ma come non lo sai?) La sua amante è Loredana!*
Esclamative
12. Sei in un ristorante a Modena assieme a un amico. Hai ordinato dei tortellini fatti in casa, i più buoni che tu abbia mai mangiato. Cosa dici?
*Magnifici!* *Questi sono i migliori tortellini di Modena!*

2. intonazione interrogativa (interrogativa totale)
2.1. tipo neutro

Una unità tonale
13. Entri in un negozio in cui non sei mai andato prima e chiedi se hanno mandarini.
*Avete dei mandarini?*

14. Entri in un negozio in cui non sei mai andato prima e chiedi se hanno mandorle.
*Avete delle mandorle?*

Più di una unità tonale
*È tornata Barbara?*

Disgiuntive
*Vuoi il gelato alla vaniglia o alla banana?*

17. Hai preparato del latte di mandorle da offrire ad alcuni amici che sai non gradiscono il gelato alla banana. Chiedi a uno di loro se preferisca il gelato alla vaniglia o il latte di mandorle.
*Vuoi il gelato alla vaniglia o preferisci il latte di mandorle?*

Enumerazioni
18. Entri in gelateria per comprare un gelato per il tuo fidanzato/a che è rimasto a casa. Lui/lei adora i gusti alla frutta, ma ce ne sono molti, e sei indeciso. Lo chiami per chiedergli quale fra quei gusti alla frutta lui/lei preferisca.
Qui ci sono vari gusti. Vuoi fragola anguria mandarino banana mandorla amarena o limone?

Periferia della frase
19. La tua amica sta cercando il suo ragazzo, Davide, ma tu non sai se alla fine l’ha trovato. Vedi qualcuno che conosce entrambi e lo chiedi a lui.
Loredana l’ha trovato Davide?

20. Chiedi a un’amica comune notizie di Loredana, che si è da poco trasferita a Milano, dove abita il suo fidanzato Davide:
E’ andata a vivere da Davide Loredana?

2.2. tipo non neutro
Focalizzazione e enfasi (con frase scissa)
E’ Loredana che arriva?

Esclamative
22. Gli operai dovevano arrivare alle dieci, ma tu sei dovuto uscire per una commissione e hai lasciato tua figlia a casa ad aspettarli. Quando arrivi ti accorgi che non sono ancora arrivati e, sorpreso/a, le chiedi se davvero non sono ancora arrivati
Ma non sono ancora arrivati!?

Vuoi le mandorle!?

Richieste di conferma
24. Domenico ti ha appena detto che verrà con te a cena. Sai che lui esce solo con la sua fidanzata, Loredana, ma gli chiedi conferma circa il fatto che ci sarà anche lei.
Viene anche Loredana no?
25. Stai aiutando tua mamma a preparare un dolce. Lei si aggira per la cucina cercando l’ultimo ingrediente, le mandorle, senza trovarle. Le chiedi se stia cercando le mandorle, sapendo bene quale sarà la risposta.

_Vuoi le mandorle?_

**Imperative**

26. I tuoi nipoti stanno ascoltando la televisione ad un volume altissimo. Chiedi se lo possono abbassare

_Il volume! Volete abbassare il volume?_

**Offerte**

27. Chiedi ai tuoi amici se vogliono venire a bere una birra con te.

_Volete venire a bere una birra?_

28. Chiedi alla tua nipotina se vuole una bambola.

_Vuoi una bambola?_

**Invito**

29. Chiedi alla tua nipotina se vuole una bambola.

_La vuoi una bambola?_

**Domande retoriche**


_Povero me! Ci sarà mai un po’ di silenzio e calma in questa famiglia?_

4. _intonazione interrogativa (interrogative parziali)_

3.1. _tipo neutro_

**Una unità tonale**

31. Chiedi che ora è.

_Che ora è?_
32. Sei a Parigi in vacanza e vuoi comprare un regalo per una ragazza che non conosci molto bene ma con cui vuoi fare bella figura. Telefonii alla sua più cara amica e le chiedi cosa le regalerebbero, secondo lei, le sue amiche intime.

`Che cosa le regalerebbero?`

33. Un tuo amico ti dice di aver comprato due scatole di caramelle molto difficili da trovare in una zona commerciale che tu conosci bene. Chiedi chi, dei negozianti della zona, le vendeva.

