Fragments of Languages

FROM 'RESTSPRACHEN' TO CONTEMPORARY ENDANGERED LANGUAGES

Daniele Baglioni and Luca Rigobianco

Fragments of Languages

Brill's Studies in Historical Linguistics

Series Editor

Jóhanna Barðdal
(Ghent University)

Consulting Editor

Spike Gildea
(University of Oregon)

Editorial Board

Anna Berge (*University of Alaska*) – Gerd Carling (*Goethe University*) –
Nicholas Evans (*The Australian National University*)
Bjarke Frellesvig (*University of Oxford*) – Mirjam Fried (*Charles University*) –
Russel Gray (*University of Auckland*) – Tom Güldemann (*Humboldt-
Universität zu Berlin*) – Guglielmo Inglese (*University of Turin*) Brian D. Joseph
(*The Ohio State University*) – Ritsuko Kikusawa (*National Museum of
Ethnology*) – Silvia Luraghi (*Università di Pavia*)
Barbara McGillivray (*King's College London*) – Verónica Orqueda (*Pontifical
Catholic University of Chile*) – Marc Pierce (*University of Texas*) – Joseph
Salmons (*University of Wisconsin-Madison*) – Søren Wichmann (*MPI/EVA*)

VOLUME 23

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/bshl*

Fragments of Languages

From 'Restsprachen' to
Contemporary Endangered Languages

Edited by

Daniele Baglioni
Luca Rigobianco

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

Notes on the Morphology and Syntax of a 'Restsprache in Re': Istro-Romanian

Michele Loporcaro

1 Introduction: 'Restsprachen in Re' vs. 'Post Rem'*

A language that has come down to us only in fragmentary attestations was not necessarily, in the synchronic phase from which its documentation originates, an endangered language, although subsequently, by definition, it must have been. Thus, the connection between 'Restsprache' and endangered language proposed in the conference introductory text (see now Baglioni & Rigobianco, this volume) can be articulated by specifying that the status of 'Restsprache' can be 'in re' or 'post rem', which restates Untermann's (1980; 1983: 12 f.) distinction between 'Restsprachen' (stricto sensu), i.e. languages in decay (by language shift) at the time of their attestation, and 'Trümmersprachen', i.e. "Sprachen mit fragmentarisch erhaltenem Corpus" ['languages with fragmentarily preserved corpus'] (Untermann 1980: 7). The terminological distinction is thus updated to the current usage in historical linguistics, in which, again, the pre-existing term 'Restsprachen' seems to be used to denote both referents.

The fragmentary nature of the attestations may be due to external factors (desultory or undeveloped writing practices, or writing on perishable materi-

---

---

als, so that documents were not being handed down to a substantial extent), which filter 'post rem' the documentation available to us, but it may also be due to intrinsic factors, which restrict 'in re' the vital space of this language.

For example, it is very possible that whoever wrote the well-known Gallo-Roman inscriptions of imperial times, a selection of which is presented in (1)—engraved on whorls and found at various locations between central-eastern France and Switzerland—divided their everyday linguistic life between Gaulish and Latin (respectively shown in capital and italic capital letters, while forms attributable to either language are shown in bold capitals), with a fair share of code-switching/mixing:[1]

(1) Gallo-Roman inscriptions (Loth 1916; Lambert 1997: 123–124; 2002: 323–333; Meid 1980: 1032–1038):
     a. GENETTA IMI | DAGA VIMPI 'my girl/I'm a girl, good (and) beautiful' (*Agendincum*, Sens; RIG II.2, L-120)
     b. **NATA** VIMPI | · CVRMI **DA** 'beautiful girl, give (me some) beer' or 'good beer' (?), (*Augustodunum*, Autun; RIG II.2, L-112)
     c. **NATA** VIMPI | *POTA VI(NU)M* 'beautiful girl, drink (some) wine' (?)[2] (*Autissiodurum*, Auxerre; RIG II.2, L-121)
     d. *AVE* VIMPI 'hello, (my) beautiful' (*Noviodunum*, Nyon (CH); RIG II.2, L-122)
     e. GENETA | *VIS* **CARA** 'dear girl, will you?' (*Augustodunum*, Autun; RIG II.2, L-114)

Gauls eventually shifted to Latin, and even on the same type of objects from the same places and time one can see inscriptions entirely in Latin, such as

---

1 Here are the Gaulish words featuring in the inscriptions in (1): **genet(t)ā* 'girl' EDPC 157, Welsh *geneth*; a doublet of this word may hide under *nata* (1b–c), a homograph to the Latin participle *nāta* 'born.F.SG' (> 'daughter') which Meid (1980: 1032) regards as 'eine jüngere Form von *gnatha*' ['a more recent form of *gnatha*'] (attested in turn on a Gaulish inscription from St. Réverien, Nièvre; cf. Dottin 1918: 210, nr. 59), i.e. Gaul. (*g*)*nāta*, closely matching its Latin counterpart, both in terms of form (*gnāta > nāta*) and meaning ('born.F.SG' > 'daughter'); **dago-* 'good' EDPC 86 f., Gaul. *dago-marus*, Old Irish *dag-*; **wimpo-* 'beautiful' EDPC 422, Middle Welsh *gwemp* 'excellent'; **kormi* 'beer' EDPC 217, *curmi* (Marcellus Burdigalensis, 4th century), XVI 33, κουρμί (Dioscorides): Welsh *cwrw*, Irish *cuirm*; **kar-o-* 'to love' EDPC 191 Old Irish *caraid*, Middle Welsh *caru*.

2 The interpretation of the second half of this inscription is debated, with uncertainties beginning with the order: given that it is written circularly around the whorl, it can also be read VIMPOTA (see discussion in Mullen 2022: 56 f.).

