ANNA L. MORO

FIORILLO'S LA GHIRLANDA AND OLD NEAPOLITAN:
A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

Although the early Seicento holds a prominent position in the history of literature in Neapolitan, few works from that period have received adequate attention from linguists.¹ The past few decades have witnessed a renewed interest in the publication of modern editions of Neapolitan texts² and, in particular, a re-evaluation of that literature from a sociohistorical and sociocultural perspective.³ Few studies, however, have focussed on a systematic linguistic analysis of the language of even the most prominent figures of the early Seicento in literature in Neapolitan, Basile and Cortese.⁴ One figure who has received limited attention from those interested in Old Neapolitan is Silvio Fiorillo, a figure well known to commedia dell'arte scholars, most notably as an actor. Yet, there is reason to believe that Fiorillo's works, including *La ghirlanda*—almost certainly his first known work (see below)—merit attention from anyone interested in language in Naples in the early Seicento. *La ghirlanda* is a pastoral eclogue in Tuscan and Neapolitan that appears to have been first published in 1602

¹This article, as the title indicates, presents the preliminary research for a larger project, the main objective of which is a critical edition of *La ghirlanda*. The initial research for this project was made possible thanks to a grant from the Arts Research Board of McMaster University.

²See for example, the many critical editions published in the past several years in the series *Testi dialettali napoletani* directed by Enrico Malato and published in Rome by Benincasa.

³See for example, Bianchi, De Blasi and Librandi, *I' te vurria parlà*, pp. 81-116; Rak, "La tradizione letteraria" and *Napoli gentile*.

⁴Of course, many linguistic studies devoted to Old Neapolitan include observations on the language of seventeenth-century writers—for example, Bianchi, De Blasi and Librandi, *I' te vurria parlà*; De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato e scritto*; Sornicola, "L'oggetto"—but few investigations have focussed exclusively on the language of these writers. On the language of *Lo cunto de li cunti* see Vizmulder-Zocco, "Alcune considerazioni" and Moro, *Aspects of Old Neapolitan*; on the language of Cortese and Basile see Pasquarelli Clivio, *La formazione storica*, 204-239.

in Naples and to have been in circulation throughout the first half of the seventeenth century. If mentioned at all, this work is discussed very briefly by most *commedia dell'arte* scholars;⁵ to date, the most exhaustive treatment of *La ghirlanda* is found in Rak's *Napoli gentile* (231-238), where a few pages are dedicated to an analysis of the prologue and certain cultural and literary aspects of the work. The objectives of this study are to contextualize Fiorillo and *La ghirlanda* in *commedia dell'arte* scholarship and in literature in Neapolitan in the early Seicento and to present preliminary observations on the work itself—its textual history and, in particular, the Neapolitan it contains.

Fiorillo and *commedia dell'arte* scholarship

Most of what we know of Fiorillo comes to us from scholarship on the *commedia dell'arte*, since he is a prominent figure of the *commedia dell'arte* in the early seventeenth century. Fiorillo enjoyed considerable fame as an actor throughout Italy and France and worked with some of the most well known *commedia* troupes and actors of his era: Flaminio Scala and, in particular it appears, Pier Maria Cecchini and Tristano Martinelli.⁶ As many scholars have noted, the first writer to comment explicitly on Fiorillo was, in fact, his contemporary Pier Maria Cecchini: in his *Frutti delle moderne commedie et avvisi a chi le recita* (1628), Cecchini speaks about Fiorillo in connection with the two masks with which Fiorillo has since been typically identified, Pulcinella and the Spanish Capitan Mattamoros. Cecchini claims that Fiorillo is the “inventor” of Pulcinella and that he is not to be surpassed in his portrayal of the Spanish *capitano*: “Inventor di questa stragofissima parte fu il Capitan Mattamores, huomo in altri comici rispetti di una isquisita bontà, posciaché per far il Capitano spagnuolo non ha avuto chi lo avanzi, e forse pochi, che lo agguagliino” (*Frutti*, 35).

At the very end of the seventeenth-century Andrea Perrucci, in his

⁵In *La commedia dell'arte*, pp. 182-183, we find the list of characters of *La ghirlanda*, a brief plot summary and a description of the 1624 edition of the text. A brief overview of the text is also provided in Checchi, *Silvio Fiorillo*, pp. 52-54.

⁶Two of Fiorillo's sons were also well-known actors: Giovan Battista (who first played Scaramuccia and later Trappolino) and Tiberio, the older son (famous in France for his portrayal of Scaramouche). Scholars did not always maintain that Tiberio was Fiorillo's son, perhaps because while Giovan Battista often belonged to the same *commedia* troupe as his father, Tiberio had a career that developed quite independently of his father's (Checchi, *Silvio Fiorillo*, pp. 17-18). For the debate surrounding Tiberio's relation to Fiorillo see in particular Prota-Giurleo, *I teatri di Napoli*, pp. 170-174.

treatise *Dell'arte rappresentativa, premeditata e all'improvviso* (1699), reiterates that the role of Pulcinella was invented "da un Comediante detto Silvio Fiorillo, che si faceva chiamare il Capitan Mattamoros" (cited in Checchi, *Silvio Fiorillo*, 105). Most commentators throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries do not offer significant additional insights into the career of Fiorillo; most simply repeat what Cecchini and Perrucci had already mentioned and refer to the principal troupes to which he belonged and to a couple of his works, usually the later ones (Checchi, *Silvio Fiorillo*, 106-109). Croce, however, does consider Fiorillo one of the outstanding figures of seventeenth-century theatre in Naples: "Il più grande degli attori napoletani, il più illustre inventore di *tipi*, fu Silvio Fiorillo, che creò il *Capitan Matamoros* ... e dette il primo impulso alla maschera di Pulcinella" (Croce, *I teatri di Napoli*, 64-65).

Most twentieth-century scholars of the *commedia dell'arte* have continued to underline Fiorillo's success in the portrayal of the Spanish Captain and to acknowledge the link between Fiorillo and the stock character of Pulcinella.⁷ Two relatively recent studies deserve particular mention for their contribution to our understanding of Fiorillo's career and his role in the early *commedia dell'arte*. Checchi's *Silvio Fiorillo in arte Capitan Mattamoros* (1986) is a comprehensive overview of the life and literary production of this actor-author; and Landolfi's presentation of Fiorillo and her analysis of extant letters attributed to Fiorillo in *Comici dell'arte: Corrispondenze* is an indispensable point of departure for the study of Fiorillo.⁸

Although Fiorillo produced several works during his career—two pastoral eclogues, *La ghirlanda* and *L'amor giusto* (1605), a long poem *Il mondo conquistato* (1627), and four other plays: *I tre capitani vanagloriosi* (1621), *L'Ariodante tradito e morte di Polinesso da Rinaldo Paladino* (1623), *La cortesia di Leone e di Ruggiero con la morte di Rodomonte* (1624), *La Lucilla costante* (1632)—until fairly recently his literary production went largely ignored. Two critical editions of *La Lucilla costante* have been pub-

⁷For a detailed discussion of the origins and evolution of Pulcinella in the context of literature in Neapolitan and theatre, see in particular Brindicci, "Il Pulcinella" and "Lo spazio vitale." On the use of Pulcinella in the *commedia dell'arte* in Naples see also Molinari, *La commedia dell'arte*, pp. 203-204. On the question of how we are to interpret the notion that Fiorillo is the "inventor" of Pulcinella and possible antecedents to Fiorillo's Pulcinella, see in particular Croce, *Pulcinella*.