`Chi le vendeva?`

34. Sei con un amico in macchina e state andando in drogheria, ma tu non sai dov’è. Glielo chiedi.

`Dov’è la drogheria?`

**Più di una unità tonale**

35. Hai degli amici che fanno sempre dei regali molto ricercati. Si avvicina il compleanno di un tua amica e ti domandi cosa penseranno di regalarle. Immaginando qualcosa di molto particolare, ti chiedi cosa potrebbero regalarle se vivessero in un paese povero (ad esempio in Ghana) in cui si trovi solo quanto serve a sopravvivere.

`E se vivessero in Ghana (che) cosa le regalerebbero?`

**Liste**

36. Tua figlia ti dice che stanotte va ad una festa. Sei molto preoccupato e le chiedi molte informazioni: dove va, con chi va, come ci arriva alla festa e quando tornerà a casa.

`Dove vai, con chi vai e quando tornerai`

**Periferia della frase**

37. Trovi un mazzo di chiavi a casa tua. Chiedi a tua mamma chi potrebbe averlo lasciato lì.

`Mamma sai chi l’ha lasciato lì?`

38. Trovi un mazzo di chiavi a casa tua. Chiedi a tua mamma chi potrebbe averlo lasciato lì.

`Sai chi l’ha lasciato lì mamma?`

**3.2. tipo non neutro**

**Esclamative**
39. Un tuo amico ti parla di una conoscenza comune che deve alla banca migliaia di euro e che tuttavia ha richiesto alla banca un altro prestito. Incredulo, tu chiedi di quanto denaro è in debito. 
*Ma quanto denaro deve alla banca!*

**Dubitativa**

40. Mentre dormi, alle due del mattino, qualcuno suona alla porta e ti sveglia. Ti chiedi chi possa essere a quest’ora. 
*Ma chi è a quest’ora?*

**Imperativa**

41. Hai chiesto più volte a tuo fratello di aiutarti a fare qualcosa ma non l’ha ancora fatto. Sei davvero arrabbiato, e gli chiedi quando ha intenzione di darti una mano. 
*Ma quando mi aiuterai!?*

**Esorativa**

42. Speravi di avere un amico per pranzo, ma lui ha rifiutato. Gli chiedi (quasi supplicante) perché non può venire. 
*Ma perché non vieni?*

**Imperativa**

43. Qualcuno ha macchiato la tua maglietta due volte ed entrambe le volte ti sei guardato intorno per vedere chi è stato. La terza volta che la maglietta è stata macchiata, vedi un tuo conoscente che veramente non ti piace perché è pettegolo ed insopportabile. Gli chiedi che cavolo vuole da te! 
*Ma cosa vuoi!?!*

**Retorica**

44. Hai chiesto ad alcuni colleghi di fare qualcosa per te mentre tu stavi fuori, ma quando rientri in ufficio scopri che non l’hanno fatta perché ti stavano aspettando. Chiedi a te stesso cosa potrebbero fare senza di te. 
*(Mamma mia!) Ma come farebbero senza di me?*

5. **intonazione interrogativa (domande eco)**

4.1. **tipo neutro**
Domande eco totali
45. Qualcuno ti dice l’ora ma tu non hai sentito molto bene. Pensi che abbia detto che sono le nove. Chiedi se è così.
(Cosa hai detto? che sono le nove?)

Domande eco parziali
46. Qualcuno ti chiede dove vuoi andare ma non hai capito molto bene. Cerchi di verificare se è proprio questo che ti hanno chiesto.
(Cosa hai chiesto? dove voglio andare?)

Disgiuntive
47. Stai organizzando una vacanza a Madrid con degli amici e qualcuno ti chiede come viaggerete. Non sei sicuro se questa persona intende come ci arriverete o come ritornerete da lì. Chiedi se intende la prima o la seconda cosa.
(Mi hai chiesto) in che modo arriveremo o in che modo ritorneremo?

Periferia della frase
48. Ti hanno detto che la tua amica Loredana vuole venire a fare un’escursione, ma tu sai che lei odia questo tipo di cose. Non ci puoi credere e chiedi se è proprio Loredana che vuole venire.
Loredana vuole venire?

4.2 tipo non neutro
Domanda totale con sorpresa
49. Ti hanno detto che la tua amica Loredana, notoriamente poco dotata in matematica, è diventata ingegnere. Non ci puoi credere e chiedi conferma.
Loredana un ingegnere?!?