AVE VALE BELLA TU, AVE DOMINA SITIIO 'hello, farewell, you (my) beautiful, hello (my) mistress, I'm thirsty' (from Autun; ILTG 524; Meid 1980: 1030; Lambert 1997: 123). By contrast, virtually none are entirely in Gaulish: "Il existe une dizaine de pesons de fuseaux portant des mots gaulois: mais un seul est entièrement en gaulois de façon certaine" ['there exist some ten whorls with Gaulish words on them: but just a single one is with certainty entirely in Gaulish'] (Lambert 2002: 320). The linguistic magmaticism of this corpus is palpable. For instance, Gaulish [wimpi] (VIMPI in (2a–d)), vocative feminine of *[wimpos] 'beautiful', is the pendant of the *BELLA* of the Latin epigraph now cited, while NATA is both Latin and innovative Gaulish (so Meid 1980: 1032),[3] and CARA can be ascribed indifferently to either language.[4] According to the editors' diagnosis, this is not an artificial mixture, first created at the time of writing, but the mirror of real-life linguistic conditions:

> ces messages amoureux sont un mélange intime de gaulois et de latin. […] Ce mélange de langues […] illustre le caractère populaire des messages. Sans doute très proches à la langue parlée dans la société gallo-romaine, plusieurs de ces légendes associent des mots gaulois et des mots de latin vulgaire, et résistent à une classification schématique ['these love messages are an intimate mixture of Gaulish and Latin. … This mixture of languages … illustrates the popular character of the messages. Undoubtedly very close to the language spoken in Gallo-Roman society, several of these legends combine Gaulish words and words in vulgar Latin, and resist a schematic classification'] (Lambert 2002: 319).

In other words, these texts give a picture of systematic code-switching and code-mixing in the context of ongoing language shift, a shift that was to be completed by the end of the Western Empire.

Some believe that this switching practice precipitated a kind of transitional mixed language: "Avant de disparaître, il avait probablement formé, avec le latin, des parlers mixtes dont nous retrouvons quelques traces dans des inscriptions d'origine vulgaire" ['Before disappearing, it [= Gaulish] had probably formed, with Latin, some mixed dialects of which we find some traces in

---

3 An important clue attesting to its being (also) an autochtonous Gaulish word (in spite of *gn-* > *n-*, see note 1) is provided by the gloss *nate fili* 'oh, son!' in the Vienna glossary (*De nominibus Gallicis*, written after the 5th century, whose earliest manuscript dates to the 8th), given its structure providing for "Gaulish words in the left-hand column" (Adams 2007: 302).

4 If this were indeed Celtic, it would require correcting the "unattested *karo- 'dear, beloved' < PIE *kh_2-ro-" in EDPC 191.

inscriptions of vulgar origin'] (Dottin 1918: 70). This is also Meid's (1980: 1034) opinion, disputed, however, by Adams (2003: 197) according to whom

> [t]here are certainly no grounds for setting up a mixed language, neither fully Latin nor fully Gaulish, which might have become established at a transitional stage in the process of Romanisation.[5]

Gaulish inscriptions (apart from those on spindle whorls exemplified in (1)) cease after the 2nd century CE, which might mean that at least of some of the spindle whorl inscriptions could provide the latest documents of Gaulish. Indeed, Mullen (2022: 46), summarizing earlier discussions on the dating of the whorl inscriptions, dismisses the claims (by Loth 1916: 169; Meid 1980: 1030; and Adams 2003: 196) that they date "to the third or fourth century AD" and, based on the evaluation of the relevant archaeological contexts, concludes for a time range between 90 and 235 CE.

A last certain metalinguistic attestation of its spoken usage is found in Sulpicius Severus' *Dialogues* (written c. 405), I 26, 5 (PL 20, 201), where a Gaul who does not speak Latin well is told: "Tu vero, inquit Postumianus, vel Celtice; aut, si mavis, Gallice loquere" ['You—Postumianus said—may speak Celtic or, if you prefer (calling it like that), Gaulish'] (cf. Lambert 1997: 10; Eska 2004: 857). At about the same time as Sulpicius' *Dialogus* is the floruit of Marcellus Empiricus (aka Marcellus Burdigalensis, cited in note 1), whose *De medicamentis* contains

> some Gaulish words which had entered local Latin and were no longer recognised as Celtic by Marcellus (though for the most part in his linguistic observations he makes a distinction between Latin and Gaulish and thus seems to have known some of the words he comments on in Gaulish, an indication that the language lingered on) (Adams 2003: 195).

Thus, not in general, but certainly in the specific texts exemplified in (1)—characterised by what Baglioni & Rigobianco (this volume: 2) dub "constitutive 'incompleteness' ... of forms and functions"—Gaulish appears to us as a 'Rest-

---

5 Mullen (2013) offers an in-depth survey of language contact (crucially including code-mixing) in Southern Gaul. Note that there is no contradiction between assuming code-switching/ mixing and the idea of a mixed identity, as Mullen (2022: 58 ff.) seems to imply, who instead appeals to translingualism. After all, it has often been reported for second-generation communities to adopt a bicultural identity structured linguistically through code-switching and mixing within systematically mixed language use (see e.g. Pizzolotto 1991; Schmid 2020).

sprache in re', independently of its fixation in writing, at a stage where mixed linguistic usage, both in speech and writing, attests to the language's retreat on its way to extinction. Such a situation of linguistic mixing and language shift in progress is not very dissimilar to that observable today for Istro-Romanian, to which I now turn. The parallelism is more fitting when considering what is seen in (1), as argued for example by Dottin (1918: 70), some sort of contact language (in the sense of Matras 2009: ch. 10) or mixed language use, a reflection of bilingual speech (Mullen 2022: 58 ff.), while it would be less than perfect if that were "just" code-switching, since the Istro-Romanian facts to be discussed show the precipitate of code-switching/mixing as borrowing and calque.[6]

In what follows, having first provided some sociolinguistic information on Istro-Romanian (§ 2), I will go on in §§ 3–4 to discuss some examples of the dialectics between retention and innovation through contact. In § 3, a few words will be spent to introduce the effects of total language contact on IR, focusing on the lexicon. I will then concentrate on grammar addressing verbal aspect (§ 4.1), some verb tenses (§ 4.2), clitic placement (§ 4.3), conjunctions (§ 4.4), and finally the formation of comparatives and superlatives (§ 4.5).

The investigation of the effects of the pressure of language contact and its role as a driver of change, because of the uniformitarian principle—according to which "the linguistic processes taking place around us are the same as those that have operated to produce the historical record" (Labov 1972: 101)—, will be useful for the study of 'Restsprachen' from the past, at the stage when they were such 'in re'.

