

On the Status and Transmission of Lingua Franca¹

Natalie Operstein

1. Introduction

The beginning of the controversy regarding the linguistic status of Lingua Franca may be dated to the year 1877, when the subject was thrashed out in a public correspondence in the popular London magazine *Athenaeum*. One of the correspondents, Hyde Clarke, contended that it was broken Italian rather than a separate language. Another, Prince Lucien Bonaparte, believed it to be a speech form as different from Italian as Portuguese- or Dutch-based creoles are different from the standard languages of Portugal or Holland.²

One hundred and thirty years later, the question is still unresolved, owing in part to the present state of Lingua Franca studies. The scientific study of this speech-form began with the now classic 1909 article of Hugo Schuchardt, who calls Lingua Franca a “communicative language”, “necessity language”, and “commercial argot”, whose surface structure may coincide with that of broken Italian, but which nevertheless differs from the latter by virtue of being stabilized through transmission from generation to generation by members of the communities concerned. Subsequent creolists writing on Lingua Franca refer to it as “pidgin” or “pidginized variety”.³ It is presently held that Lingua Franca has the distinction of being the earliest known pidgin with European-derived lexicon. Based on its lexicon, Schuchardt distinguishes between Spanish- and Italian- colored varieties of the essentially uniform Lingua Franca, with the geographical mid-point in Algiers (1979:35). Although later researchers tended to emphasize the role of Provençal in the lexical composition of Lingua Franca,⁴ a study of the vocabulary of all the known texts led Cifoletti (1989) to conclude that Schuchardt’s initial distinction between Spanish- and Italian-colored varieties was correct, Venetian being the principal source of the Italian-derived variety.⁵ The time of origin of Lingua Franca and the time of its falling into disuse have also been extensively discussed. The most widely-held notion is that it originated before or during the crusades and was dead by the time of Schuchardt’s article,⁶ although various researchers have pushed the date of its origin back to classical antiquity (Lang 1992:67) or forward to the sixteenth century (Camus Bergareche 1993:441ff).

¹ To appear in *Festschrift in Honor of Christoph Koch*, edited by Wolfgang Hock and Michael Meier-Brügger. I would like to thank the editors for their invitation to contribute to this volume, and Derek C. Carr for his valuable comments and suggestions.

² Bonaparte and Clarke (1877); Lang (1992:64).

³ Cf. Hall (1966:4); Hadel (1969:39); Coates (1971:25); Hancock (1981:391); Holm (1989:606f); Smith (1995:355).

⁴ E.g., Hall (1966:4); Hancock (1971:516 and 1981:391); Holm (1989:606), Smith (1995:355).

⁵ Additional calculations include Coates’ count of the vocabulary of the dialogues in the *Dictionnaire de la langue franque* (Anonymous 1830), which yielded 141 Italian words out of the total of 169 (1971:27), and a count of the lexical items in the body of the dictionary itself, where 55% of the lexicon appears to be Italian-derived (Cornelissen 1992:221, esp. ft 1). The vocabulary of Juan del Encina’s jocular *villancico* in Lingua Franca, written ca 1520, is also for the most part Italian-derived (Harvey, Jones and Whinnom 1967:575).

⁶ Whinnom (1977:308 ft 22); Do Couto (2002:187ff).

The scientific study of Lingua Franca, begun by Schuchardt, culminated in 1989 in Cifoletti's *La lingua franca mediterranea*, the fullest overall treatment of Lingua Franca since Schuchardt (1909).⁷ However, subdivisions of Lingua Franca studies have also appeared. Thus, beginning with Corominas' article in 1948, Lingua Franca began to interest Mediterranean lexicologists as a possible vehicle of vocabulary borrowing in that region.⁸ Studies of British slang have also leaned heavily upon Lingua Franca.⁹ Whinnom's book (1956) and his well-known article "The Origin of the European-Based Creoles and Pidgins" (1965), the most influential statement of the European-based creole monogenesis theory, put Lingua Franca in the role of archetypal European-based pidgin. This theory inspired a series of articles in which the grammatical features of Lingua Franca were compared to those of modern European-based creoles,¹⁰ and those which examine the possibility of such a connection on historical as well as linguistic grounds.¹¹

This brief overview of current scholarship on Lingua Franca brings us back to the essence of the 1877 debate: the question of its linguistic status. Bonaparte's position, stated in terms with which "modern creolists would not seriously disagree",¹² claims for the grammar of Lingua Franca a qualitative difference from that of Italian. Put in different words, Bonaparte, and the creolists writing on Lingua Franca after him, found the grammatical difference between it and Italian significant enough to consider it a separate language. Clarke's view of Lingua Franca as broken Italian means, in modern terms, that this is a collective name for a series of Italian interlanguages, or learners' varieties with various degrees of approximation to the grammar of Italian. Therefore, in his approach to Lingua Franca, Clarke concentrated on the similarity between its grammar and that of foreigners' Italian, rather than focusing on the difference between the two, as his opponent has done. Clarke's view of the situation, out of circulation for a considerable time, is beginning to gain ground again, especially with the recent advances in the field of the acquisition of Italian as a second language.¹³