⁸An excellent, succinct overview of Fiorillo's career is also found in Molinari and Guardenti, *La commedia dell'arte*.

lished (one in 1982 edited by Falavolti; the other in 1995 by Brindicci), in addition to a critical edition of *La cortesia di Leone e di Ruggiero* (in 1996 edited by Savoia). That these particular works by Fiorillo should have first attracted scholarly interest is easily explained: *La cortesia* draws on a well known source, Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*; *La Lucilla costante*, Fiorillo's last known work, has generated interest because among the *dramatis personae* there appears not only Capitan Matamoros, but also Pulcinella. As Brindicci writes in the preface to her critical edition of *La Lucilla costante*: "La rivalutazione del testo ... è motivata essenzialmente dall'interesse per Pulcinella che qui compare per la prima volta ... in una commedia d'attore, l'attore che, per tradizione, è stato ritenuto l' "inventore" della maschera" (Fiorillo, *La Lucilla costante*, v).

La ghirlanda and Neapolitan dialect literature in the early Seicento

The period of the early seventeenth-century is undoubtedly one of the most important, if not the most important, in the literary history of Neapolitan. It is the era in which a movement to legitimize Neapolitan begins, first by writers, such as Giambattista Basile and Giulio Cesare Cortese, who opt to write literary texts in Neapolitan rather than in Tuscan and, later, by writers who choose to translate great works of literature in Latin and Tuscan into their native Neapolitan (D'Ascoli, *Letteratura dialettale napoletana*, 89-98). It is commonly acknowledged that Cortese and Basile—particularly Cortese—are at the forefront of this movement "with a new linguistic consciousness and a fresh cultural purpose" (Haller, *The Other Italy*, 245), and that writers throughout the seventeenth-century follow the path established by them.

In his writings, Michele Rak has considered this literature from a *Neapolitan* sociocultural perspective, with a view to uncovering its antecedents in the previous century, in various oral and folk traditions—rather than from the perspective of well-established Tuscan models. Construed in this manner, the literature in Neapolitan in the early Seicento forms part of a continuum of oral and popular culture that includes the Neapolitan *canzone*, the *villanelle*, the *farse* and the *gliommeri*, and arguably finds its most sophisticated expression in the works of Basile and Cortese. In *Napoli gentile*, Rak emphasizes the cultural underpinnings of this literary tradition in *lingua napoletana* in the early seventeenth century:

In una prima fase, databile ai primi decenni del secolo, questa tradizione costruiva alcuni suoi immaginari archetipi con una serie di repêchages e manipolazioni attingendo a vari insiemi testuali marginali e sommersi della cultura locale. Recuperava molte canzonette (*villanelle*) di quasi 50

anni prima ... e, di fatto, si allineava prevalentemente alle tradizioni e pratiche del teatro "basso" — le farse, la commedia dell'arte, il racconto teatrale dei cantimbanchi e altri spettacoli da piazza. (11)

Rak underscores the theatrical roots of this literature. In fact, he states: "Chiunque nel secolo scrive in napoletano fa riferimento a una sola accademia, si regola con una sola Crusca: il teatro" (*Napoli gentile*, 231). Theatre—*teatro basso* or *teatro di strada*—provides the outlet for the representation of marginalised characters and helps to shape Neapolitan cultural identity in the early Seicento. Not only does this literature have roots in theatre, but, whatever the genre, it is destined for oral representation: "Molti testi letterari napoletani erano preparati per "funzionare" come testi da spettacolo e da festa" (Rak, *Napoli gentile*, 16). Given the importance of the world of theatre in the establishment of a literature in dialect in the early 1600s, it seems appropriate to turn our attention to a play written by a figure so intimately connected with the *commedia dell'arte* and written prior to the establishment of Basile and Cortese as literary figures to emulate.⁹

One encounters the perception that the Neapolitan of writers such as Basile, Cortese, and their contemporaries is somehow not authentic Neapolitan, but rather a contrived, artificial language. The writings of Croce on this literature did much to contribute to this view: he underscored that the Neapolitan used by these writers was not to be taken too seriously, since these writers had necessarily moulded and manipulated language to suit their artistic aims. In the case of Basile, Croce went so far as to comment that "in italiano mentalmente concepiva e poi traduceva in dialetto" ("Giambattista Basile," 564). In his essay on "La letteratura dialettale riflessa," Croce reduces the use of Neapolitan in Basile and his contemporaries to an artistic device exploited merely for the purpose of using something new and strange (228).¹⁰ Although one must always bear in mind the limitations of written sources in matters of language history, it would seem rather unwise to dismiss the language of these writers on the grounds of a perceived lack of authenticity. Anyone who reads these texts can attest to the fact that they contain features present in Neapolitan to

⁹Cortese's first work, *La Vaisseide*, dates from 1604, but the majority of his works are published later than this date (Cortese, *Opere poetiche*, pp. 5-11). Aside from the dedicatory letter in Neapolitan that prefaces *La Vaisseide*, Basile's works in Neapolitan belong to a later phase in his career: *Lo cunto de li cunti* (1634-36) and *Le muse napoletane* (1635), in fact, were published posthumously.

¹⁰For a detailed discussion of the problems inherent in the Crocean view of this literature, see Rak, "La tradizione letteraria," in particular pp. 581-585.

this day. It also stands to reason to believe that these writers were faithful—at least to some extent—to a *variety* of Neapolitan. Perhaps it is not the language of the *plebe*, as Arabia, Della Campa and Méry lament in their nineteenth-century work on Neapolitan orthography,¹¹ but this does not mean that it is not Neapolitan.

Fiorillo's choice of Neapolitan

There is evidence that Fiorillo stands out among actor-authors of the *commedia dell'arte* for his use of language. In her work, *Commedie dei comici dell'Arte*, Falavolti notes “la posizione del tutto particolare del Fiorillo” (*Commedie dei comici dell'arte*, 31) with respect to other actor-authors of the *commedia dell'arte*. Her comments refer to one of Fiorillo's later works, not to *La ghirlanda*, but they are, nonetheless, noteworthy. Falavolti suggests that other actor-authors make a fairly conventional and ornamental use of dialects as “oggetti di scena” or “abiti di scena.” In Fiorillo, however, rather than having a dialect that is “filtered” for its use on stage, we have what she calls “un uso del dialetto dal di dentro” (*Commedie dei comici dell'arte*, 31). In Landolfi's view, Falavolti does not go far enough in capturing the nature of Fiorillo's Neapolitan: “non ne coglie l'intera portata innovativa e i conseguenti legami del padre di Pulcinella con la nascente letteratura dialettale napoletana” (“Silvio Fiorillo,” 312). More than one scholar has noted how, particularly in the eclogues, Fiorillo adopts a decidedly anti-Tuscan position and seeks to show that Neapolitan is as worthy as Tuscan for artistic objectives. Francesca Savoia writes that in the eclogues “il dialetto napoletano non veniva adottato in funzione puramente accessoria ed esornativa, ma per competere aggressivamente col toscano tradizionalmente usato nel genere pastorale” (Fiorillo, *La cortesia di Leone*, 7). As Bianchi, De Blasi and Librandi note, in the prologue to *L'amor giusto* Fiorillo claims to write both in Neapolitan and Tuscan in order to “contrapporre i pregi del napoletano ... alle affettazioni toscane” (*I' te vurria parlà*, 93). In fact, Fiorillo states:

... non penzasseno Segnure de vedere ascire da sti Vuosche, Vallune, Montagne, e grotte, quacche Pastore de chiste Toscanielle ntonate, span-tecate, e pompuse co li cauzune de tiffe taffe ... co no parlare quattro, lince, quince, lei, lui, adesso, quantunque ... sì sì, va ca state frische se

¹¹ Arabia, Della Campa and Méry write: “A noi basta aver dimostrato coi documenti riportati, che gli scrittori del dialetto non scrissero la parlata della plebe di Napoli, non destinarono i loro scritti alla plebe, non ritrassero la vita plebea nelle loro opere” (*L'ortografia del dialetto napoletano*, p. 45).

aspettate de sentire chesto; Vuie sentarrite, la primma, e precepalmente cosa, Segnure miei belle ... cierte parole grosse, grasse, e chiatte, a doie sole, e tonne comme à ballane ... commo sarria à dicere ... craie, pescraie, prescigne, ò pescozze ... ca vale chiù na scarpa cacata de no Napoletano (con leverenzia desse faccie vostre) che quanta Toscanicchie se trovano pe lo munno.¹² (Fiorillo, *L'amor giusto*, 15-16)