2 The Ecological Setting of Istro-Romanian

Istro-Romanian (henceforth IR) is one of the four subdivisions of Daco-Romance, according to the majority view to be found in handbooks (e.g. in Tagliavini 1972: 356–364). However, linguists from the local community (e.g., Vrzić & Doričić 2014: 105) prefer subsuming IR directly under a superordinate classificatory unit dubbed 'Eastern Romance', on a par with those varieties which the handbook view regards as the three further branches of Daco-Romance, viz. Daco-Romanian (DR), Aromanian (AR) and Megleno-Romanian (MR).[7]

---

6   Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for bringing up this point.

7   The subgrouping is controversial (Dahmen 1989: 436 f. reviews the different proposals, and Dahmen & Kramer 2021 even question, on extralinguistic grounds, the traditional grouping

IR is spoken by a vanishingly tiny number of speakers in a few villages in north-eastern Istria (see Figure 14.1) and comprises two mutually intelligible, yet clearly distinct varieties (northern and southern, henceforth NIR vs. SIR respectively), which have been spoken in isolation from each other since the late Middle Ages and thus came to diverge in both lexicon and grammar.[8] NIR is spoken just in Žejane (IR *Jeiǎn*, in the municipality of Matulji, Primorje-Gorski Kotar district), while SIR survives in an area lying some 20 km to the SSW as the crow flies, but at least 40 km on foot (see the list of the SIR villages in Filipi 2002: 31). This geographic setting favoured the mutual isolation and hence the structural divergence of the two branches, since they are separated by the Učka/Monte Maggiore massif. For SIR, the first-hand data cited in the following were collected with speakers from the variety of Šušnjevica if not otherwise specified.

The sociolinguistic setting of IR is one of total (or absolute) language contact (Breu 2011: 440), as its speakers are all bilingual with Croatian in the standard and the Čakavian dialect varieties and lack a separate ethnic identity, viewing themselves as Croats. Such a situation favours assimilation and its linguistic manifestation, i.e. language shift to the majority language. This shift is nearly completed nowadays (the Ethnologue classifies IR as 'shifting'):[9] fluent native speakers (probably around 100) are today over 50 years of age and the language is not being passed on to children any longer. Obviously, given this situation, earlier sources give higher and higher figures as one climbs back in time. Thus Ascoli (1861: 48 f.), elaborating on Combi (1859: 108 f.), reported over 3000 IR speakers, while about one century later, Tagliavini (1972: 364; first ed. 1949) and Kovačec (1971: 23) estimated some 1500 speakers. More recently, Filipi's (2002: 53) figures indicate some 90 and 80 speakers for SIR and NIR respectively and, finally, Vrzić & Doričić (2014: 107) give a somewhat more optimistic estimate for NIR (120 fluent speakers), but the data are uncertain, as in the same year Vuletić (2014: 191 n. 9) indicates 53 NIR speakers (out of the 134 inhabitants of Žejane), based on information from the http://www.vlaski-zejanski.com/ website (last accessed on 10 July 2023), provided by the first author of the article just quoted (Z. Vrzić).

---

within a unity of the four dialects). According to Pușcariu (1976: 254 f.), IR and DR form a western branch, AR and MR an eastern branch.

8   A certain amount of the differences in the lexicon (on which cf. Kovačec's 1998 dictionary and Filipi's 2002 atlas) depends on the different intensity of contact with other languages: for instance, for 'newspaper' SIR has the Italian loanword [dʒorˈnɒle] while NIR has borrowed [noˈvine] from Croatian.

9   EGIDS level 7: cf. https://www.ethnologue.com/language/ruo/ (last accessed on 10 July 2023).

3   Effects of Total Language Contact on Istro-Romanian

IR is well documented, starting with the first studies in the mid-19th century, which allows one to appreciate the increasing impact of total language contact (see §2) on its structure. Before the eventual language shift, total contact has generally been observed to be conducive to simplification of the grammar of the minority language, so that "the reduction of language-specific rules seems to be the most important reason for language change" (Breu 2011: 440). Indeed, comparison with the other branches of Romanian shows that the grammatical structure of IR has been substantially reshaped (see the data discussed in Kovačec 1963; 1966; 1968; 1971; Filipi 2002; Sala 2013: 218–225; Vrzić & Doričić 2014; Loporcaro et al. 2021). For example, both IR branches have lost the palatal secondary articulation of consonants, as seen in DR *lup* 'wolf', pl. *lupʲ*, resulting in inflectional homophony across numbers in the nominative of many masculine nouns (IR *lup* 'wolf=wolves', Kovačec 1998: 108).[10] Croatian too lacks this phonological contrast. The impact of Croatian is particularly evident in the syntax, where IR has copied the relatively free word order of Croatian, thus departing from the other branches of Romanian, as well as specific rules such as those for the placement of clitics (pronominal and auxiliaries; see §4.3). Lexical borrowing led to relexification even in core domains such as those of body parts (Vrzić & Doričić 2014) or numerals (see Loporcaro et al. 2021 with references to the previous literature), so that it is often the case that whole IR sentences consist of Croatian lexemes "sans en changer autre chose que les morphemes grammaticaux" ['without changing anything else but grammatical morphemes'] (Kovačec 1968: 81).

To give a graphic impression of this intermingling, consider a short excerpt from the collection of SIR texts published by Puşcariu (1906), reproduced in (2) with Puşcariu's Romanian translation (displayed interlinearly, preceding the English one), to be used as a term of comparison (IR Slavicisms unknown to DR are boldfaced and italicized while Slavicisms common to the two varieties or occurring only in DR are boldfaced in both texts):

(2)   SIR text from Puşcariu (1906: 8):
    a. O vote un ***hlapắţ* sluzit**-a *gospodåru* tota lui *zivľeńa*
      Odată o **slugă** a **slujit** la un **stăpân** toată viaţa lui.
      '(There was) once a servant (who) had served a master all his life.'

---

10   For this lexeme, the alternative plural form *lúpure* 'wolves' is also available, in competition with the unmarked plural *lup* (Kovačec 1966: 64), where one sees the extension to original masculines of the *-ure* suffix originally restricted to neuters.

    b. Cănd-a vut *gospodåru za muri*, i̯e zis-a lu **hlapăţu**:

       Când a fost **stăpânul** pe moarte, i-a zis **slugii**:

       'When the master was about to (literally: had to) die, he said to the servant:'

    c. "tu-mń-ai̯ fost bur, ma i̯o te rogu viro me *vegl'ă* ţa nopte ţe me *zecopéiru*.".

       "Tu mi-ai fost bun, dar te rog vino şi ţine-mi veghea în noaptea când mă vor *îngropà*.".