In the remainder of this paper, I hope to show that the two views of Lingua Franca are reconcilable, since they concern two different facets of the language. Clarke's view of Lingua Franca as a series of (fossilized) interlanguages is concerned with the purely linguistic aspect of this speech form: a comparison of its grammar with that of Italian foreigner talk and early interlanguages indeed shows similarities that cannot be written off as a coincidence. Bonaparte's view of Lingua Franca as a pidginized variety of Italian, on the other hand, rests on sociolinguistic grounds, namely, on the fact that it was perceived by its contemporaries to be a separate form of communication. Before proceeding any further with the argument, it will be useful to examine the principal similarities between Lingua Franca and the early stages of Italian as a second language, as well as with Italian foreigner talk. For the sake of clarity, I do not compare features that can be regarded as universally applicable either to second language acquisition (e.g.,

⁷ A more recent treatment of a similar scope is Do Couto (2002) (reviewed in Operstein 2004).

⁸ Cf. Kahane et al. (1958); Whinnom (1966-67); Cifoletti (1979).

⁹ Cf. Partridge (1950); Hancock (1973 and 1984).

¹⁰ Hadel (1969); Wood (1971); Birmingham (1976).

¹¹ De Granda (1976 and 1977); Arends (1999).

¹² Whinnom (1977:297).

¹³ Cf. Camus Bergareche (1993); Minervini (1996:272ff).

lack of number and gender differentiation in nouns, or the omission of elements such as articles or prepositions), or to spoken language in general (for instance, the tendency towards parataxis). I concentrate instead on the common features of Italian interlanguages, foreigner talk, and Italian-based pidgins which seem to be specific to these forms: the verbal system, the copula, and the pronominal system.

2. The verb

The preface to the *Dictionnaire de la langue franque* describes the nineteenth-century Lingua Franca verb as having two forms: “Les verbes ne se conjuguent pas, ils n’ont que deux temps: l’infinitif qui est toujours terminé en ir ou en ar, et le participe passé en *ito* ou *ato*, fem. *ita*, *ata*” (Anonymous 1830). The simplified Italian of Ethiopia¹⁴ likewise has two forms, with the infinitive employed for all tenses, imperfective aspect, the conditional and imperative, and the past participle used for a simple past tense (Habte-Mariam 1976:174ff). In Italian foreigner talk, the infinitive and past participle, with or without an auxiliary, likewise tend to be overgeneralized at the expense of the finite forms of the verb (Berruto 1993:2283f).

For Italian interlanguages acquired in a natural setting, it has been possible to establish a developmental sequence in the acquisition of the verbal system. The first stage is characterized by the use of one basic form for all tenses and aspects. Although for most learners this tends to correspond to the third or (more rarely) second person singular of the Italian present tense,¹⁵ those having Chinese as their first language tend to overextend the infinitive.¹⁶ This tendency on the part of Chinese learners has been variously explained as a special simplifying strategy on the part of the learners, exposure to Italian foreigner talk, frequency of the infinitive in the input, but also by the formation of closed communities by Chinese immigrants, which favors fossilization of interlanguages at an early stage.¹⁷ The tendency among Chinese immigrants in Italy to use the infinitive rather than present tense as a generalized verb form is paralleled by a similar tendency among foreign workers in Switzerland,¹⁸ where the use of the infinitive is even more strongly linked to the sociolinguistic conditions. The presence of a large number of Italian-speaking immigrants, as well as the speakers of closely related languages -- Spanish, Catalan, and Portuguese -- favors the use of Italian as the lingua franca of intergroup communication among foreign workers, both at work and in informal situations. In addition, the prestige of Italian does not equal that of Swiss German, which makes the foreigner talk variety of this language an acceptable object of study, while in Italy it is but one of the varieties of Italian to which immigrants are exposed (Dal Negro 1994:60). It has been further claimed that the continuum of early interlanguages in Switzerland

¹⁴ In the only paper written on this speech form (Habte-Mariam 1976), it is described as a pidgin. However, since the beginning of research on the acquisition of Italian as a second language, it has become increasingly clear that it can be more adequately described as a continuum of interlanguages rather than a true pidgin (cf. Berruto 1987:178f; Berretta 1990c: 56 ft 7; Bernini 1990:82 ft 2).

¹⁵ There has been some discussion in the literature as to why it is this particular form that becomes generalized, since its total quantity in the input is inferior to that of the infinitive (Berretta 1992:141). The answer proposed by Giacalone Ramat connects this with the fact that third person singular, especially of the verbs in *-are*, coincides with the verbal stem, or common denominator of the paradigm, and for this reason can be easily extracted by the learners (1990:33-34).