As Fiorillo's own words in *L'amor giusto* suggest and as others have also indicated, we are dealing with a writer for whom the adoption of Neapolitan serves a function far greater than mere literary adornment. Fiorillo's use of Neapolitan should be examined in connection with the language of writers such as Basile and Cortese, and his works should be considered in view of the development of a "prestigious" literature in Neapolitan in the early seventeenth-century. As Molinari and Guardenti state, Fiorillo's literary production "è da mettere in relazione con quel movimento di difesa della lingua napoletana—di cui il Fiorillo si era fatto in certa misura portavoce con le egloghe" (*La commedia dell'arte*, 744).¹³

¹²A loose translation of the passage would be as follows: "Don't think that you'll see pompous Tuscan shepherds coming out of these woods, ravines, mountains and caves ... wearing taffeta pants ... being so stiff and particular ... speaking with words like *quinci, quindi, lei, lui, adesso, quantunque* ... you're kidding yourselves if that's what you expect to hear; my dear spectators, first and foremost you will hear large, fat, substantial words, words with a double sole and round like boiled chestnuts ... words like *craie, pescraie, prescigne* or *pescozze* ... because (with all due respect) a shoe soiled with the feces of a Neapolitan is worth more than all the Tuscans found in the world." *Craie, pescraie, prescigne* and *pescozze* are, respectively, Neapolitan for *tomorrow, the day after tomorrow, three days from now, four days from now*. For a further explanation of this passage, see Bianchi, De Blasi and Librandi, *I te vurria parlà*, p. 114 n. 7; and for other references to the "large, substantial words" of Neapolitan (in Cortese, Basile and others), in connection with the apparent *antitoscanismo* of writers in the early 1600s in Naples, see pp. 93-96 in the same study by Bianchi, De Blasi and Librandi. An excellent overview of the positions of various Neapolitan writers with respect to language and dialects in the 1600s is found in Haller, *The Other Italy*, pp. 256-257.

¹³The question of whether or not Fiorillo personally knew Basile and Cortese does not have a definitive answer. There does not seem to be any evidence of a connection between Fiorillo and Basile, but it is possible that Fiorillo might have known Cortese. As many scholars note, the first literary reference to Pulcinella appears in Cortese's *Viaggio di Parnaso* (1621), which could be interpreted as a tribute to Fiorillo's character. In addition, the actor Bartolomeo Zito, Cortese's friend and author of the *Defennemiento de la Vuiaasseide* (1628), is also the author of one of the dedicatory sonnets published with Fiorillo's *L'amor giusto*. For

Having established Fiorillo's position both from the point of view of the *commedia dell'arte* and from that of literature in Neapolitan in the early Seicento, we will now focus our attention on particulars concerning *La ghirlanda*. After a few introductory comments on the structure and plot, I will discuss its textual history and a number of salient features of the Neapolitan in which it is written.

La ghirlanda: brief notes on structure and plot

As already mentioned, *La ghirlanda* is a pastoral eclogue. Its five acts are composed of three-line stanzas with an interlocking rhyme scheme (*aba, bcb, cdc, ded*, etc.—the classic *terza rima*) and hendecasyllabic verses. Several Neapolitan characters populate the work, including four shepherds (one named Fiorillo), a ploughman, and a citizen who recites the prologue. Two nymphs (Ardelia and Argilia), Venus, Cupid and the Minister of the Temple of Love are the principal Tuscan-speaking characters. The principal love intrigue involves Ardelia and the Neapolitan shepherds Carella and Micco: Ardelia is unable to make Carella reciprocate her affections without the intervention of Venus and Cupid, but she could have the love of Micco in whom she has no interest. It must be mentioned, however, that although the central courtship is between Ardelia and Carella, Fiorillo reserves significant dramatic space for the *character* Fiorillo, who is the love interest of the other nymph, Argilia. At one point, Argilia leaves Fiorillo's side prior to his waking up, a development which provides a reason, upon discovering that Argilia is gone, for Fiorillo to "become mad" and to embark on a lengthy monologue. In addition, the *ghirlanda* of the title refers to the garland given by Argilia to Fiorillo.

La ghirlanda: textual history

Since there is some confusion in the scholarship concerning whether or not *La ghirlanda* is Fiorillo's first published work, it is a matter that ought briefly to be addressed. Based on known extant texts, there is no evidence of Fiorillo having published anything prior to his first two eclogues, *L'amor giusto* and *La ghirlanda*.¹⁴ Although some scholars indicate that *L'amor gius-*

details on the connection between Fiorillo, Cortese and Zito, see Brindicci, "Il Pulcinella," in particular pp. 61-65.

¹⁴Brindicci ("Il Pulcinella," p. 82 n. 54) suggests that perhaps *Il Mondo conquistato*, Fiorillo's poem in twenty-four stanzas, is from as early as 1600, but the extant editions of this work are both from the 1620s: 1624 and 1627 (Landolfi, "Silvio Fiorillo," p. 318).

to is Fiorillo's first work and *La ghirlanda* his second,¹⁵ in fact *La ghirlanda* appears to be Fiorillo's first work. The confusion stems in part from the dates of various reprints and in part, of course, from the fact that we are dealing with works that have received limited scholarly attention. The Naples 1608 edition of *La ghirlanda*, which seems to be the earliest available and to which many refer, is a reprint of the Naples 1602 edition: it bears the year 1602 on the title page and its colophon clearly states that it is a reprint of the 1602 edition.¹⁶ The earliest date associated with *L'amor giusto* is 1604, although most scholars refer to the 1605 edition published in Milan.¹⁷ Although both works belong to an early period in Fiorillo's career, the publication of *La ghirlanda* clearly predates that of *L'amor giusto*. In addition, it is clearly stated in the prologue to *L'amor giusto* that this work—*L'amor giusto*—is Fiorillo's second eclogue “meza Napoletana, e meza Toscanesa” (12). Since we know only of two eclogues by Fiorillo, this internal reference can only confirm that *La ghirlanda* is the author's first eclogue.

In all, there are four extant editions of *La ghirlanda*. The 1608 edition, although a reprint of the 1602 edition according to colophon, appears to have undergone changes before being reprinted. If we are to believe what Fiorillo writes in the dedicatory letter, dated 1 April 1608, to the Duke of Gravina, Antonio Ursino, the 1608 edition represents a revised, expanded and embellished version with respect to what was published in 1602:

¹⁵For example, Bartoli, *Notizie istoriche*, p. 223; Prota-Giurleo, *I teatri di Napoli*, p. 169; Molinari, *La commedia dell'arte*, p. 201; Checchi, *Silvio Fiorillo*, p. 50; Rak, *Napoli gentile*, p. 218.

¹⁶The colophon reads: IN NAPOLI, / Nella Stamperia di Tarquinio / Longo. 1602. & ristampata / per Gio. Battista Gar / gano, & Matteo / Nucci. 1608.

¹⁷Allacci, *Drammaturgia*, p. 60; Martorana, *Notizie biografiche*, p. 200; Brindicci in Fiorillo, *La Lucilla costante*, p. 162; Prota-Giurleo, *I teatri di Napoli*, p. 169. Checchi (*Silvio Fiorillo*, p. 50) and Landolfi (“Silvio Fiorillo,” p. 318) mention an edition of *L'amor giusto* published in Naples by Stigliola in 1604. Bianchi, De Blasi and Librandi (*I te vurrìa parlà*, p. 93) and Rak (*Napoli gentile*, p. 238 n. 2) make use of the Naples 1605 edition published by Stigliola, and Rak notes that the dedicatory letter of this edition bears the date 22 October 1604. The dedicatory letter found in the 1605 Milanese edition by Malatesta bears the date 3 August 1605. Aside from these early editions, there is only one additional known edition of *L'amor giusto*, published by Beltrano in Naples in 1625 (cited by both Checchi and Landolfi). A comment by Martorana suggests that the work may have had more editions than these: “Avendo avuto la disgrazia fino a questo momento di non poter vedere *L'amor giusto* del Fiorillo che ebbe più edizioni e non rare (al dir di alcuno)” (*Notizie biografiche*, p. 434).