       '"You have been kind to me, but please come and watch over me on the night I am to be buried".'

    d. ţela **hlapăţ** a mes si se *imbaté* pre un om: ţela fost-a åńelu.

       Sluga a mers şi s'a *întâlnit* cu un om: acela erà îngerul.

       'That servant went and met a man: that was the angel.'

In (2), IR forms of Latin heritage not preserved in DR are given in italics: these include lexemes, such as *imbaté se* 'to come across' (< *IMBATTERE, Salvioni–Faré 4277a: cp. the Italian cognate *imbattersi*), and aspects of grammar, such as the preservation of the infinitive: *cănd-a vut za muri* (introduced by the Slavic preposition *za*), *viro me vegl'ă* (< Lat. VIG(I)LARE; note here also the preservation of the palatal lateral in the consonant cluster [gʎ] from [gl]). In this passage, this is a minority component, as is the other—noted in spaced out italics—of forms of non-Slavic origin,[11] while Slavicisms are a clear majority.

    As is well-known, Romanian itself is the Romance language with the lowest percent incidence of inherited Latin lexicon, which is estimated not to exceed 2000 entries, though mostly of high frequency (Sala 2006: 44). This original layer—unlike in the 'Romània continua'—was not corroborated by the centuries-long osmosis with Latin and the learned loanwords that derived from it, in whose stead a host of loanwords entered Romanian from Old (Church) Slavonic. IR goes further: in (2), an IR Slavicism which is not found in DR is *zivl'eńa* (NIR *živl'eńa* < Čakavian *življenje*) 'life', related to the verb of Slavic origin *zivi̯/živi̯* 'to live' (< *živ(j)eti*), which replaced Lat. VIVERE to whose family DR *viaţa* (< VIVITIA DER 9323) belongs, along with its derivative *a vieţui* 'to live', synonymous with the much more usual *a trăi*. Equally Slavic is *zecopéiru* '(they) will bury' (inf. *zecopéi* IHR 223 < Croatian *zakopati*). This verb form simultaneously exhibits aspects of innovation (by contact) and preservation (with respect to DR), and these will be the two first structural features to be considered in §4, with which we transition from lexicon to grammar.

---

11   These are *îngropa* 'to bury', from *groapă* 'grave', probably a substratum word (cp. Albanian. *gropë* 'id.', DER 3891), and the Magyarism *a întâlni* 'to meet'.

4   The Changing Structure of Istro-Romanian

4.1   *Verbal Aspect*

The verb form *zecopéiru* in (2) shows at work a productive lexeme formation device, impacting verbal morphology, that was acquired by contact and undermined inherited mechanisms. A further example is given in (3) (again, the IR sentence in (3a) is followed by the DR counterpart in (3b), and Slavicisms are boldfaced):[12]

(3)   a.   **oˈbitʃno** am kumparaˈvɛi̯t ˈkʷɒrne, **ali** jer am kumpaˈrɒt **ˈribe**   SIR
       b.   **obișnuit** cumpăram carne, dar ieri am cumpărat pește   DR
            'usually I bought meat, but yesterday I bought fish' (Hurren 1969: 66)

In the first verb form [kumparaˈvɛi̯] 'to buy' in (3a), formed on a Romance basis (the same as in the second verb in (3a), [kumpaˈrɒ] < Lat. COMPARĀRE REW 2094), the derivational suffix is Slavic, and serves the formation of an aspectual pair. Among the most discussed innovative features of IR, is namely that of having imported the Slavic system of forming pairs of verbal lexemes (variously shaped, as exemplified in Table 14.1) whose members are distinguished by aspect/Aktionsart.

Suffixation and prefixation occurring in such pairs are among the lexeme formation devices that IR imported from Slavic and uses productively, to the detriment of inherited strategies: thus, IR is possibly the only Romance language in which the inherited -ĀRE verb class has ceased to be productive and remains confined to the original Latin stock (e.g. *leɣǿ* 'to tie' < Lat. LIGĀRE).

4.2   *Istro-Romanian Future and Conditional*

In the inflection of the same verb form *zecopéiru* '(they) will bury' in (2c) we see—as mentioned while concluding §3—also a conservative feature. Indeed, we are confronted here with a verb tense found in ancient DR but no longer in present-day DR, variously named as future subjunctive (Ascoli 1861: 67), restrictive future ("restrictivul viitor", Pușcariu 1926: 179; Kovačec 1971: 142), or (synthetic) conditional (Maiden 2020: 28; 2021: 296). All labels capitalize on the fact that, though in (2c) we see it occurring in an embedded temporal clause, its unmarked context of use is the protasis of a conditional sen-

---

12   The adverb meaning 'habitually' is a Slavicism in DR as well, but IR has borrowed it again and uses it as an unadapted loanword; the noun [ˈribe] in SIR (= NIR [ˈriba]) replaces the Romance word *pește* (< Lat. PĬSCEM) of Romanian (3b).

TABLE 14.1   Aspectual-actional lexeme pairs in the IR verb system (after
             Maiden 2016: 211; cf. Hurren 1969; 1999: 114–138; Kovačec 1971:
             123–130)

	a. imperfective	b. perfective	
i.	*dopaˈdɛi̯ se*	*dopaˈdi se*	'to please, like'
	skaˈkɛi̯	*skoˈtʃi*	'to jump'
	spoviˈdɛi̯	*spoviˈdi*	'to confess'
	ˈtortʃe	*poˈtortʃe* (*spreˈdi*)	'to spin'
ii.	*laˈtrɒ*	*zalaˈtrɒ*	'to bark'
	durˈmi	*zadurˈmi*	'to sleep'
iii.	*fareˈkɒ*	*prikuˈji*	'to shoe (a horse)'
	ˈbɛ	*poˈpi*	'to drink'
	matʃiˈrɒ	*zmeˈʎi*	'to grind'

tence introduced by the conditional conjunction *se* (< Lat. sī).[13] Both contexts are exemplified in Table 14.2 (a), and the periphrastic indicative future, formed with the auxiliary verb 'to want' as in DR, is given for comparison in (b) (cf. Ascoli 1861: 65; Puşcariu 1926: 179; Kovačec 1971: 147; Hurren 1999: 90).