¹⁶ Giacalone Ramat (1993:370f); Banfi (1993:58); Berretta (1990c); Berretta and Crotta (1991:317).

¹⁷ Banfi (1990:48); Berretta (1990a:180 ft 13).

¹⁸ Berruto (1987:177 and 1991:345); Dal Negro (1994:53).

shows traces of a true pidginization owing to the special conditions attending the use of Italian as a group language in a multilingual situation (Dal Negro 1994:72). In an environment where foreigner talk and non-native varieties of Italian assume the role of a target language, interlanguages stop at an early stage of development, do not evolve toward the standard, and their grammar becomes fossilized and internalized (Berruto 1991:342-44).

The next stage in the development of the verb system of early interlanguages is characterized by the addition of the past participle, generally without an auxiliary. It has been claimed that the resulting system of opposition is aspectual rather than temporal, with the participle being the marked form.¹⁹ This is the stage that structurally corresponds to the verb systems of foreigner talk, *Lingua Franca*, and the simplified Italian of Ethiopia described above. It is also found in numerous early written representations of Italian interlanguages, which agree with modern studies in having a verb system based on a two-form opposition (such a verbal system is found, e.g., in *greghesco*, the Italian of the Greek characters in sixteenth-century Venetian plays, cf. Lazzerini 1977:63).

To summarize: the verb systems of *Lingua Franca*, the simplified Italian of Ethiopia, Italian foreigner talk and early interlanguages tend towards a two-form opposition, basic form versus marked form, and seem to be founded on aspect. The marked form in all these is the Italian past participle, generally used without an auxiliary. The unmarked form tends to be the infinitive in all forms, except certain varieties of early interlanguages, where it apparently depends on the quality of input. Given the aspectual character of the opposition, all of the varieties also agree in making use of lexical means to specify the time of action, for instance, *bisogno* in *Lingua Franca*; *adesso, domani, ja* in the simplified Italian of Ethiopia; *presto, ieri* in foreigner talk; *adesso, oggi, domani, subito* in early interlanguages.²⁰ Finally, as the aspectual two-form opposition is common to both Italian foreigner talk and early interlanguages, one may safely ascribe the corresponding system in *Lingua Franca* to the summation of the tendencies of both.²¹

3. The copula

Italian has two verbs rendered by the English “to be”: *essere* (copula/existential) and *stare* (copula/locative). In foreigner talk, *essere* tends to be omitted about half of the time (Berruto 1993:2281), while in early interlanguages only the more phonetically salient forms, like *sono* or *siamo*, are realized (Berretta 1992:138). There has been no study specifically devoted to the realization of *stare* in either of these varieties, but evidence from Spanish, a closely related language with a similar opposition, suggests that *stare* will tend to be realized in foreigner talk in at least its locative function.²² In *Lingua Franca* and the simplified Italian of Ethiopia, *stare* is the only form of the pair that is used, and it does duty for both, as can be seen in the following examples:

(a) locative uses of *stare*

¹⁹ Giacalone Ramat (1993:371ff); Banfi (1993:59); Giacalone Ramat and Banfi (1990:421).

²⁰ Habte-Mariam (1976:178); Berruto (1993:2285f); Massariello Merzagera (1990:109-14).

²¹ Incidentally, it also becomes unnecessary to invoke the influence of a similar opposition in Arabic to explain the aspectual opposition in the *Lingua Franca* verb, as was done by Fronzaroli (1955:238f).

²² The data on Spanish foreigner talk is based on Thompson (1991:95ff).

loro stare addis abeba ‘They live in Addis Ababa’ (Habte-Mariam 1976:179);
star in casa? ‘Is he at home?’ (Anonymous 1830:94);
che ’I zingani in chel tempo star . . . in chesta tera? ‘that the gypsies were at that time in this land?’ (Pellegrini 1972:632);

(b) nonlocative uses of *stare*

adesso loro stare amico ‘Now they are friends’ (Habte-Mariam 1976:179);
qouesto star vero ‘This is true’ (Anonymous 1830:93);
No star beritae? ‘Isn’t it true?’ (Pellegrini 1972:632).

It is at least plausible to attribute this feature of Lingua Franca and the simplified Italian of Ethiopia to the summation of the tendency present in foreigner talk and learners’ varieties to omit *essere* while keeping *stare* which, in a pidgin, assumes the functions of a copula and general locative verb.