Perilche essendomi molt'anni sono non senza industria affaticato intorno al lavoro d'una rustica Ghirlanda; e conoscendola per all'hora assai povero d'ornamenti, volsi lasciarla nella solitudine sepolta: ma hora cresciuta, & imbellita del suo dicevole decoro, mosso da paterno affetto, e desideroso di farla uscire in luce; hò giudicato dedicarla à lei in segno della mia servitù." (8)

At this point we cannot know what changes to his original work Fiorillo deemed necessary, but it seems prudent to identify this first available edition as solely that of 1608.

In addition to the 1608 edition, there is a Milanese edition, published by Malatesta, presumably from 1611: there is no publication date in the text, but the date of the dedicatory letter is 29 July 1611. Both the 1608 and 1611 editions clearly identify Fiorillo with his stage persona, Capitan Mattamoros: each title page (recall that the 1608 title page bears the date 1602) qualifies Fiorillo as "Comico / detto il Capitan Mattamoros," and each title page displays the well known woodcut image of the Spanish *capitano*, found also in some editions of Fiorillo's other works.¹⁸

The 1624 edition, published by Combi in Venice, seems largely a reprint of the 1611 edition: the dedicatory letter is identical to the one found in the 1611 edition and the same dedicatory poems precede the text.¹⁹ The text itself presents only minor orthographic changes with respect to the 1611 edition.²⁰ The fourth and final extant edition is from 1652 and was published by Cavallo in Naples; it contains no dedicatory letter or son-

¹⁸Landolfi, "Silvio Fiorillo," pp. 323-324. Fiorillo's link with the character Capitan Mattamoros is firmly established by the late 1500s-early 1600s. Not only does he identify himself through this role on the title page of the 1602 edition (reprinted in the 1608 edition), but the first of Fiorillo's letters analyzed by Landolfi ("Silvio Fiorillo," p. 321) bears the signature "detto il Capitan Mattamoros" and is dated 20 November 1599. Additionally, the 1608 edition of *La ghirlanda* is prefaced (pp. 3-6) by an eight-stanza poem, in Spanish and Tuscan, entitled *Por el retrato del Capitan Mattamoros* "che non c'entra niente con l'azione ma presenta l'attore nel suo doppio volto: il vanaglorioso (in spagnolo) e il pauroso (in toscano)" (Rak, *Napoli gentile*, p. 232).

¹⁹The first of these poems is a sonnet written by Fiorillo to Fabio Visconti the addressee of the dedicatory letter. The following six poems (five of which are sonnets) are in honour of Fiorillo and his work and are composed by Ottavio Buono, Giovan Battista Composti, Antonio Carnevale, Fabritio Cinamo, Daniel Geofilo Piccigallo, Salvatore Scarano.

²⁰For example, there are minor changes in punctuation and in spelling: an instance of *persutto* in 1611 becomes *presutto* in 1624; the accent marking *sì* (second person singular of the verb "to be") is removed in the 1624 edition. Overall, however, the text appears to be essentially the same as the 1611 Milanese edition.

nets, but shares with the 1608 edition the inclusion of an eight-stanza poem entitled *Por el retrato del Capitan Mattamoros* (see note 18). The 1652 edition does present noteworthy orthographic changes with respect to previous editions and will thus be discussed in more detail below.²¹

Two other editions of *La ghirlanda* are mentioned in some of the scholarship, but a search for these has proved futile thus far. Allacci, Bartoli, and Prota-Giurleo, for example, mention a 1609 edition which has been cited sporadically by other scholars.²² In addition, a 1644 edition—published in Naples by Cavallo, the same publisher responsible for the 1652 edition—is cited by Brindicci.²³ The fact that *La ghirlanda* was reprinted as often as all of these editions indicate, suggests that it was received favourably in its time and that it had some importance in cultural circles. It appears to be the only work by Fiorillo to have been the object of so many reprintings and, as far as we know, it is the only text by Fiorillo to have seen intermittent publication over a fifty-year period: 1602-1652.

Linguistic features of Fiorillo's Neapolitan

The following discussion of Fiorillo's language will be limited to observations concerning the Neapolitan portions of *La ghirlanda*. Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to look at the Tuscan used by Fiorillo, future research will need to examine this code as well and the function of the two linguistic codes in the work. Since Fiorillo is an actor-author of the early *commedia dell'arte*, his works ought to shed light on language use in theatre at the time.²⁴ The discussion that follows focusses on some of the

²¹The following copies of the four extant editions were consulted for this study: (1) 1608 edition: Biblioteca Nazionale, Naples; (2) 1611 edition: Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto and the British Library; (3) 1624 edition: Biblioteca Nazionale, Naples; (4) 1652 edition: Biblioteca Nazionale, Naples. The copy of *L'amor giusto* (Milan, 1605) consulted for this study is in the British Library.

²²Allacci, *Drammaturgia*, pp. 398-399; Bartoli, *Notizie storiche*, p. 223; and Prota-Giurleo, *I teatri di Napoli*, 169. If these references are accurate, we may actually be dealing with different editions published in the same year: according to Bartoli, there is a 1609 edition published in Naples by Longo; according to Allacci, there is a 1609 edition published in Naples by Bozzimo.

²³Brindicci, "Il Pulcinella," p. 79 n. 12; Fiorillo, *La Lucilla costante*, p. 162; Checchi, *Silvio Fiorillo*, p. 133; and Checchi, "Fiorillo," p. 190.

²⁴Language use in the *commedia dell'arte* has not been studied in great detail, but one study conducted on Perrucci's *Dell'arte rappresentativa* did show that while other dialects seem to have been diluted for use on stage, this was not true of Neapolitan: "Two of the dialects of the Commedia dell'Arte, beside Tuscan, were

most striking characteristics of Fiorillo's Neapolitan and on those features which appear interesting from a diachronic perspective. All page references for the examples cited correspond to the 1608 edition.²⁵

Phonological and morphophonological features

We find syntactic doubling fairly regularly marked in the case of *v* - *bb*, the latter represented by a single *b*; the complex alternation between *v* and *b*—betacism—in (respectively) weak and strong position is well known in Neapolitan.²⁶ In *La ghirlanda* in weak position we typically find *v*: *chino de viole* (63), *sso vosco* (48), *no vase* (28), *te vorria dicere* (39), *no viecchio* (66); in word-initial position, following an element that produces *raddoppiamento sintattico*,²⁷ we find *b*: *le biole* (26), *A bieccchio latro* (29), *che bolite* (55), *Pe buie* (64), *tre buoie* (86), *chiù bieccchio* (92). Syntactic doubling, however, is not always indicated for *v* - *b*, and is rarely indicated for other consonants. There are a few examples of *ghi* (the strong counterpart to [j] in Neapolitan) following forms with reduplicating power: *Pe ghire* (45), *a ghire* (46); but there are also examples in which the doubling is expected and not indicated: *so ianco* (27), *pe no ire* (47), *comme a iaccio* (60). Syntactic doubling provoked by the feminine plural and neuter definite articles is also only sporadically indicated: *le biole* (cited above), *le boglie soie* (30), *lo ssaie* (27), *tello borria dicere* (39). Even these few examples, particularly of the long consonant following the neuter definite article, are valuable, given their rare appearance in Old Neapolitan texts; Fiorillo seems to indicate this more frequently than other authors of his era.²⁸

always to be spoken in a pure form, namely Neapolitan and Venetian" (Clivio, "The Language", p. 227).

²⁵All examples provided are given in the form in which they appear in the edition cited. The orthography has not been altered, except to restore the distinction between *u* and *v*.

²⁶De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato*, pp. 228-229; Tulleners-Bloemen, "Il betacismo"; Bloemen, "L'analisi diacronica del betacismo."

