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Following indications of one reviewer and the editors, in this appendix to "On the Lack of Evidence for Non-Myopic Harmony" (Linguistic Inquiry [ref.]) I give a more extensive set of data of the Italo-Romance dialects of Grado and Central Veneto that are crucial for the arguments developed in the paper. Since the presence of metaphony in paroxytones is uncontroversial, I give only examples of proparoxytones. When the tonic is a (possibly vacuous) undergoer, i.e. /e/, /o/, /i/, /u/, these examples show that harmony (metaphony) is active not only in paroxytones but also in proparoxytones. When the tonic is a non-undergoer (/a/, /ɛ/, /ɔ/), they determine whether harmony (metaphony) is myopic (the post-tonic is raised) or non-myopic (the post-tonic is not raised).

1. Data in Walker (2010)

(1) and (2) contain all the proparoxytones in Walker (2010):

(1) Grado. Proparoxytones  [ = (2) and (3) in Walker 2010; = (5) in Mascaró [year]]

a. énzen-e  ínzin-i  'shin-M.SG/PL'
   zóven-e  zúvin-i  'young man-SG/PL'

b. bodʒánten-i  *bodʒántin-i  'crab before the last moult-M.PL'
(2) Central Veneto. Proparoxytones  [= (2) and (3) in Walker 2010; = (8) in Mascaró [year]]

a. órden-o  úrdin-i  'order-1SG/2SG.PRES.IND'

b. pérség-o  pérség-i  *pérsig-i  'peach-M.SG/PL'
ázen-o  ázen-i  *ázin-i  'donkey-M.SG/PL'
ángol-o  ángol-i  *ángul-i  'angle-M. SG/PL'

No other crucial proparoxytones (i.e. with a final /i/ trigger and an underlying mid post-tonic vowel) can be found in Walker (2005, 2011).

2.1 Grado: additional data in Walker's sources. As for Walker's sources, Ascoli (1898), Battisti (1914), Rohlfis (1966), and Maiden (1991) do not contain any examples of the proparoxytone cases that are relevant. But Rosamani (1990), Tarlao (1983) and Marin (1981[1999], 1985)\(^1\) add some (uncertain) evidence in favor of the pattern in (1a) with additional examples, making a total of three cases with raising when the tonic is /e/, /o/, /i/, /u/, and no exceptions (unraised post-tonic):\(^2\)

\(^1\) Pages in citations correspond to the edition in 1999 of Marin 1981[1999]. Since this edition, compared to the 1981 edition, contains new material in pages 441-456, when referring to material in the 1981 edition, the one consulted by Walker, I make sure that it appears in pages 7-400.

\(^2\) Some examples suggest that there are exception, although the alternating forms with no final -i are lacking: núvol-i 'clouds' (Marin 1981[1991]:247), sñe-li 'be 3PL.IMP-them' (Tarlao 1983:160).
(3) **Grado. Effect on the post-tonic when the tonic is /e/, /o/, /i/, /u/**

énzen-e ínzin-i (= (1) above; Bartoli et al. 1995-2011, cited in Cortelazzo 1978:14)
zóven-e zúvin-i (= (1) above; Bartoli et al. 1995-2011, cited in Cortelazzo 1978:14; Rosamani 1990:1270)
píkol-a pikul-i ‘small-M.PL’ (Marin 1981[1999]:297/275)

The non-myopic (1b) pattern, however, is clearly disconfirmed in the sources cited in Walker (2010, 2005): in the context with tonic /a/, /ɛ/, /ɔ/ there are 2 cases with no raising (including bodʒánten-i, the only alleged example), but 13 cases of raising (C=Cortelazzo 1978, M=Marin 1981[1999], R=Rosamani 1990, T=Tarlao 1983):⁴

(4) **Grado. Effect on the post-tonic when the tonic is /a/, /ɛ/, /ɔ/**

a. **Exceptions**

póver-o póver-i ‘poor-SG/PL’ M:303/353
bodʒánten-o bodʒánten-i ‘crab before the last moult-M.PL’ C:217-219

---

³ I have adapted the transcriptions. For Bartoli, who notes the voiced s as ʃ, [ʃ] = [z]. For Cortelazzo, [g̃] = [dʒ]. For Rosamani and Marin, who use different modified orthographic notations, [ɛ̂] = [ɛ].
[ð̃] = [ʒ], [gn] = [ɲ], [c]/_a,o,u = [k]. Stress has also been regularized and marked always [´]. Similar conventions apply to the transcriptions of Central Veneto. I have also added ‘-’ to mark the boundary before the gender/number marker.