Etymologically, this verb tense ultimately stems from the Latin future perfect: e.g. *aˈflɒr* '(if) I find' < *ADFLAVERO, *aˈvur* '(if) I have' < HABU(E)RO/-IM, *ˈfur* '(if) I am' < FU(E)RO, etc. (Ascoli 1861: 67, Maiden 2021: 296), whose stem was analogically reshaped in several verbs: e.g. *askunˈser* '(if) I hide' < ABSCONDIDERO × ABSCONS-, *faˈkur* '(if) I make' < FECERO × FAC-, *ˈdɒr/daˈvur* '(if) I give' < (DEDE)RO × DA(+v)- (cp. Croatian *davati/dati*), etc.

That of the definition of this tense is to some extent a nominalistic issue. The forms of the IR future subjunctive are identical to those of the Old Romanian conditional, and these in turn are etymologically identical to those of the Spanish future subjunctive (ORo. *zisere, fure* = Sp. *dijere, fuere* etc., Maiden 2004: 84; Maiden 2008: 6). Now, "In old Romanian, the conditional is a kind of future tense form characteristically confined to the protasis of those conditional sen-

---

13   The outcome of Lat. sī has retained its original function in IR as well as in AR (cf. (15) below).

TABLE 14.2   Future subjunctive and future indicative (NIR)

a. future subjunctive (NIR);					b. future indicative (NIR)		
1SG	se/kənd	jo	aˈflɒ-r	fiˈni-r	(na)piˈsæi̯-r	jo	voi	aˈflɒ
2SG	"	tu	aˈflɒ-ri	fiˈni-ri	(na)piˈsæi̯-ri	tu	vɛr	"
3M/F.SG	"	je/jɒ	aˈflɒ-re	fiˈni-re	(na)piˈsæi̯-re	je/jɒ	va	"
1PL	"	noi̯	aˈflɒ-rem	fiˈni-rem	(na)piˈsæi̯-rem	noi̯	rɛm/rɛnᵃ	"
2PL	"	voi̯	aˈflɒ-rets	fiˈni-rets	(na)piˈsæi̯-rets	voi̯	vɛts	"
3M/F.PL	"	jeʎ/jɒle	aˈflɒ-ru	fiˈni-ru	(na)piˈsæi̯-ru	jeʎ/jɒle	vor	"
	'if/when find/found// finish/ finished// write/wrote' etc.; 'I will find etc.'						

a [rɛm] and [rɛn], occur in free variation, which is reminiscent of "[t]he historical change *-m > -n" that occurs in Istrian Northwest Čakavian dialects and affects verb inflections such as 1SG *kopân* 'I dig' (< -m; see e.g. Kalsbeek 2011: 137).

tences whose apodosis contained a verb in the future" (Maiden 2021: 297). This means that even proponents of the 'conditional' label acknowledge the future semantic component, which actually seems the crucial one, so that the traditional label 'future subjunctive' seems preferable. Note that this semantic trait becomes the primary one in related Dalmatian, where the same forms gave rise to the unmarked (indicative) future:

(4)   *manˈʧ-ur-me e ˈb-ar-me   daˈpu*   Dalmatian
      eat-FUT-1PL and drink-FUT-1PL afterwards
      'we'll eat and drink afterwards' (Bartoli 1906: 242; Maiden 2016: 130)

Moreover, both IR speakers and linguists with a Slavic background use the Croatian future as a translational equivalent of this tense, as shown e.g. by Kovačec's (1998: 295) translations: *i̯é va verí când tot fúre ɣótovo* 'on će doći kada sve bude gotovo' = 'he will come when everything is ready' (lit. 'will be ready'); *se veríri acåsa, na rem poɣovarúi̯* 'ako dođeš kući, porazgovarat ćemo' = 'if you come home (lit. 'will come'), we will talk'. The same correspondence emerges in translations of Croatian questionnaire items given by our IR informants, as exemplified in (5):

(5)   a. Ako će ti ju pokazati, sviđat će ti se   (Croatian, questionnaire item)
         'if they show it (F.SG) to you, you'll like it' (lit. 'if they will show')

b. NIR 2017

se	*tsi‿*	*vo‿*	*araˈtʷɒru,*	*dopaˈdi*	*ti‿*
if	2SG.DAT	3SG.F.ACC	show.FUT.SBJV.3PL	please.INF	2SG.DAT

se‿	*ˈvɒ*
REFL	FUT.IND.3SG

c. SIR 2017

ʃe	*tsi‿*	*vo‿*	*raˈtʷɒ-ru,*	*pjaˈʒɛi̯*	*tsi‿*
if	2SG.DAT	3SG.F.ACC	show.FUT.SBJV.3PL	please.INF	2SG.DAT

se‿	*ˈvɒ* /
REFL	FUT.IND.3SG

ʃe	*tsi‿*	*vo‿*	*raˈtʷɒ-ru,*	*ˈvɒ*	*‿tsi*
if	2SG.DAT	3SG.F.ACC	show.FUT.SBJV.3PL	FUT.IND.3SG	2SG.DAT

‿se	*pjaˈʒɛi̯*
REFL	please.INF

d. SIR 2017

ʃe	*ts‿*	*ˈvɒ‿*	*vo‿*	*raˈtʷɒ,*	*pjaˈʒɛi̯ tsi se ˈvɒ*
if	2SG.DAT	FUT.IND.3SG	3SG.F.ACC	show.INF	…

Answers (5b–c) show that, given a question containing 'if' in the source language, followed by a verb in the future, the future subjunctive is a natural response for speakers from both branches. As shown in (5d) for SIR, however, this is not mandatory, as also the (periphrastic) future indicative is an option to fulfil the same task, which is all the more proof that not calling the verb tense at issue a future would miss a generalization.