²⁷For the forms that provoke *raddoppiamento sintattico* in Neapolitan see Bichelli, *Grammatica del dialetto napoletano*, pp. 60-62 and De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato*, pp. 57-62. On syntactic doubling in the dialects of southern Italy, historically an assimilatory process, see Fanciullo and Borrelli, *Raddoppiamento sintattico*; for the dialect of Naples in particular see also Andalò, "Il raddoppiamento sintattico," and Bullock, "Consonant Gemination".

²⁸De Blasi and Imperatore (*Il napoletano parlato*, p. 240) cite examples of the type *chesto mmale*, *lo ffuoco*, with the double consonant following neuter determiners, from Fiorillo's *L'amor giusto*.

As De Blasi and Imperatore (*Il napoletano parlato*, 206-207) have already noted for *L'amor giusto*, Fiorillo uses *hi* to render the Neapolitan sound derived from FL: in that eclogue, he writes *hiato*, *hiumme*, *abievoluto* (< FLATU, FLUMEN, FLEBILIS). Many examples of this type are found also in *La ghirlanda*: *hiuocolo* (21), *Hiorillo* (22), *lo hioe* (29), *hiure* (30), *Hiorelluccio* (44), *hiummo* (47), *Hiato* (79), *le hiamme* (90). Typically, seventeenth-century writers use *shi* to represent [ʃ] < FL, and *sci/scie* is employed to represent [ʃʃ], the palatal fricative derived from other etymologies (Moro, *Aspects of Old Neapolitan*, 45-67). De Blasi and Imperatore suggest that Fiorillo's *hi* might be indicative of [j] rather than [ʃ], given that the former necessarily preceded the latter chronologically, and given that "ancora a fine Cinquecento la vicenda della sorte di FL- non era definitivamente risolta" (*Il napoletano parlato*, 206). Two factors, however, favour the possibility that Fiorillo might have been attempting to represent [ʃ], a sound that was relatively recent and had no standard way of being represented—we must bear in mind that Cortese and Basile, who opt for *shi*, do so later than the first publication of *La ghirlanda*. *La ghirlanda* presents *scioreva* (20) and *ascevoluto* (42) (unlike the *abievoluto* of *L'amor giusto*), both of which remain unchanged in later editions. Although these examples may be simply orthographic oversights, they suggest that the sound represented with *sci/scie* in these words had to be quite similar to the sound represented by *hi*. Second, as will be discussed ahead in more detail, in the latest extant edition of *La ghirlanda* (1652), all instances of *hi* are eliminated in favour of *shi*.

Not surprisingly, we find consistently represented the evolution of PL > *chi* [kj] in Romance forms inherited directly by Neapolitan: *chianura* (28), *chiù* (33), *lo chianto* (37), *chiuppe* (39), *schiecchio* (44). In learned forms, however, as is typical also of the language of Basile (Moro, *Aspects of Old Neapolitan*, 57), we find the dialect treatment of postconsonantal [l], whereby the [l] is rhotacized: *suppreco* (19), *pubrecamente* 21), *contempro* (39), *concrudo* (75), *Egroca* (93). A rhotacized [l] is also consistently found in preconsonantal position (before non-dental consonants), a Neapolitan feature "tuttora forse considerato plebeo e 'basso'" (De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato*, 217-218) and not often indicated in texts prior to the 1600s: *pormone* (30, 63), *serve* (37), *cuorpo* (42), *sarvo* (47), *vorpa* (55), *parmo* (59).

Very well documented in *La ghirlanda*, as in other texts from the 1600s, are the morphophonemic alternations that result from metaphony of both high mid and low mid vowels. The effects of high mid vowel metaphony (tonic *e* > *i* and *o* > *u*, predominantly in masculine forms and

in second person singular and plural verbal forms), as a result of a prior influence of final -i or -u, are discernible in countless examples: *chisso* (39), *bavive* (45), *coglite* (55), *li rine* (65), *zinno* (66), *figliulo* (23),²⁹ *fuste* (37), *surdo* (48), *pasture* (64), *curre* (68), *pormune* (91), *segnure* (93). Etymological feminine metaphonic plurals, judging by the language of Neapolitan writers, appear to be on the decline in the early 1600s under the influence of analogy (Moro, *Aspects of Old Neapolitan*, 87-114). And in fact, in *La ghirlanda*, there are only a couple of examples of such metaphonic forms: *frunne* (27), *le raggiune toie* (73). Metaphonic diphthongs (tonic [ɛ] > [je] and [ɔ] > [wo] under the influence of a prior final -i or -u, again in masculine singular and/or plural forms, and in certain second person singular and plural forms), a Neapolitan feature at times suppressed in literary texts in Neapolitan from the 13- and 1400s (De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato*, 180-187), are not lacking in Neapolitan texts of the seventeenth century.³⁰ In *La ghirlanda*, too, there is ample evidence of such diphthongs: *miettelo* (24), *lietto* (27), *pietto* (38), *cortielo* (39), *li viene* (47), *rieste* (67), *puopole* (20), *uorto* (24), *iuorno* (27), *uosso* (54), *me puorte* (64), *puorco* (72). Two instances of the metaphonic diphthong in the feminine plural form of “verde” stand out: *serve vierde* (37) and *frasche vierde* (92).

A feature of the language of Basile, Cortese, and other Neapolitan writers of the seventeenth century as well, is the sporadic use of the Hispanic diphthong *ue* in the place of Neapolitan *uo*. It is difficult to gauge whether or not its inconsistent use in texts of the period reflected a possible Neapolitan pronunciation (De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato*, 188-189); lexical items with *ue* are always used in combination with their counterparts with *uo*. In Basile's *Lo cunto de li cunti* and *Le muse napoletane*, the Neapolitan form with *uo* is clearly dominant with respect to its counterpart with Hispanic *ue*—with the exception of *uerco*, which Basile uses 88 times in *Lo cunto*, as opposed to *uorco*, used 23 times (Moro, *Aspects of Old Neapolitan*, 142-145). The 1608 edition of *La ghirlanda* presents very few examples indeed of the diphthong *ue*: *vuestro* (22), *muerzo* (25), *fuerze* (72). Interestingly, in addition to these forms, other items containing *ue*—*despuerto*, *huerto*, *muerto*, *puerte*, *puesto*—appear in the 1611 edition, and do so more frequently. This change in favour of more forms

²⁹The pre-metaphony tonic vowel at the basis of the Neapolitan form *figliulo* is [o] rather than [ɔ] (De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato*, p. 49).

³⁰For an inventory of the metaphonic data in *Lo cunto de li cunti*, see Moro, *Aspects of Old Neapolitan*, pp. 115-145.

with *ue* in a later edition of *La ghirlanda* invites further investigation, as does the issue of the overall status of such forms in the language of Neapolitan writers.

Morphological and syntactic features

The apocopated infinitive—*parlà, capì*—characteristic of modern Neapolitan (De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato*, 113), and of many dialects of southern Italy (Rohlf, *Grammatica storica*, 359), is rarely encountered in old Neapolitan texts. One study of *Lo cunto de li cunti* found no examples of the truncated infinitive (Vizmuller-Zocco, “Alcune considerazioni,” 129). Fiorillo’s language in *La ghirlanda*, while undoubtedly favouring full infinitival forms, does present several examples of the apocopated infinitive: *E bogliote donà na bella cosa* (27), *A muodo de sonà le ciaramelle* (59), *me faie venì l’appietto* (71), *faccioue passà sta fantasia* (62), *Ne maie cerca de dareme martiello* (77, corrected to *cercà*, with the word-final accent, in the 1652 edition), *Pe fareme schizza le cellevrella* (86, changed to *schizzar* in the 1611 edition), *E quanto grano nge po i a no crivo* (86), *E bi se te può fa no bello vagno* (91).