⁴ Many of these examples appear several times in the set of sources; I only give one reference.
b. Regular cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>álbor-o</td>
<td>álbur-i</td>
<td>'tree-SG/PL'</td>
<td>M:63/30, R:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>árzen-e</td>
<td>árzin-i</td>
<td>'(water) bank-SG/PL'</td>
<td>M:293/317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bókol-o</td>
<td>bókul-i</td>
<td>'flower bud-SG/PL'</td>
<td>M:33/273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>láse-l-o</td>
<td>lási-l-i</td>
<td>'leave-2SG.IMP-IT.M.SG/M.PL'</td>
<td>M:122/148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ánzol-o</td>
<td>ánzul-i</td>
<td>'angel-SG/PL'</td>
<td>M:203/150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nókol-o</td>
<td>nókul-i</td>
<td>'bump-SG/PL.'</td>
<td>R:443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nálbor-o</td>
<td>nálbur-i</td>
<td>'marble-SG/PL'</td>
<td>R:670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sókol-o</td>
<td>sókul-i</td>
<td>'clog (shoe)-SG/PL.'</td>
<td>R:1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vansátol-o</td>
<td>vansátul-i</td>
<td>'leftovers-SG/PL'</td>
<td>R:1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gógodz-o</td>
<td>gógudz-i</td>
<td>'pebble-SG/PL'</td>
<td>R:444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vénkol-o</td>
<td>vénkul-i</td>
<td>'nightmare-SG/PL'</td>
<td>R:1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pápol-o</td>
<td>maña-pápol-i</td>
<td>'tidbit-SG/nickname'</td>
<td>T:164/R:567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(lit. 'tidbit-PL eater')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mámol-o</td>
<td>mámul-i</td>
<td>'boy-SG/PL'</td>
<td>C:160-162, M:75/33,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R:577, T160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The single example proposed favoring myopic non-raising, bodzánten-i 'crab before the last moult-M.PL.' (1b, 4a) deserves some comments. In the source, Cortelazzo (1978), out of 208 subjects, 148 were unable to give an answer, 104 gave a different root, or a wrong answer, 16 gave the root bodzánten- but followed by the singular marker -e, -o, or a paroxytone form. Only 44 (21%) gave the root with bodzánten- followed by the marker -i: 40 with no raising of the post-tonic, 4 with raising. This contrasts with the other relevant proparoxytone in this source, mámoli 'boys' (4b), a much more common word, for which there are 173 (83%)
relevant answers, 56 with no post-tonic raising, but 117 with raising (mámul-i). This suggests that the common noun undergoes myopic raising and that bodžánten-i is the exception.

2.2 Grado: additional data in additional sources. In order to see whether additional evidence might get us on a firmer base, I looked for other possible sources, beyond those in Walker (2005, 2010). For Grado there is Bottin's (2003) dictionary, additional texts by Marin, and the AIS atlas. The AIS atlas (Jaberg and Jud 1928-1940) confirms two examples in (4b), ánzul-i and sükul-i (entries 804, 1569). Marin (1951, 1964), which have approximately the same extension as the original Marin sources, confirm the first exception in (4a) and the first 5 examples in (4b), and add one case of raising in the context of a tonic /é/ (vége - vígil-i (1964:54/302) 'see-INF/see-INF-them.M') and three more cases for myopic raising: sárbol-o - sárbul-i (1951:288) 'sorb-SG/PL', réfol-o - réful-i (1964:340/177) 'gust-SG/PL', trabákol-o - trabákul-i (1964:101/161) 'small sailboat-SG/PL'. Bottin (2003) is based on the speech of conservative speakers of the 1950's, thus correspondig to a late phase of the first stage of Grado. It contains around 17,000 entries and 79 clear cases of myopic raising of the post-tonic, 9 of which coincide with those in the original sources.5 I give some examples of sg./pl. alternations in (5). Notice that the single case in the original data with opaque non-raising, bodžánten-i (1b), does undergo raising in Bottin (2003:s.v.): bodžánten-o (or bodžánten-e)-bodžántin-i.

(5) diávol o diávuli 'devil' zmérgolo zmérguli 'big thing'
    kávol o kávuli 'cabbage' sékol o sékuli 'century'

---

5 The proparoxytone stress and the the mid open character of the stressed vowel ([é, ő]), not always indicated in the source, were checked in Rosamani (1990). The source also gives information about raising of both tonic and post-tonic when the tonic is mid close. (e.g. véskovo - vískuvi 'bishop-SG/PL', órdene - úrdini 'order-SG/PL). There are 22 cases.
These sources strengthen the conclusion that harmony in the first stage of Grado is indeed myopic.

### 3.1 Central Veneto: additional data in Walker's sources.

The four examples in (2) come from Brunelli (2000), and were checked with a native consultant (Walker, p.c.). The single example with raising of both tonic and post-tonic, órdén-o úrdin-i, contrasts with another example that can be found in the sources, búgol-i, ‘snail-PL’ in Zamboni (1974:44), that doesn't raise the post-tonic, although the tonic is an acceptable (vacuous) target. No relevant proparoxytones are found in the other sources, Rizzi (1989), Belloni (1991), Maiden (1991), Marcato and Ursini (1998).