4. Personal pronouns

Anonymous (1830) gives *mi*, *ti*, *noi*, and *voi* as first and second person pronouns; earlier or other contemporary texts provide in addition *tu*, *nos outros*, and *vos outros* (Cifoletti 1989:59). Subject pronouns are usually present beside the verb, presumably to make up for the lack of declension; but not necessarily so. In the dialogues provided in Anonymous (1830:94), one finds sentences such as *cosa counchar?* (rendered as ‘que fasons-nous?’) and *qué pensar?* ‘qu’en pensez-vous?’. In commands, the pronoun may be either present or absent, cf. *ti sentar* ‘asseyez-vous’ vs. *andar fora* ‘allez-vous en’ (Anonymous 1830:95). Third person pronouns are absent in subject position in the dialogues, cf. *e il padré di ti commé star?* ‘et Monsieur votre père comment est il?’ -- *non star bouonou* ‘Il n’est pas bien’ (Anonymous 1830:94). Object pronouns in Anonymous (1830), identical in form to the subject ones, are preceded by a pronominal object marker *per*, cf. *mi tenir piacher conoschir per ellou* ‘je serais bien aise de faire sa connaissance’; *qouando piacher per ti* ‘quand il vous plaira’.

In the simplified Italian of Ethiopia, the opposition between subject and object pronouns exists for the first and second person singular, *iy/me*, *tu/te*; for the rest of the forms there is no such distinction. The indirect object pronoun is placed after the verb and preceded by the indirect object marker *ber* (< *per*) (Habte-Mariam 1976:177f). From the examples cited, it appears that the presence of a subject pronoun is obligatory in declarative sentences but unnecessary in commands, cf. *kwello luy dire ber te tu dire ber me* ‘you will tell me that which he tells you’; *benire sera sera* ‘come every evening’ (Habte-Mariam 1976:179).

For Italian foreigner talk, the order of preference in the use of pronouns as opposed to full forms seems to be the following: use of lexical items whenever possible (i.e., in the third person); explicit use of subject pronouns to make up for the reduced verb morphology (including first and second person pronouns in declarative sentences and second person pronouns in the imperative, i.e. where pronouns are not required in Italian); the use of stressed subject forms, to the exclusion of the unstressed ones, in both subject and object position.²³

Learners of Italian in the natural setting tend to replace third person subject pronouns with lexical items or omit them altogether when the referent is clear from the discourse. The subject pronouns of the first and second person are, on the contrary, acquired early and are used as obligatory subjects as a substitute for verbal inflection, and

²³ Berretta (1988:377f); Berruto (1993:2281f).

can even replace the verb, or the auxiliary, altogether. The first or second person pronouns can be omitted if their referent can be gathered from the context. Object pronouns, on the other hand, are not acquired until later, after a period of omission and substitution by subject pronouns which do duty for all object positions.²⁴

It has been frequently suggested that the pronouns of the first and second singular in Lingua Franca, *mi* and *ti*, originated in the oblique case pronouns of Italian (cf. Cornelissen 1992:220). Cifoletti seems to have been the first scholar to point out that these forms began as subject rather than oblique case pronouns -- the function they have in Venetian and other northern dialects (1989:59f). The tendency of the foreigner talk and early interlanguages to use the subject pronouns in all functions thus seems to confirm the origin of *mi* and *ti* in the subject pronouns of the base language(s).

5. *Per* as a pronominal case marker

Although our most complete primary source of Lingua Franca, Anonymous (1830), makes regular use of *per* as a marker of pronouns in nonsubject functions, there are reasons to doubt the regularity of this device in the actual language.

First, the use of *per* or, indeed, the marking of oblique case pronouns is either optional in or absent from all other known texts in Lingua Franca. When present, the marking of nonsubject pronouns can take different forms, as can be seen in the following examples from Giancarli's *Zingana* (1545) and two plays by Goldoni: *mi insegnata a ela un rasion e mandata ela; presta mi piata tia del cuna* (Pellegrini 1972:612); *mi te voler ben; voler far festa a mi / e mi testa voler taggiar a ti* (Goldoni 1941: X, 416f); *mi dir ti* (Goldoni 1941:1226); *mi far ti Levantina / e te prometter tutto* (Goldoni 1941:1211). The second argument follows from the inadequacy of traditional grammar when it comes to describing variation in such notoriously unstable forms as pidgins. When a modern linguist, aware of the problem,²⁵ sets about describing the grammar of the simplified Italian of Ethiopia, we must understand that he has chosen for description one of the *possible* grammars of this speech form. In other words, the grammatical description refers to tendencies rather than rules, and the actual usage may be less systematic than its description would suggest. The same reasoning may be applied to the grammar of Lingua Franca written in 1830. In fact, a statement comparable to the one above is found in the preface to that work, whose author writes: "Cet idiome, qui ne sert guère qu'aux usages familiers de la vie, et aux rapports commerciaux les moins établies; il diffère même sur plusieurs points, suivant les illes où il est parlé". Despite this avowal, the grammatical description of Lingua Franca and the grammar of the eight dialogues supplied at the end are remarkably consistent. One may conclude, from the similarity of the two situations, that in describing a pidgin in the nineteenth century, the author was facing the same difficulties as the twentieth-century scholar. Since it was not possible to capture the observed variation by means of a traditional grammar, the adopted course was in both cases to describe the most grammatically regular features of the possible forms. Applied to the oblique case marking in Lingua Franca as spoken in nineteenth-century Algiers,

²⁴ Berretta (1986: 332f and 1988:380ff); Giacalone Ramat (1988:200, 206).