A feature of Neapolitan texts from the 1300s and 1400s is the presence of inflection (for person and number) in non-finite verbal forms, i.e. the infinitive, the gerund and the past participle (Loporcaro, “L’infinito coniugato”; Sornicola, “Campania,” 333; De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato*, 251–255). There is textual evidence of these forms until the 1500s, after which they seem to disappear, “visto che sono respinti da tutti gli autori dialettali, in primo luogo Cortese e Basile” (De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato*, 254). To date, the only exception to this apparent obliteration of inflected infinitivals in texts of the 1600s is found in the language of Fiorillo. De Blasi and Imperatore (*Il napoletano parlato*, 254–255) cite several forms from *L’amor giusto*: *ghiremo, haveremo, farono, essennono*. From *La ghirlanda* we can add another example of the inflected infinitive (third person plural): *Nè l’autre sanno manco, che nge farono* (22).

Several interesting present tense (indicative) forms also emerge from *La ghirlanda*. There are numerous first person singular forms with an epenthetic, analogically-formed velar consonant: *stongo* (29, 58), *dongo* (35, 58), *songo* (46, 47). Forms such as these, typical of Neapolitan (Sornicola, “Campania,” 333), are still widely encountered particularly in areas outside Naples (Radtke, *I dialetti*, 87). A double velar replaces the original long dental consonant in *te mpromecco* (67) (cf. [mɛk:ə] “metto” and [aʃpek:ə] “aspetto” cited by Radtke (*I dialetti*, 87) for the province of Naples). Moreover, we find examples of the epenthetic *g* analogically

extended to other persons: *singhe* (27, 30) and *dinghe* (40) are second person singular forms, while one occurrence of *songo* marks the third person plural (a rarity in Old Neapolitan texts according to De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato*, 243): *E adonca se à sto siecolo chiù sapie / Songo li recetante* (22). Far more common than these forms, however, are the numerous first person singular examples with a deleted intervocalic consonant, typical of Neapolitan texts from the 13- and 1400s (De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato*, 213): *seo* (24, 67), *vao* (41, 59) / *baò* (45), *preo* (45, 77), *veo* (46, 69) / *beo* (40, 45), *creo* (87, 88).

In *La ghirlanda* Fiorillo uses fairly consistently the Neapolitan future and conditional forms. For the future, forms in *-aggio* prevail: *sarraggio* (29) / *saraggio* (63), *beveraggio* (31), *faraggio* (42). For the conditional we find forms in *-ia* regularly used: *romparia* (24), *vorria* (27) / *borria* (40), *haverria* (32), *farria* (42), *decerria* (46), *Me pareria* (91) for the first person and third person singular, and *borrisse* (24) and *sarisse* (88) for the second person singular. One example of the periphrastic future, expressed by the present of TO HAVE + INFINITIVE, as in *aggia parlà*, found in modern spoken Neapolitan (Bianchi, De Blasi and Librandi, *I' te vurria parlà*, 13), is also found in *La ghirlanda*: *O comme t'haggio ammare zantragliosa* (68).

La ghirlanda presents numerous examples of both the present perfect and preterite; although my focus here is on formal aspects, a more detailed study should also take into account questions of function. Among the numerous examples of the present perfect we find: *c'haggio fatta* (42), *t'haggio fatto* (79), *t'haggio ntiso* (76), *m'haie fatte* (78), *maie dato* (83), *c'havite dato* (88), *puosto m'haie* (86), *è iuto* (64), *simmo arrevate* (87), *site venute* (87). A few strong preterite forms for the first and third person singular appear: *appe* (21), *crise* (31), *fice* (83), *fecence* (20), *fece* (21), *vozence* (20), *voze* (74). But there are also numerous examples of weak preterites in *-ette*, the dominant type in modern Neapolitan:³¹ *trasette* (20), *piacette* (20), *dette* (22), *Sagliette* (30), *Sentiette* (74), *Stiette* (88). The archaic perfect in *-ao*, typical of Neapolitan texts from the 1300s and 1400s (De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato*, 245), appears once in the form *legao* (90).

There are several examples of paragogic *ne* in Fiorillo's work. The majority of these involve the cliticisation of *ne* to the pronouns *te* and *me* following the prepositions *a* and *per/pe*: *Pigliate à mene* (26), *Guodote à mene* (27), *pe tene me konzummo* (55), *commo à tene* (92). This type of paragoge is documented in Neapolitan texts from as early as the 1300s, and in

³¹ For a detailed discussion of strong and weak preterite forms in Old Neapolitan, see Pasquarelli Clivio, *La formazione storica*, pp. 179-249.

the 1600s there is evidence of paragogic *ne* extended to *tu* and *chiù* (De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato*, 231). Indeed, *tune* and *chiune* appear in *La ghirlanda*, as does one instance of *oimene*: *No la canusce tune* (27), *si contenta tune* (63), *E non saraggio chiune sconzolato* (63), *Ohime li rine, oimene* (65).

The example cited above, *Pigliate à mene*, is also interesting from the point view of the prepositional accusative construction found in Ibero-Romance and in modern Neapolitan. The term *prepositional accusative* refers to the phenomenon whereby a [+ human] direct object is preceded by the preposition *a*: for example, Spanish *Veo a María*. Sornicola's study of the development of this structure in Old Neapolitan showed that, although the structure is rare in the texts from the 1600s considered for her study (*Lo cunto de li cunti* and Sarnelli's *Posilecheata*), the preposition does appear regularly where the head of the NOUN PHRASE is a personal pronoun ("L'oggetto," 74-76), such as in *Pigliate à mene*. Citing examples similar to this, including ones with the verb *pigliare*, from the texts examined, Sornicola ("L'oggetto," 77) is able to confirm the importance of tonic personal pronouns in the evolution of the construction.

The Neapolitan used in *La ghirlanda* also presents examples of the double imperative. The double imperative, of the type *va' ioca* substitutes the structure IMPERATIVE + A + INFINITIVE; as De Blasi and Imperatore explain, it is rarely found in old texts, probably in part because it is limited to direct speech, and perhaps because it was the object of "una specie di censura" (*Il napoletano parlato*, 260-261). *La ghirlanda* offers a clear example of such a structure: *Và cuoglie le biole* (26). We also find examples of the double imperative in the second person plural, involving *ire*, whereby the first form is in the second person singular and the subsequent form is in the second person plural (with or without enclitic pronouns): *Và iate va faciteve* (55).³²

A principal feature of modern Neapolitan syntax is the proclitic position of pronouns dependent on infinitives: *pe te fa senti* (De Blasi and Imperatore, *Il napoletano parlato*, 261). In her study of the position of clitics in Basile's *Lo cunto de li cunti*, Viztmüller-Zocco found that clitic placement did not necessarily follow the rules of the modern dialect. In the case of MODAL + INFINITIVE, the majority of the examples studied did show a preponderance of the proclitic position for pronouns (the typical order associated with Neapolitan); but in the case of PREP + INFINITIVE she found

³²Bichelli (*Grammatica*, p. 211) cites such examples for modern Neapolitan: *Va jatevenne* and *Va jate*; he admits, however, that the use of the latter example is quite rare.

considerable oscillation in the language of Basile—her findings, in fact, lead her to conclude that Basile was not entirely faithful to Neapolitan syntax (“Alcune considerazioni,” 130). In Fiorillo’s Neapolitan, the proclitic position is by far the dominant one; we find numerous examples of pronouns preceding the structure MODAL + INFINITIVE, and preceding the infinitive in the structure PREP + INFINITIVE: *O che me pozza accidere* (24), *io tello boria dicere* (39), *Io me vorria scannare* (59), *no la pozzo ammare* (71), *m’ha voluto commetare* (85), *E tu cride demme delleggiare* (24), *de lo fare* (46), *Demme arrobbare* (47), *de te dare* (58), *pe te contentare* (67), *de te conzolare* (67), *E pe mme fare* (88). There are significantly fewer cases in which we find the pronoun attached to an infinitive following a preposition: *à darele* (67), *De fareme tirare* (78), *Pe fareme* (86). Although there is some oscillation, it is clear that proclisis is dominant in the language of Fiorillo, but enclisis is not unknown in the structure PREP + INFINITIVE, as Vizmuller-Zocco found for the language of *Lo cunto*.