4.3   *Clitics and Clitic Placement in IR*

The two variants of the SIR response in (5c) differ in the placement of pronominal clitics, which represents one of the many areas where the two grammars, Romance and Slavic, intersect, resulting in an intricate state of affairs. In examples such as those in (6), IR shows pronominal clitics apparently indistinguishable in terms of syntactic placement from the general Romance (and specifically Romanian) conditions:

(6) a. *askuˈtɒts‿me   ˈbire*
        listen:IMP.2PL‿1SG.ACC well
        'listen to me well'

b. *nu   mi⸗'ɛ   'frika*
    NEG 1SG.DAT⸗is fear
    'I am not afraid'

However, the affirmative counterpart to the negative clause (6b) is ['frika mi⸗'ɛ] 'I am afraid', showing that the placement of pronominal clitics can diverge from the Romanian rules and take the second position dictated by Croatian Wackernagel clitic placement rules, though this is not a must, as will be shown in (8c), (10) (Dragomirescu & Nicolae 2020: 155 treat this duplicity as the coexistence of two cliticization sites, "a C-oriented site, specific to Wackernagel, 2nd position clitics, and an I-oriented site, the general option of the Romance languages"). In addition, again as in Croatian, clitichood is systematically observed with auxiliary verbs and the copula, as exemplified with the perfective auxiliary 'to have' in (7a):[14]

(7) a. *kumpa'rɒt⸗av   'kɒza*   NIR 2017
        bought:M.SG⸗have.PRS.3PL house
        'they bought a house'

    b. *bɛpo ʃi adri'ɒna av⸗ kumpa'rɒt   'kɒza ʃi*
        Beppe and Adriana have.PRS.3PL⸗bought house and
        mj⸗av⸗o⸗ara'tɒt
        1SG.DAT⸗have.PRS.3PL⸗3SG.F.ACC⸗showed
        'Beppe and Adriana bought a house and showed it to me'

Note that in (7b) the proclitic auxiliary [av] ends up sandwiched between two pronominal object clitics thus forming a sequence that is ungrammatical in DR (contrast the Romanian counterpart *mi-au aratat-o*).[15] In addition to the parallelism with Croatian syntax, one has to mention the fact that in Old Romanian

---

14 The auxiliary form *av* in (7a–b) is both a phonological and syntactic clitic (see, e.g., Loporcaro 2012: 756 f., 765–769 for this distinction, though see Dragomirescu & Nicolae (2021) who argue that the auxiliary 'to have' in Istro-Romanian is not a clitic). This makes a difference with respect to the DR forms of *a avea* 'to have' that an anonymous reviewer brings up in this connection. These forms are indeed often described as 'clitic' (Maiden 2018: 237; Zafiu 2021: 360) since they are monosyllabic and, for the cited authors, lack lexical stress (which is questionable, however). Certainly, unlike its IR counterpart, DR *a avea* is not clitic syntactically.

15 As Oli Winistörfer pointed out to me, this sandwiching would be banned also in Slavic varieties of the region. The NIR example (7b) is at odds with Zegrean's (2012: 157) account, who argues that in IR "Unless other pronominal clitics are present, 3rd person auxiliaries are enclitic on the participle" and thus deems ungrammatical examples such as NIR

TABLE 14.3   Daco-Romanian and Croatian copula

a.	Daco-Romanian stressed	clitic	b.	Croatian stressed	clitic
1SG	sunt	⹀s		jesam	sam
2SG	eşti	—		jesi	si
3SG	este / e	⹀i		jest(e)	je
1PL	suntem	—		jesmo	smo
2PL	sunteţi	—		jeste	ste
3PL	sunt	⹀s		jesu	su

"unstressed pronominal elements (and auxiliaries) were subject to 'Wackernagel' conditions, tending to occur immediately after the first major constituent of the clause, and never clause-initially: e.g. *Văzutu-l-am*, lit. 'seen him I.have' vs modern *L-am văzut* 'him=I.have seen'» (Maiden 2016: 105).[16] Under such circumstances, it may be difficult to discern what IR owes to shared Romanian inheritance from what is due to Croatian contact pressure. However, this discrimination proves easier when it comes to the copula. Like IR, also DR possesses some clitic forms of the copula (the third persons and the first singular), which are displayed in Table 14.3 (a) alongside the Croatian enclitic copula paradigm in (b).

Unlike DR, Croatian displays no gaps in this paradigm.[17] The same is true in IR, as exemplified in Table 14.4 with auxiliaries encliticizing to some place/time

---

*Dejan a⹀mes ân besęrica 'Dejan has gone to church' (instead of *Dejan mes⹀a ân besęrica*). Both orders are actually possible, as also seen e.g. in the SIR examples in (2d), with *ţela hlapằţ a mes* 'that servant went' alongside *ţela fost-a ằńelu* 'that was the angel'.

16   That the possibility of enclitic placement of the auxiliary is at least partly hereditary suggests also the comparison with Megleno-Romanian, which has developed an "inverted perfect" with modal (evidential) functions resulting from the univerbation of an original participle+auxiliary sequence (Tomić 2006: 378–380). Though some authors prefer a compositional analysis of these forms (see e.g. Zegrean 2012: 43 n. 38), the inverted perfect of the verb *iri* 'be' (*fost-am* 1 (SG=PL), *fost-ai* 2SG, *fost-au* 3 (SG=PL), etc.), exemplified in (i) (cf. Tomić 2006: 378 n. 71, 380), provides particularly clear evidence for reanalysis since the participle **fost* does not occur on its own any longer in Megleno-Romanian (having been ousted by analogical *fută*; see Capidan 1921: 175):

(i) *nu   ra   casă; fostau   la lucru.*
     NEG was.3SG home was.EVID.3   at work
     'he wasn't at home; (I understand that) he was at work'

17   The availability of a full enclitic paradigm for the copula is widespread in Southern Slavic: cf. e.g. Tomić (1997: 303) on Macedonian.

TABLE 14.4   Northern Istro-Romanian enclitic copula (NIR 2017)

	a. 'whence?'	b. 'where?'	c. pronoun	d. 'since when?'	e. 'here'
1SG	'dende⸗səm	'juva⸗səm	'jo?	də 'kənd ⸗səm 'ɒntʃ	'ɒntʃ ⸗səm de la 'dɛset 'uri
2SG	'dende⸗ʃ	'juva⸗ʃ	'tu?	⸗ʃ	⸗ʃ
3SG	'dende⸗je/⸗i̯	'juva⸗je/⸗i̯	'je (M)/'jɒ (F)?	⸗je/⸗i̯	⸗je/⸗i̯
1PL	'dende⸗smo	'juva⸗smo	'noi?	⸗smo	⸗smo
2PL	'dende⸗ste	'juva⸗ste	'voi?	⸗ste	⸗ste
3PL	'dende⸗s	'juva⸗s	'jeʎ (M)/'jɒle (F)?	⸗s	⸗s
	'where am I from?', etc.	'where am I?', etc.	'I, you' etc.	'since when have I been here?', etc.	'I have been here since 10 o'clock', etc.

adverbs ([juva] < UBI + VOLET, ['dende] < DE + UNDE; ['ɒntʃ] < HA(N)C+CE; the reader is referred to Frățilă & Bărdășan 2010: 88, 154, 187 for the etyma):

The 2SG form seems explicable as a reduction of the common Romanian one, given palato-alveolar [ʃ], probably favoured by the Croatian parallel. For the rest, comparison with Table 14.3 (a) suggests that enclitic 3SG ⸗i and 3PL ⸗s are while all remaining forms must be borrowed from Croatian.