²⁵ Habte-Mariam remarks on the simplified Italian of Ethiopia: "Some speakers are more fluent than others. Some show more concern for grammatical detail than others do, even if the grammar is not actually that of Italian. . . . Even the speech of individuals engaged in similar occupations differs in vocabulary and surface structure" (1976:174).

this means that if sentences without the pronominal object marker occurred in actual speech, the fact would not be recorded in this dictionary.

However, even if *per* was not obligatory, it unquestionably was there from at least as early as the sixteenth century, and the question of its origin still remains to be explored. The extant texts in Lingua Franca offer some help in this direction. Thus, in Goldoni's Lingua Franca, the use of *per* as an Accusative case marker is not confined to pronouns; cf. the following examples from *Le donne di casa soa*:

Ti qua trovar per zente (I, 4);

Mi proveder per tutto (I, 10);

Mi no voler per donna (IV, 5);

and from *L'impressario delle Smirne*:

aver ordinato per teatro (III, 10).

A similar use of *per* is attested in some learners' varieties, where it is employed as a general indicator of goal, direction, or indirect object, cf.:

lui mandato lettera ber me 'he sent me a letter';

io scritto ber Farid 'I wrote to Farid'.²⁶

Taking into account these data, it is possible to represent the development of the pronominal case marker in Lingua Franca as a following sequence of steps: (1) *per* is used with nouns and pronouns to indicate scope/goal/direction and, ultimately, Accusative case (a stage documented in Goldoni) or Dative case (a stage documented in early interlanguages); (2) use of *per* is restricted to pronouns, either as a Dative case marker (a stage attested in the simplified Italian of Ethiopia), or as a general oblique case marker (a stage represented by Anonymous 1830).²⁷

6. A summary or structural traits

Structural traits shared by Lingua Franca with the other forms of simplified Italian can be summarized in the following table:

	Lingua Franca	Foreigner Talk	Early Interlanguages	Simplified Italian of Ethiopia
Infinitive as the basic verb form	+	+	±	+
Past participle for perfective aspect	+	+	+	+
<i>Essere</i> omitted	±	+	+	±
<i>Stare</i> used as copula	±	+ (?)	+ (?)	±
Subject pronouns for object ones	+	+	+	+
Oblique pronominal case marker	+	-	±	+
Intelligibility to speakers of the base language	+	+	+	+

7. Stability and transmission of Lingua Franca

As the preceding analysis shows, Lingua Franca remained unchanged in its main structural features for an appreciable period of time; moreover, its structure contains virtually no innovations with respect to those of its main components, foreigner talk and learners' varieties. The question as to the reason for this remarkable stability naturally arises. In addition, the stage at which the summation of the elements of foreigner talk and

²⁶ Banfi (1988:137); Bernini (1989:140f).

²⁷ The possibility of a connection with object marking by means of spatial prepositions in Spanish (*a < ad*) and Romanian (*pe < per*) also needs to be explored.

interlanguages occurs has been described as pertaining to the early stages of the formation of a pidgin (cf. Ferguson and Debose 1977:111ff). However, for Lingua Franca this stage seems to have persisted at any given point of its existence from the sixteenth until the nineteenth century. This speech form never seems to have reached the stage where it became unintelligible to the speakers of the base language; in this way, Lingua Franca does not pass the “unintelligibility” test which has been claimed to be one of the main diagnostic features for identifying a speech form as a pidgin.²⁸