There are many more relevant cases in Brunelli (2000:s.v.), but the source is problematic. Like Brunelli (2006), its second "corrected and systematized" version, Brunelli (2000) is a unified prescriptive dictionary that combines very diverse dialects including, in addition to Central Veneto, among others, Grado, Venice, Treviso, and Belluno, and it usually does not specify dialectal source in the entries, in any case not in the proparoxytone entries. It is not clear whether this is a reliable source or not; to be on the safe side, let us consider both

---

6 The consultant "learned the Venetan dialect near the Vicenza/Verona border" (Walker 2005:922). He or she was approximately 30 years old, but there is no information about the specific location in the Vicenza/Verona border (Walker, p.c.).
possibilities. If we assume, correctly, I think, that Brunelli (2000) is not a source from which we can extract reliable information about harmony in a homogeneous group of Central Veneto speakers, then the empirical base is reduced to the (contradictory) examples úrdin-i, with transparent raising, and búngol-i, with transparent non-raising.

Should we assume that this dictionary is a reliable source with respect to harmony, then we should check it carefully. What we do find is no raising of the internal post-tonic when the tonic is /a/, /e/, /ɔ/, as in Walker's (2b), but also no raising when the tonic is /ɛ/, /o/, /ɨ/, /u/ either—in other words, proparoxytones just do not undergo raising, a situation that is not uncommon in Italo-Romance metaphonic systems. None of the 26 proparoxytones that appear in the dictionary shows raising (17 have tonic a, e, ɔ and 9, shown in (6), have tonic e, o, u, ɨ).8

---

7 Here are some examples:

chiłômetro … [pl.reg. -i] … quanti chiłômetri xeli da qua a…?
kilometer… regular plural -li … 'how many kilometers are there from here to…?'
eco avb. … èccomi, ecocci, eccoti …
'here adverb … here I am, here we are, here you are …'
pèrsego … [pl.reg. -ghi] … El me daga un puchi de pèrseghi
'peach … regular plural -ghi … give me some peaches'

8 This second version, Brunelli (2006), is not cited in Walker (2010) but is cited in Walker (2011). In (6) the plural forms are derived from the conventional notations in the dictionary, where the full plural is always indicated when there is raising of the tonic; in the case of zóveno - zóveni the form zóveni is explicitly included in the entry. In the case of úrdin-i ((2a), not shown in (6)) Brunelli (2000, s.v. ordenar) gives two possibilities, one with raising, the other with no raising: “órdeno ['I order'], te órdeni/úrdini ['you order']”; the example does not appear in the second “corrected and systematized” version.
Central Veneto. Effect on the post-tonic when the tonic is /e/, /o/, /i/, /u/

bónbol-o bónbol-i 'fatty-M.SG/PL'
liévor-e liévor-i 'hare-M.SG/PL'
zőven-o zóven-i '(male) youngster-M.SG/PL'
zőven-o zóven-i 'young-M.SG/PL' (A)
artíkol-o artíkol-i 'article-M.SG/PL'
kapítol-o kapítol-i 'chapter-M.SG/PL'
rúden-o rúden-i 'rusted-M.SG/PL'
rósteg-o rósteg-i 'rough, coarse (person)-M.SG/PL' (A)
títol-o títol-i 'title-M.SG/PL'

If there is no raising in proparoxytones, then the lack of raising in cases like pérseg-o → pérseg-i is due, not to nonmyopic harmony, i.e. to the fact that e, a, and o are non-undergoers, but rather to the general inability of harmony to take place in proparoxytones.

5. Central Veneto: additional data in additional sources. I could only find additional information in the AIS (Jaberg and Jud 1928-1940). I selected those places in the atlas, a total of 5, that had a majority of cases of regular paroxytone raising in the eleven cases I could find with sufficient information. The information regarding proparoxytones for these five places is the following. There is one map with a case with tonic /e/, /o/, /i/, /u/, the adjective 'young'; for this item there is one case of non-raising (Tonezza, dzóven-i); in the rest of places it is not

---

9 18 nevúd-i 'nephews', 43 túz-i 'children', 52 víd-i 'you see', 92 píl-i 'hairs', 97 kavíj-i 'head hairs', 138 polmún-i 'lungs', 153 di-i 'fingers', 1017 g(ay)-is-i 'have-2SG.PRES.SUBJ', 1357 fjúr-i 'flowers', 1375 pevarún-i 'peppers', 1560 púnt-i 'stitches'.
possible to determine if there is raising because the singular form is not supplied, and there
exist singular forms with post-tonic i in the area. There are two instances of words with tonic
/a/, /ε/, /ɔ/, 'angels' and 'clogs'. For the first item there are three places with raising (ândʒi-i,
Crespadoro and Cavarzere; ânzu-i, Fratta Polesine) and two places with no raising (Tonezza
and Montebello, ândʒeli). For the second word only in one place do we have the singular to
make sure whether there is raising or not (Tonezza, sőkul-i). Given all the data reported,
evidence is insufficient to make any claim about the nature of raising in proparoxytones,
although it rather points to a system in which raising is myopic and has many lexical
exceptions.
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