Enclisis, of course, is found in other contexts. It is the only option allowed for the affirmative imperative in Neapolitan, and thus we find: *miettelo* (24), *Damme* (28), *Vuoglieme bene* (55), *Portatemenne* (64), *Tenitemella* (66), *Rompitelo* (63), *Fuimmongene* (67). More striking than these examples are the many cases in *La ghirlanda* in which clitics are attached to a finite, non-imperative, verb, particularly following the conjunction *e*: *e basove / Le dotte mano* (22), *e donate lo core* (23), *E bogliote donà* (27), *e ... sentome venire* (69), *e bogliome coccare* (69), *Ed esceme lo spireto* (71). The phenomenon is well documented in Old Italian,³³ and is also known in Old Neapolitan: Rohlfs (*Grammatica storica*, 171) cites examples from the *Bagni di Pozzuoli*. Since modern Neapolitan rejects enclisis in finite verbal forms (Bichelli, *Grammatica*, 131-138), save in the affirmative imperative as noted above, it is difficult to gauge at this point to what extent we are dealing with literary imitation on the part of Fiorillo (or in the language of other Neapolitan writers of the same era), with the exploitation of a rhythmic device (to achieve stress on a specific syllable of the hendecasyllable in the case of *La ghirlanda*), or with the representation of a linguistic reality. It must be noted that the latter possibility seems not entirely out of the question. Basile’s *Lo cunto de li cunti* presents sporadic evidence of an enclitic attached to a finite verb: Vizmuller-Zocco notes the example *Aggiotence ncappata* with the clitic following the auxiliary (130); Basile *Lo Cunto* also writes *haince apierte l’uocchie* (154), *haiela trovata* (722), *e*

³³In Italian the phenomenon persists to some extent in later centuries, in the language of Straparola and Bandello, particularly after the conjunction *e* (Rohlfs, *Grammatica storica*, pp. 170-172).

volitene vedere (772), *e dicelo* (664), none of which has an imperative function. There also appear to be fossilized expressions in Neapolitan in which enclisis follows a finite verb. Basile and Cortese use expressions such as *dicote e dissete*, *dicome e disse* (D'Ascoli, *Nuovo vocabolario*, 260); in *Lo cunto* we find not only *dapo' mille dicote e dissete* (76), *ma che tante dicote e dissete* (616), but also the expression *damme e dotte* (772). In addition, D'Ambra's Neapolitan-Tuscan dictionary, from 1873, records the expression *Sì e vogliola* (cited in Rohlfs, *Grammatica*, 174), the formulaic response given by the groom during a marriage ceremony: "Volete la tal di tale per moglie ec. E lo sposo risponde: *Sì e Vogliola*. Onde far il *Sì e Vogliola* appo noi significa Matrimonio" (D'Ambra, *Vocabolario*, 398). The examples from *La ghirlanda* and from *Lo cunto*, and the number of Old Neapolitan expressions in which enclisis follows a finite verbal form, suggest that we might not be dealing solely with literary imitation or artistic creativity.

The written code

A thorough account of the editions of *La ghirlanda* should also shed light on the orthographic practices employed by Neapolitan writers in the early 1600s. A contentious issue for Galiani and Oliva, who wrote on language matters concerning Neapolitan in the eighteenth-century, was the orthography used by seventeenth-century writers, in particular Basile and Cortese. Galiani, for example, in his *Del dialetto napoletano* (40-46) vehemently condemns the use of certain orthographic practices Basile and Cortese saw fit to use (the use of *sh*, the representation of syntactic doubling, etc.), and which others chose to imitate.³⁴ The use of *sh* [ʃ] < FL, a major feature of the language of Basile and Cortese, was problematic not only for Galiani, but also for Oliva ("Grammatica," 228), and must have generated debate for some time, given its discussion in *Ortografia del dialetto napoletano*, published in 1887 (Arabia, Della Campa and Méry, *L'ortografia*, 13, 23-24). As mentioned above, Fiorillo adopts *hi* in earlier editions of *La ghirlanda* to represent the Neapolitan sound derived from FL- (*Hiorillo*, *hiore*, *hiummo*, *hianme*, etc.), but in the 1652 edition we find all instances of *hi* altered to *shi*: *Shiorillo*, *shiure*, *shiore*, *Shiorelluccio*, *shiummo*, *shiamme*, *shiato*. Who is responsible for the change: the publisher or Fiorillo? If the

³⁴Galiani argues that Neapolitan has had to suffer the consequences of the "ortografia barbara e mostruosa" with which its first writers "il Basile ed il Cortese, lo cominciarono a scrivere" (*Del dialetto napoletano*, p. 41).

³⁵As discussed above, although some sources indicate a 1644 edition, published in Naples by Cavallo, it has thus far not been possible to locate such an edition.

1652 edition is merely a reprint of the 1644 edition,³⁵ it is possible that Fiorillo himself authored the changes. Fiorillo is believed to have died in the early 1640s, some time between 1641 and 1644, but a precise date is not known (Landolfi, "Silvio Fiorillo," 317). It is also possible, however, that the publisher effected these changes: after all, these late editions of *La ghirlanda* were both published in Naples by Camillo Cavallo, the same publisher responsible for more than one reprint of Basile's *Lo cunto de li cunti* (1645 and 1654) and for reprints of several of Cortese's works between 1644 and 1646 (Cortese, *Opere poetiche*, 10-11). Perhaps all we can say with certainty at this point is that the change from *hi* to *shi* further attests to the influence of Basile and Cortese. Although difficult to prove, it is not implausible that the idea for *shi* in Basile and Cortese is based on Fiorillo's *hi*. A comparison with the Neapolitan contained in other works by Fiorillo should help to elucidate this aspect of the orthography, as well as other orthographic matters, such as the representation of double consonants and the use of the diphthong *ue*.

Concluding remarks

These preliminary observations show how a study of Fiorillo's language in *La ghirlanda* can yield valuable insights concerning Neapolitan in the early seventeenth-century. A thorough examination of his language, together with a systematic analysis of the language of other writers of the Seicento who opted for Neapolitan in their works, would permit us to begin to arrive at a typology of Neapolitan in the 1600s. Such an investigation, of course, ought not only to consider questions of form—phonological, morphological and syntactic features—but also to address issues pertaining to the lexicon and language function. A detailed study of *La ghirlanda* will also require a comparison with the use of Neapolitan in Fiorillo's other works, particularly with a view to uncovering any variation in language—not necessarily reflecting linguistic changes, but rather extralinguistic factors: perhaps changes in the type of audience expected for a particular work or changes brought about on account of perceived trends in works written in Neapolitan. Finally, of course, an analysis of *La ghirlanda* should also pay close attention to the Tuscan it contains and to the interaction between the two linguistic codes found in the work. An investigation of language use not only in *La ghirlanda*, but also in Fiorillo's other works, could prove useful for our understanding of the use of language, and *languages*, in the *com-media dell'arte*.