On the other hand, Lingua Franca amply qualifies for pidgin status with regard to another diagnostic feature, namely: it was felt by its users to be a separate entity in the sense that it had to be learned as a separate entity.²⁹ Numerous testimonies of contemporaries leave us in no doubt as to the fact (cf. Cifoletti 1989:155ff). Perhaps, the most precious evidence is supplied by speakers of Spanish and Italian -- the two languages that contributed the most to Lingua Franca, and whose speakers must have had the greatest sensitivity in assessing the fact that it was a separate form of communication. “La tercera lengua que en Argel se usa, es la que los moros y turcos llaman franca, o hablar franco”, writes a Spaniard Haedo in 1612 (Cifoletti 1989:158). Casanova, a Venetian, casually remarks that a certain Greek slave girl he is interested in speaks with her Turkish master in Lingua Franca (1966:213).³⁰ These same people testify to the ease with which Romance language speakers could switch to Lingua Franca. Thus, Haedo observes that “the Christians” “se acomodan al momento a aquel hablar” (ibid.). Moreover, Spaniards affirm similarity between Lingua Franca and Spanish as spoken by foreigners, more specifically, black Africans. For example, to give his readers a vivid idea of what Lingua Franca is like, Haedo compares it to the speech form with which his compatriots were amply familiar, the so-called *habla bozal*, the speech of the black slaves recently brought to the Peninsula: “viene a ser el hablar franco de Argel casi una gerigonça, o alomenos [sic] un hablar de negro boçal, traydo a España de nuevo” (ibid.). A similar assessment of what appears to be a Spanish-colored Lingua Franca is made in the sixteenth-century autobiographical work *El Viaje de Turquía* by Cristóbal de Villalón. Upon hearing a sentence in what is presumably Lingua Franca, one of Villalón’s characters remarks: “para qué le habláis negresco?” (1965:21). And from the many sources of *habla bozal* contemporary to both Villalón and Haedo that are available to us, it is clear that the speech-form referred to by this name was a continuum of Spanish interlanguages. However, not every Romance language formed a suitable background to instant comprehension of seventeenth-century Lingua Franca. French, for instance, did not. We are fortunate to possess this testimony by Laurent d’Arvieux, a seventeenth-century diplomat and amateur linguist who had studied several oriental languages to perfection: “Il me reçut avec ce compliment d’un Italien corrompu, qu’on appelle Langue Franque, dont on se sert ordinairement a Tunis . . . Je ne sçavoit pas assez ce jargon pour m’en servir en lui parlant” (Foltys 1984:17). If d’Arvieux had to learn Lingua Franca in order to use it, so did other Frenchmen, as well as non-Romance language speakers.

To conclude: Lingua Franca was clearly a pidgin by its use and status. Structurally, it seems to have always been composed of two parts. From the viewpoint of non-speakers of the base language, it was a continuum of more or less fossilized

²⁸ Ferguson and Debose (1977:112); Thomason and Kaufman (1988:168).

²⁹ Ferguson and Debose (1977:112); Thomason and Kaufman (1988:169).

³⁰ More examples of Lingua Franca as perceived by Italians in Cifoletti (1989:178-85).

approximations to a target variety that was, from the viewpoint of the speakers of the base language, a simplified register. The use of this register was not automatic but had to be specially acquired. For this reason, even though Lingua Franca was instantly intelligible to the speakers of the base language, it was considered even by them a separate form of communication, a cultural artifact brought about by a special combination of circumstances. In this capacity, Lingua Franca was transmitted from generation to generation while the conditions that favored its use persisted,³¹ but quickly fell into oblivion with their demise.

References

- Anonymous. 1830. *Dictionnaire de la langue franque ou petit mauresque, suivi de quelques dialogues familiers et d'un vocabulaire des mots arabes les plus usuels, a l'usage des Français en Afrique*. Marseille.
- Arends, Jacques. 1999. Lingua Franca en de 'Europese' creooltalen. *Gramma/TTT* 7:173-90.
- Banfi, Emanuele. 1986. L'italiano degli altri. *Italiano e Oltre* 5:231-34.
- _____. 1988. Osservazioni sulla sintassi dell'italiano spontaneamente acquisito da parlanti arabofoni. Anna Giacalone Ramat (ed.), *L'italiano tra le altre lingue: Strategie di acquisizione*. Bologna: Il Mulino. 127-41.
- _____. 1990. Infinito (ed altro) quale forma basica del verbo in microsistemi di apprendimento spontaneo di italiano-L2: Osservazioni da materiali di sinofoni. Giuliano Bernini and Anna Giacalone Ramat (eds.), *La temporalità nell'acquisizione di lingue seconde*. Milan: Franco Angeli. 39-50.
- _____. 1993. Italiano come L2. Emanuele Banfi (ed.), *L'altra Europa linguistica. Varietà di apprendimento e interlingue nell'Europa contemporanea*. Florence: La Nuova Italia.
- Bernini, Giuliano. 1989. Le preposizioni nell'italiano lingua seconda. *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Linguistica e Letterature Comparate* 5:198-208.
- _____. 1990. Lo sviluppo degli paradigmi verbali nelle varietà elementari di apprendimento dell'italiano lingua seconda. Giuliano Bernini and Anna Giacalone Ramat (eds.), *La temporalità nell'acquisizione di lingue seconde*, Milan: Franco Angeli. 81-102.
- Berretta, Monica. 1988. *Che sia ben chiaro ciò di cui parli: riprese anaforiche tra chiarificazione e semplificazione*. *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Cagliari* n. s. 7:367-89.
- _____. 1990a. Il futuro in italiano L2. *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Linguistica e Letterature Comparate* 6:147-88.
- _____. 1990b. Morfologia in italiano lingua seconda. Emanuele Banfi and Patrizia Cordin (eds.), *Storia dell'italiano e forme dell'italianizzazione*. Rome: Bulzoni. 181-201.
- _____. 1990c. Il ruolo dell'infinito nel sistema verbale di apprendenti di italiano come L2. Giuliano Bernini and Anna Giacalone Ramat (eds.), *La temporalità nell'acquisizione di lingue seconde*. Milan: Franco Angeli. 51-80.
- _____. 1992. Marcatezza in morfologia e apprendimento di lingue seconde. *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Linguistica e Letterature Comparate* 8:129-56.
- Berretta, Monica, and Giuseppina Crotta. 1991. Italiano L2 in un soggetto plurilingue

³¹ Cf. Kahane (1976:197).