As a further example of clitic placement, consider in (8a–c) the different linearizations which we have recorded for the parting formula meaning 'see you tomorrow':

(8)   a. *ve'dɛ⸗nɛ⸗rɛm*   *'mɒre*   NIR 2017
          see⸗REFL.1PL⸗FUT.1PL tomorrow

      b. (*noi*) *nɛ⸗rɛm⸗ve'dɛ*   *'mɒre*
          (1PL) REFL.1PL⸗FUT.1PL⸗see tomorrow

      c. *rɛn⸗nɛ⸗ve'dɛ*   *'mɒre*
          FUT.1PL⸗REFL.1PL⸗see tomorrow
          'see you tomorrow'

(9)   *ve'dɛ⸗rɛn⸗nɛ*   *'mɒre*
      see ⸗FUT.1PL⸗REFL.1PL tomorrow
      'we'll see (each other) tomorrow'

TABLE 14.5   Present indicative, future indicative auxiliary, and conditional auxiliary (['vrɛ] 'to want')

a.	['vrɛ] 'to want'	PRES.IND	b.	FUT.IND auxiliary	c.	COND auxiliary (NIR)
1SG	jo	'vrɛsu		voi		rɛʃ/raʃ
2SG	tu	'vrɛʃi		vɛr		rɛi
3M/F.SG	je/jɒ	'vrɛse		va		rɛ
1PL	noi̯	'vrɛm/vre'sɛm		rɛm/rɛn		rɛm/rɛn
2PL	voi̯	'vrɛts/vre'sɛts		vɛts		rɛts
3M/F.PL	jeʎ/jɒle	'vrɛsu		vor		rɛ
	'I/you etc.	want/		will		would'

Examples (8)–(9) show that the auxiliary and the pronominal clitic may swap positions, both with respect to the verb and among each other. Nothing similar occurs in Romanian, while the initial placement in (8c) is incompatible with Croatian rules too: in Croatian, *sutra ćemo se videti* 'we'll see (each other) tomorrow' is fine abruptively, contrary to **ćemo se videti sutra*, which becomes grammatical only if some word/constituent occurs right before (cf. e.g. Tomić 2004: 519).

A further clitic auxiliary is the one employed to form the conditional exemplified in (10):

(10) a. (')*rɛi꞊vo꞊'vrɛ*   *kumpa'rɒ ?* (*bitsi'klɛta*)   NIR 2017
          COND.2SG꞊DO.3F.SG꞊want.INF buy.INF   bicycle(F).SG
          'would you want to buy it?' (the bicycle)

     b. *se rɛts꞊a'flɒ*   *a'ʃɒva*   *'kɒza*   *'zaidin*
          if COND.2PL꞊find.INF such.F.SG house(F).SG immediately
          rɛts꞊vo꞊'vrɛ
          COND.2PL꞊DO.3F.SG꞊want.INF
          'if you found such a house, you'd immediately want it'

This too, as the one occurring in the indicative future, ultimately stems from the auxiliarization of a form of the verb ['vrɛ] 'to want' (cf. Zafiu 2021: 365, with earlier references)—in this case the imperfect indicative (while the future auxiliary stems from the indicative present). In the conditional, just as in the future, the auxiliary forms are usually unstressed, as seen in (10b), though if they occur

clause initially (as in (10a), an option unavailable in Croatian) they may bear stress (other instances of stressed auxiliaries are shown in (5c–d)). The two forms occurring in (10) are distinct from the corresponding ones of the future indicative auxiliary, seen in Table 14.2 (b) and repeated here in Table 14.5 (b), after those of the present indicative of the verb ['vrɛ] of which they represent the clitic counterpart, standing to it in the same relationship as the conditional (seen in Table 14.5 (c)) to the imperfect indicative of the same lexical verb (see Kovačec 1971: 151, IHR 216).

Comparison of Table 14.5 (b-c) shows that the 1PL forms of the future and conditional auxiliaries are homophonous and, in addition, they are also homophonous with the inflection in the same person of the future subjunctive. Consider the following examples:

(11) a. *se   laꜜˈdɒ-rɛm*   *ˈkʎutʃ-u*   *puˈtæꜜvor*
       if   IO.3PLꜜgive.FUT.SBJV-1PL   key(M)-DEF.M.SG   be.ableꜜFUT.IND.3PL
       ˈji   ənˈnuntru   NIR (2017)
       go. INF inside

   b. *se   laꜜrɛmꜜˈdɒ*   *ˈkʎutʃ-u*   *puˈtæꜜvor*
      if   IO.3PLꜜFUT.IND.1PLꜜgive   key(M)-DEF.M.SG   be.ableꜜFUT.IND.3PL
      ˈji   ənˈnuntru
      go. INF inside

   c. ako ćemo im dati ključ, moći će ući/oni će moći ući
                                        Croatian questionnaire entry

   d. se daremo loro la chiave potranno entrare
                                        Italian questionnaire entry
      'if we give (lit. 'will give') them the key, they'll be able to get in'

The string [ˈdɒ-rem] in (11a) is glossed as a future subjunctive, given that it appears in a conditional clause. Under this analysis, -[rem] is an inflectional ending.[18] The questionnaire input ((11c); see § 4.2) was in the future, and among the answers we collected also the alternative order in (11b), where however [rɛm], preceding the lexical verb, must be viewed as the form of the future auxiliary (Table 14.5 b). Having said this, it follows that (11a) is also liable to an alternative analysis, whereby [rem] is a clitic auxiliary (of the future indicative

_____

18   Remember the non-distinctness of [rɛm] and [rɛn], addressed in n. a in Table 14.2.

or the conditional) rather than an inflectional ending, given the homophony just mentioned that is observed in this one person.[19]

4.4   *Some Conjunctions in Istro-Romanian*

A further Slavicism boldfaced in (3), § 4.1, is the adversative contrastive conjunction *ali*, a Croatian loanword in IR which is unknown to DR, on a par with the other synonymous, but inherited, conjunction, *ma* (Kovačec 1971: 160), which occurred above in the textual excerpt in (2c):

(12)   Adversative contrastive/textual conjunction *ma* < Lat. MA(GI)S
   a. *no nu-i fome, ma lu feţóri*   (SIR, IHR 110)
       'it is not I who am hungry, but the child'

   b. *ma i̯o te rogu* (= (2c)); *ma če am ió facút?*   (NIR, IHR 110)
       'but I beg you'   'but what have I done?'   (textual conjunction?)