Works Cited

- Allacci, Leone. *Drammaturgia di Leone Allacci accresciuta e continuata fino all'anno 1755*. Venice: Pasquali, 1755.
- Andalò, Adriana. "Il raddoppiamento sintattico nel dialetto di Napoli" pp. 241-251 in *Tra Rinascimento e strutture attuali*, eds. Luciano Giannelli et al. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier, 1991.
- Arabia, V., R. Della Campa, and G. Méry. *L'ortografia del dialetto napoletano*. Naples: L. Pierro, 1887.
- Bartoli, Francesco. *Notizie istoriche de' comici italiani che fiorirono intorno all'anno MDL fino a' giorni presenti*. Vol. 1. Padua: Conzatti, 1782.
- Basile, Giambattista. *Lo cunto de li cunti*, ed. Michele Rak. Milan: Garzanti, 1986.
- Bianchi, Patricia, Nicola De Blasi, and Rita Librandi. *I te vurria parlà: Storia della lingua a Napoli e in Campania*. Naples: Tullio Pironti, 1993.
- Bichelli, Pirro. *Grammatica del dialetto napoletano*. Bari: Pégaso, 1974.
- Bloemen, Mireille. "L'analisi diacronica del betacismo: alcune conseguenze per la teoria generativa del cambiamento linguistico" pp. 363-396 in *Linguistica storica e cambiamento linguistico: Atti del XVI Congresso Internazionale di Studi*. Eds. Luciano Agostiniani, Patrizia Bellucci Maffei, and Matilde Paoli. Rome: Bulzoni, 1985.
- Borrelli, Doris. *Raddoppiamento Sintattico in Italian: A Synchronic and Diachronic Cross-Dialectal Study*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Brindicci, Monica. "Il Pulcinella di Silvio Fiorillo fra vita materiale del teatro e modelli narrativi" pp. 55-85 in *Quante storie per Pulcinella*, ed. F. C. Greco. Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1988.
- . "Lo spazio vitale del Pulcinella seicentesco: il libro e la scena" pp. 125-168 in *Pulcinella: Una maschera tra gli specchi*, ed. F.C. Greco. Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1990.
- Bullock, Barbara E. "Consonant Gemination in Neapolitan" pp. 45-58 in *Phonological Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, ed. Lori Repetti. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000.
- Cecchini, Pier Maria. *Frutti delle moderne commedie et avvisi a chi le recita*. Padua: Guareschi, 1628.
- Cecchi, Giovanna. *Silvio Fiorillo in arte Capitan Mattamoros*. Capua: Capuanova, 1986.
- . "Fiorillo" pp. 189-191 in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1997.
- Clivio, Gianrenzo P. "The Languages of the *commedia dell'arte*" pp. 209-237 in *The Science of Buffoonery: Theory and History of the Commedia dell'Arte*, ed. D. Pietropaolo. Ottawa: Dovehouse, 1989.
- La commedia dell'arte: Storia e testi*, ed. Vito Pandolfi. Vol. 3. Florence: Le Lettere, 1988.
- Commedie dei comici dell'arte*, ed. Laura Falavolti. Turin: UTET, 1982.
- Cortese, Giulio Cesare. *Opere poetiche*, ed. Enrico Malato. Vol. 2. Rome: Ateneo, 1967.
- Croce, Benedetto. "Giambattista Basile e l'elaborazione artistica delle fiabe popo-

- lari" pp. 539-567 in Croce, Benedetto, *Storia dell'età barocca in Italia*. Milan: Adelphi, 1993.
- . *I teatri di Napoli*. Vol. 1. Naples: Piero, 1891.
- . "La letteratura dialettale riflessa, la sua origine nel Seicento e il suo ufficio storica." pp. 222-235 in Croce, Benedetto. *Uomini e cose della vecchia Italia*. Vol. 1. Bari: Laterza, 1927. Rpt. Bari: Laterza, 1956.
- . *Pulcinella e il personaggio del napoletano in commedia. Ricerche ed osservazioni*. Naples: Grimaldi & Cicerano, 1983.
- D'Ambra, Raffaele. *Vocabolario napoletano-toscano domestico e di arti e mestiere*. Naples: a spese dell'Autore, 1873. Rpt. Bologna: Forni, 1969.
- D'Ascoli, Francesco. *Letteratura dialettale napoletana*. Vol. 1. Naples: Gallina, 1996.
- . *Nuovo vocabolario dialettale napoletano*. Naples: Gallina, 1993.
- De Blasi, Nicola and Luigi Imperatore. *Il napoletano parlato e scritto*. Naples: Fausto Fiorentino, 1998.
- Fanciullo, Franco. *Raddoppiamento sintattico e ricostruzione linguistica nel Sud italiano*. Pisa: ETS, 1997.
- Fiorillo, Silvio. *L'amor giusto, egloga pastorale in Napolitana, e Toscana lingua*. Milan: Pandolfo Malatesta, 1605.
- . *La cortesia di Leone e Ruggiero con la morte di Rodomonte*, ed. Francesca Savoia. Lucca: Maria Pacini Fazzi, 1996.
- . *La ghirlanda, egloga in Napolitana e Toscana lingua*. Naples: Longo, 1602; Rpt. Naples: Gargano and Nucci, 1608.
- . *La ghirlanda, egloga in Napolitana et Toscana lingua*. Milan: Malatesta, 1611.
- . *La ghirlanda, egloga in napolitana et toscana lingua*. Venice: Combi, 1624.
- . *La ghirlanda, egloga in Napolitana e Toscana lingua*. Naples: Cavallo, 1652.
- . *La Lucilla costante*, ed. Monica Brindicci. Naples: Bellini, 1995.
- Galiani, Ferdinando. *Del dialetto napoletano*, ed. Enrico Malato. Rome: Bulzoni, 1970.
- Haller, Hermann. *The Other Italy: the Literary Canon in Dialect*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
- Landolfi, Domenica. "Silvio Fiorillo" pp. 307-345 in *Comici dell'Arte: Corrispondenze*, eds. Claudia Burattelli, Domenica Landolfi and A Zinanni. Vol. 1. Florence: Le Lettere, 1993.
- Loporcaro, Michele. "L'infinito coniugato nell'Italia centro-meridionale: ipotesi genetica e ricostruzione storica." *Italia dialettale* 49 (1986): 173-240.
- Martorana, Pietro. *Notizie biografiche e bibliografiche degli scrittori del dialetto napoletano*. Naples: Chiurazzi, 1874.
- Molinari, Cesare. *La commedia dell'arte*. Milan: Mondadori, 1985.
- Molinari, Cesare and Renzo Guardenti. *La commedia dell'arte*. Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1999.
- Moro, Anna L. *Aspects of Old Neapolitan: The Language of Basilè's "Lo cunto de li cunti"*. Munich: Lincom Europa, 2003.
- Oliva, Francesco. "Grammatica della lingua napoletana" pp. 207-327 in F. Galiani, *Del dialetto napoletano*, ed. Enrico Malato. Rome: Bulzoni, 1970.

- Pasquarelli Clivio, Mirella. *La formazione storica del perfetto forte nell'Italia meridionale*. Rome-Toronto: Bulzoni-University of Toronto Press, 1994.
- Perrucci, Andrea. *Dell'arte rappresentativa premeditata, e all'improvviso*. Naples: Mutio, 1699.
- Prota-Giurleo, Ulisse. *I teatri di Napoli nel '600: la commedia e le maschere*. Naples: Fiorentino, 1962.
- Radtke, Edgar. *I dialetti della Campania*. Rome: Il Calamo, 1997.
- Rak, Michele. "La tradizione letteraria popolare-dialettale napoletana tra la conquista spagnola e le rivoluzioni del 1647-48" pp. 573-747 in *Storia di Napoli*. Vol 4. Naples: Società Editrice Storia di Napoli, 1974.
- . *Napoli gentile: La letteratura in "lingua napoletana" nella cultura barocca (1596-1632)*. Bologna: il Mulino, 1994.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Morfologia*. Turin: Einaudi, 1968.
- Sornicola, Rosanna. "Campania" pp. 330-337 in *The Dialects of Italy*, eds. Martin Maiden and Mair Parry. London: Routledge, 1997.
- . "L'oggetto preposizionale in siciliano antico e in napoletano antico." *Italienische Studien* 18 (1997): 66-80.
- Tulleners-Bloemen, Mireille. "Il betacismo nell'Italia meridionale: analisi sincronica sulla base dei dati AIS." *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* 7 (1983): 97-117.
- Vizmler-Zocco, Jana. "Alcune considerazioni sulla collocazione dei pronomi atoni nel "Cunto de li cunti" di Giambattista Basile." *Canadian Journal of Italian Studies* 10 (1987): 125-133.