Domanda parziale con sorpresa
50. Il tuo vicino ti ha detto di essere andato al ristorante a pranzo e di aver ordinato coniglio con cipolle. E’ convinto che gli volevano servire un gatto invece di un coniglio. Non ci puoi credere. Incredulo, gli chiedi di ripetere ancora una volta cosa crede che gli volessero servire.
Cosa ti volevano servire?
5. **Intonazione Imperativa**

**Ordini**

51. I tuoi nipoti stanno guardando la televisione con il volume altissimo. Dici loro di abbassare, perché è impossibile resistere.

*Il volume! Abbassate il volume!*


*Vieni qui per favore!*

53. Chiedi a un amico di andare al cinema con te. Ti dice che ha del lavoro da finire, ma tu sai benissimo che può farlo anche dopo il cinema. Cerchi di convincerlo a venire al cinema con te.

*E dai vieni!*

6. **Vocativi**

54. Entri nell’appartamento di Domenico ma non riesci a vederlo dall’ingresso di casa, Immagini che sia nel salone e lo chiami.

*Domenico!*

Passano 10 secondi ma nessuno ti risponde. Pensi che sia in un’altra stanza dell’appartamento, così lo chiami di nuovo.

*Domenico!*

7. **Topic contrastivo vs Focus contrastivo (Soggetto)**

55. Pranzo tra compagni di classe. Tuo fratello farà il caffè per tutti, e vuole sapere quanto zucchero può usare. Tu però non conosci le preferenze di tutti, ma solo quelle della tua compagna di banco Milena. Come lo prendono i tuoi amici? Tu rispondi:

*Milena lo vuole amaro.*

56. Marco ha preso il caffè per tutti, e tu lo aiuti a distribuire i bicchieri. Lui ti dice che uno è amaro. Tu pensi che sia per Milena, perché lei lo prende sempre amaro, ma non sei sicuro e allora gli chiedi se e’ proprio lei che lo vuole così. Chiedi:

*Milena lo vuole amaro?*
57. Marco ha preparato il caffè per tutti, e tu lo aiuti a distribuirlo. Lui ti dice che la tazzina senza cucchiaino è per Simona perché lei lo ha chiesto senza zucchero. Marco però si sbaglia secondo te. Così gli rispondi:
Milena lo vuole amaro.

6. FUTURE WORK PERSPECTIVES: OTHER COMPARATIVE STUDIES, INTERACTION WITH RHYTHM

A natural follow-up of this study will be to compare the intonation systems with that of other regional Italian varieties, with the collaboration of native researchers. The goal will be to evaluate the possible existence of a standard Italian intonation. Another potential comparison will take into account non-Italian languages showing different characteristics in terms of dialect variation. One of these could be Brazilian Portuguese, the language which has been object of sociolinguistic variational study in the student’s Master thesis and which, unlike Italian, shows diatopic varieties but not coexisting dialects and no subjacent internal bilingualism. Outside of the Romance area, an interesting comparison could come from documentation of Southern American native languages belonging to the Carib family, which are characterized by the presence of a falling interrogative pattern. Another interest of the researcher, within prosody, is combining the metric autosegmental system with a study on rhythm and the identification of connection between the type of accents and their distribution in time, in terms of the distance between syllables who carry them.
7. ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Colantoni, L.; Gurlekian, J., 2004
Convergence and Intonation: historical evidence from Buenos Aires Spanish

This paper describes a situation of intonational change due to contact, namely the modification of
two intonational patterns (pre-nuclear pitch accent and broad focus declarative final fall) in Buenos
Aires Spanish, as a consequence of contact with Italian immigrants. When Italian immigration in
Argentina is a sedimented and robust pre-existing reality, the picture includes a standard,
uniformizing language (Spanish, the official language, which is taught in schools), challenged by a
genetically similar “substratum” variety heavily present among the people.

The borrowing of intonational features, in this case, is from Italian to standard Buenos Aires
Spanish. The features which seems to have been replaced are the peak alignment in pre-nuclear
accents and the downstepping of nuclear falls in unfocused declarative sentences. The difference
between the starting pattern and that resulting after change is merely quantitative, as the patterns
show the same overall similar shape (although this does not mean that the difference is not
phonological). It is probably for this reason that the authors define the phenomenon as
“convergence” of one pattern into another.