- (cantonese-maltese-inglese): sviluppo della morfologia". *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica ed Applicata* 20:285-331.
- Berruto, Gaetano. 1983. L'italiano popolare e la semplificazione linguistica. *Vox Romanica* 42:38-79.
- _____. 1987. *Sociolinguistica dell'italiano contemporaneo*. Rome: La Nuova Italia Scientifica.
- _____. 1991. *Fremdarbeiteritalienisch*: fenomeni di pidginizzazione dell'italiano nella Svizzera tedesca. *Rivista di Linguistica* 3:333-67.
- _____. 1993. Italiano in Europa oggi: *foreigner talk* nella Svizzera tedesca. *Ommaggio a Gianfranco Folena*. Padua: Programma. 2275-90.
- _____, Bruno Moretti, and Stephan Schmid. 1990. Interlingue italiane nella Svizzera tedesca. Osservazioni generali e note sul sistema dell'articolo. Emanuele Banfi and Patrizia Cordin (eds.), *Storia dell'italiano e forme dell'italianizzazione*. Rome: Buizoni. 203-28.
- Birmingham, John C., Jr. 1976. Papiamentu: The Long-lost Lingua Franca? *The American Hispanist* 2:8-10.
- Bonaparte, Lucien, and Hyde Clarke. 1877. Correspondence on Lingua Franca. *Athenaeum* 545, 607-08, 640, 671-72, 703.
- Camus Bergareche, Bruno. 1993. El estudio de la lingua franca: Cuestiones pendientes. *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 57:433-54.
- Casanova, Giacomo. 1966. *History of My Life*. Trans. Willard R. Trask. Vol. 1. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Cifoletti, Guido. 1979. La parola *fantasia* nelle lingue del Mediterraneo. *Incontri Linguistici* 5:139-45.
- _____. 1980. *Il vocabolario della lingua franca*. Padua: CLESP.
- _____. 1989. *La lingua franca mediterranea*. Padua: Unipress.
- Coates, William. 1971. The Lingua Franca. Francis Ingemann (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth Kansas Linguistics Conference*. Lawrence: University of Kansas. 25-43.
- Cornelissen, Ralf. 1992. Zur *Lingua Franca* des Mittelmeer. Gabriele Birken-Silverman and Gerda Roessler (eds.), *Beiträge zur sprachlichen, literarischen und kulturellen Vielfalt in den Philologien*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. 217-28.
- Corominas, John. 1948. The Origin of Spanish *ferreruelo*, Italian *ferraiuolo*, and the Importance of the Lingua Franca for Romance Etymology. *Papers of the Modern Language Association* 63:719-26.
- Do Couto, Hildo Honório. 2002. *A língua franca mediterrânea: histórico, textos e interpretação*. Brasília: Editora Plano.
- Dal Negro, Silvia. 1994. Sistema verbale di apprendenti di italiano L2 nella Svizzera tedesca. *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* 18:51-77.
- De Granda, German. 1976. Un planteamiento sociohistórico del problema de la formación del criollo portugués del Africa occidental. *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 40:299-310.
- _____. 1977. *Lingua franca mediterránea y criollo portugués atlántico*. Manuel Álvaro (ed.), *Actas del V Congreso Internacional de Estudios Lingüísticos del Mediterráneo*. Madrid: Departamento de Geografía Lingüística. 181-86.
- Ferguson, Charles H., and Charles E. Debose. 1977. Simplified Registers, Broken Language, and Pidginization". Albert Valdman (ed.), *Pidgin and Creole*

- Linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 99-125.
- Foltys, Christian. 1984. Die Belege der Lingua Franca. *Neue Romania* 1:1-37.
- Fronzaroli, Pelio. 1955. Nota sulla formazione della Lingua Franca. *Atti e Memorie dell'Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere La Colombaria* 20 (n.s. 6): 211-52.
- Giacalone Ramat, Anna. 1988. Riflessioni sull'acquisizione di pronomi in inglese e francese L2. Anna Giacalone Ramat (ed.), *L'italiano tra le altre lingue: Strategie di acquisizione*. Bologna: Il Mulino. 191-216.
- _____. 1990. Presentazione del progetto di Pavia sull'acquisizione di lingue seconde. Giuliano Bernini and Anna Giacalone Ramat (eds.), *La temporalità nell'acquisizione di lingue seconde*. Milan: Franco Angeli. 13-38.
- _____. 1993. Italiano di stranieri. Alberto A. Sobrero (ed.), *Introduzione all'italiano contemporaneo: La variazione e gli usi*. Vol. 2. Rome: Laterza. 341-410.
- _____, and Emanuele Banfi. 1990. The Acquisition of Temporality. A Second Language Perspective. *Folia Linguistica* 24:405-28.
- Goldoni, Carlo. 1941. *Tutte le opere* (edited by Giuseppe Ortolani). Verona: Arnoldo Mondadori.
- Habte-Mariam, Marcos. 1976. Italian. M. L. Bender et al. (eds.), *Language in Ethiopia*. London: Oxford University Press. 170-80.
- Hadel, Richard E. 1969. Modern Creoles and Sabir. *Folklore Annual of the University Folklore Association* 1:35-43.
- Hall, Robert A., Jr. 1966. *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hancock, Ian F. 1971. A Survey of the Pidgins and Creoles of the World. Dell Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*. Cambridge: University Press. 509-23.
- _____. 1973. Remnants of Lingua Franca in Britain. *The University of South Florida Language Quarterly* 11:35-36.
- _____. 1977. Recovering Pidgin Genesis: Approaches and Problems. Albert Valdman (ed.), *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 277-94.
- _____. 1984. Shelta and Polari. Peter Trudgill (ed.), *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: University Press. 384-403.
- Harvey, L., R. Jones, and K. Whinnom. 1967. Lingua Franca in a *villancico* by Encina. *Revue de Littérature Comparée* 41:572-79.
- Holm, John. 1989. *Pidgins and Creoles*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: University Press.
- Kahane, Henry. 1976. The Mediterranean Contact Vernacular. *Studies in Language Learning* 1:191-204.
- _____, Renée Kahane, and Andreas Tietze. 1958. *The Lingua Franca in the Levant: Turkish Nautical Terms of Italian and Greek Origin*. Urbana: University of Illinois.
- Lang, George. 1992. The Literary Settings of Lingua Franca (1300-1830). *Neophilologus* 76:64-76.
- Lazzerini, Lucia. 1977. Il *greghesco* a Venezia tra realtà e ludus. Saggio sulla commedia poliglotta del cinquecento. *Studi di Filologia Italiana* 35:29-95.
- Massariello Merzagera, Giovanna. 1990. Mezzi lessicali per l'espressione della temporalità in apprendenti sinofoni. Giuliano Bernini and Anna Giacalone Ramat (eds.), *La temporalità nell'acquisizione di lingue seconde*. Milan: Franco Angeli.

- 103-15.
- Minervini, Laura. 1996. La Lingua Franca mediterranea: Plurilinguismo, mistilinguismo, pidginizzazione sulle coste del Mediterraneo tra tarde medioevo e prima eta moderna. *Medioevo Romanzo* 20:231-301.
- Operstein, Natalie. 2004. Review of Hildo Honório do Couto, *A língua franca mediterranea: Histórico, textos e interpretação* (Brasília: Editora Plano, 2002). *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 19:410-14.
- Partridge, Eric. 1950. Parlyaree. *Here, There and Everywhere: Essays upon Language*. Freeport, NY: Books For Libraries Press. 115-25.
- Pellegrini, Giovan Battista. 1972. L'arabo della Zingana di A. Giancarli. *Gli arabismi nelle lingue neolatine*. Vol. 2. Brescia: Paideia. 601-34.
- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1979 [1909]. The Lingua Franca. T. L. Markey (ed. and trans.), *The Ethnography of Variation: Selected Studies on Pidgins and Creoles*. Ann Arbor: Karoma. 26-47.
- Smith, Norval. 1995. An Annotated List of Creoles, Pidgins, and Mixed Languages. Jacques Arends, Pieter Muysken, and Norval Smith (eds.), *Pidgins and Creoles: An Introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 331-74.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey, and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Thompson, Roger M. 1991. Copula Deletion in Spanish Foreigner Talk: Using Questionnaires as a Research Tool. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 6: 89-106.
- Valentini, Ada. 1990. Io palale italiano no bene. *Italiano e Oltre* 5:37-39.
- Villalón, Cristóbal De. 1965. *Viaje de Turquía* (edited by Antonio G. Solalinde). 4th ed. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Whinnom, Keith. 1956. *Spanish Contact Vernaculars in the Philippine Islands*. London: Oxford University Press / Hong Kong: University Press.
- _____. 1965. The Origin of the European-based Creoles and Pidgins. *Orbis* 14:509-27.
- _____. 1966-67. Tafariario: problema etimológico. *Filología* 12:211-17.
- _____. 1977. Lingua Franca: Historical Problems. Albert Valdman (ed.), *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 295-310.
- Wood, Richard E. 1971. The LF in Molière's *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*. *The University of South Florida Language Quarterly* 10:2-6.
- Zago, Renata. 1986. Lingua franca nelle commedie di Goldoni. *Quaderni Utinensi* 7-8: 122-26.