The article points out an important factor which has helped this convergence: the resulting
Italian-type pattern already existed in Spanish, although it was associated with another pragmatic
intention (contrastive focus). What took place, then, according to the authors, was nothing but a
gradual dissociation of the pragmatic marking from that intonation, which became then the default
pre-nuclear declarative pattern.
The study reported by this article deals with intonation in a very peculiar situation of language contact, that of Spanish and Catalan in Majorca, none of which can be defined to be the dominant language. The author interviews bilingual subjects, grouped into Catalan-dominant and Spanish-dominant subjects; although focusing on a single sentence type, he crosses many sociolinguistic parameters and largely explores all possible aspects of change, both at a personal level, that is, within the (bilingual) individual, seen as some sort of pioneer of change, in both absorption and spreading of patterns, and at a social level, as a matter of interaction between individuals, as shown by comparison between bilinguals and monolinguals. The author observes that Spanish-dominant bilinguals’ intonation, within the speaker, is the same in both languages and, although more similar to Spanish monolingual-like intonation, it is slowly accommodating towards Catalan, especially in women, whereas Catalan-dominant bilinguals show a tendency to split into a double intonation system and strongly stick to Catalan monolingual-like intonation, while speaking Catalan, accommodating only in their L2 (Spanish). Also Catalan young people seem to show stronger Catalan intonation type than older subjects, and this is probably because written education in Catalan was only received by the young.

The methodology uses a very simple idea: measuring the contour tendency towards a certain pattern, in terms of a single-parameter variable, namely the contour convexity, in order to have an immediate quantitative definition of the behavior of the observed data.
This article faces the issue of whether, in a given linguistic area of Italy, dialectal prosodic features pass on to Italian, or instead other adaptational schemes take place. He investigates the dilalia situation (that is, local dialect vs local Italian) of two macro-areas of Salento, who share intonational schemes but belong to different linguistic (at the segmental level) areas, which suggests that one of the two, the most “innovative”, has at some time crossed the prosodic border towards the second one and undergone intonational change.

Through a series of recording and Map Tasks, the author collects and analyzes data from several communities, usually eliciting from the same speaker a sentence, both in Italian and in local dialect, chosen in such a way that the segmental material in the two language is similar and similarly distributed. While in most cases the dialectal pattern is identically transferred to Italian, to the point that the Italian and dialectal melodic contour actually coincide, there are some exceptions, where the speakers produce a different and “exotic” scheme while speaking Italian, which does not come from their own intonational dialectal substratum. These exceptions are the most interesting cases, because their studying could reveal something about prosodic change over time. First of all, exceptions always have to do with questions and expressions of surprise, whereas statements are more stable in that they copy the dialectal pattern onto Italian. Secondly, there is a macro-area (Southern Salento) which is less likely to produce these exotic schemes, which are more typical of Northern Salento. Finally, those Northern Salento speakers, when producing those exotic patterns, show a tendency to look for a hypotetical Standard Italian intonation, and end up using sometimes Southern Salento intonation, which they wrongly perceive as “more Standard Italian” and to which they associate more prestige. We can also observe speakers of Griko, another dialect, end up using Northern Salento intonation while speaking Italian. In other situations speakers are uncertain about which one is the “correct” intonation to use and, through several repetitions of the experiment, end up uttering sentences with various melodic contours.
The intonation of polar questions in two central varieties of Italian

The article arises from a study on intonation of Rome and Perugia Italian and makes use of Map Tasks for elicitations of polar questions, probably the sentence type expressing the widest variation across Italy.

The author studies polar questions of two central Italian varieties, one from Perugia and one from Rome, and finds in both a tritonal nuclear pitch accent which could be labeled as (L)HL and a L-H% boundary tone, sometimes realized as a L-L% in Rome. These exceptions are probably a sign of southern areal influence in Rome. The discussion goes on with the minimal classification of interrogative variation in terms of markedness or unmarkedness of pitch accent and boundary tones with respect to the declarative unmarked default case. While Rome seems to have a tendency to mark more the pitch accent, Perugia rather opts for the boundary tone.
5. D’Imperio, 2002

Italian intonation: an overview and some questions

In this article the author, after offering a review of the lit on Italian intonation and on the history attempts at defining an Italian intonation and labeling strategies, faces many theoretical issues and tries to answer by producing and analyzing data from Neapolitan Italian: the existence of the phrase accent and how to get around situations of overlapping of pitch and phrase accents, by using multi-syllable words, how to define nucleus and nuclear pitch accent in the Italian context. Then the author shows another experiment on recognizing broad focus and narrow focus and observes that in questions her subject had a harder time performing the task, for focus was often confused with saliency. Finally the author argues about downstepping and shows how downstep in Neapolitan applies only in post-focal and less prominent positions and can probably be assigned the role of less-than-nuclear accent. She also shows how a downstep relationship can apply across strong prosodic boundaries.
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