Conjunctions offer one more chance to see how the picture offered by IR is variegated, also characterised by some aspects of preservation with respect to DR. Such is the case with *ma*, the outcome of Latin MAGIS, instead of which DR has *dar*, as an adversative contrastive conjunction, but which also remains in the other two branches: MR and AR *ma* 'but' (see Papahagi 1974: 762 and Bara 2004: 97 respectively). This (exclusive) adversative contrastive conjunction *ma* in IR is also reinforced by Croatian, which has in turn borrowed *ma* from Romance (i.e. Italian): e.g. *ma/ali što sam ja učinio?* 'but what have I done?' (Skok 1971–1974: II, 343).

Taking a somewhat broader look at coordination, one sees that the common Romanian copulative conjunction *şi* occurs also in IR (in SIR also as *si*, IHR 190), as exemplified in (13):

(13)   Copulative conjunction: IR *şi* (SIR also *si*) = DR/AR/MR *şi* < Lat. SĪC
       'bɛpo ʃi adri'ɒna av kumpa'rɒt 'kɒza ʃi mj≠av≠o ara'tɒt   NIR (2017)
       'Beppe and Adriana bought a house and showed it to me'

However, its range of use is narrower than in DR, since alongside this conjunction, IR features a further one with a non-exclusive contrastive function (or

---

19   I have been following the descriptive literature (see especially Kovačec 1971: 143, 151) in transcribing with [ɛ] the auxiliary form and with [e] the ending, but indeed the vowel timbre is intermediate in both.

the function of contradiction of expectation, such as expressed by e.g. Spanish *pero/mas* contrasting with corrective *sino*, etc.; cf. e.g. Cuenca et al. 2019: 6). This is the outcome of Lat. ET, which modern DR lacks:

(14) Adversative contrastive conjunction: IR *e* (IHR 75) < Lat. ET (MR *e* 'and', Papahagi 1974: 527; AR *e* 'and, but, or', Bara 2004: 58/*i* 'and', Cunia 2010: 552), inherited but with a changed function, viz. non-exclusive contrastive (= DR *dar*)

   a. ˈbɛpo ʃ**i**/*e adriˈɒna ˈjiɾvor la ˈmɒre   NIR (2017)
       'Joe and Adriana will go to the seaside'

   b. ˈjo voiɾˈji la ˈmɒre ʃ**i**/*e tu ˈboʎe ku ˈmire
       'I'll go to the beach and you'll come with me'

   c. ˈjo voiɾˈji la ˈmɒre **e**/*ʃi tu ˈboʎe a ˈkɒza
       'I'll go to the beach and you go home'

   d. kuˈtʃɒ tʃe am ˈdɒt ˈʃoldi ˈditseʎei̯ ˈjiɾvoi̯ ə(n) ˈrai̯, **e** se nu raʃ ˈost ˈdɒ, ˈjiɾraʃ ˈost la ˈdrɒku
       'for giving money to children I will go to heaven, but/and if I didn't (give) I would go to hell' (/raʃ + ˈfost/ → [raˈʃost])

The examples in (14) show that IR [ʃi] and [e] are in complementary distribution, the latter only being felicitous when a contrast is implied, as in (14c–d) (contrary to (14b)). Again, the occurrence of this conjunction in IR is obviously a matter of preservation, combined, however, with an innovation, given the restriction in meaning to the non-exclusive contrastive function that pertains instead to *dar* or *iar* (the latter with a meaning halfway between 'and' and 'but') in DR (Cuenca et al. 2019: 8). This innovation is common to Aromanian, not to Megleno-Romanian, where *e* preserves its original copulative meaning.

    Finally, in (15a) one sees another conservative trait of IR, in which the outcome of Lat. SĪ 'if' (> *se*, IHR 174) still fulfils its original function as a conditional conjunction, in the same way as observed for its counterpart *să* in Old Romanian (15b), which then became in DR a modal marker for 'irrealis' (the subjuntive and the 'viitor popular': *am/o să vin* 'I'll come'):

(15) Conditional conjunction: IR *se* ≠ DR *dacă* (Old Romanian *să* < Lat. SĪ)
   a. se tu veˈriri, jo ts raʃ ˈdɒ baʃˈkot   NIR (2017)
       'if you came I would give you a cookie'

b. *să ești ti* (Old DR, Coresi, 16th c., DER 7300.1)
    (= AR *și* 'that; if'; Bara 2004: 140)
    'if it is you'

4.5   *Comparative and Superlative Formation*

I will now round off this short guided tour of some notable aspects of IR morphology and syntax by discussing a dramatic—and, to date, unparalleled—example of contact-induced change, which has taken place in the expression of the superlative. Prior to this change, IR must have formed both comparative and superlative in the same way as exemplified in (16) for DR, since all branches of Romanian have inherited this strategy from Proto-Romance:

(16) a. *mare*   'big'   b. *mai mare*   'bigger'   c. *cel mai mare*   'the biggest'
         bun   'good'   *mai bun*   'better'   *cel mai bun*   'the best'

Proto-Romance has virtually generalized analytic comparative and superlative formation, which ousted the affixal strategy that Latin had inherited from PIE. In Latin, the comparative was formed by adding the suffix *-ior* (M/F.NOM)/*-ius* (N.NOM) to the root, with some cases of allomorphy ensuing in a handful of high-frequency lexemes: e.g. *magnus* 'big' → *maior/maius* 'bigger'. This synthetic formation yielded in Proto-Romance to a periphrasis, whereby the adverb MAGIS (in peripheral varieties: Romanian, Spanish and Portuguese) or PLUS (in central varieties such as Italian and French) precedes the adjective. Alongside this regular strategy, most languages have preserved about half a dozen irregular high-frequency comparatives inherited from Latin: e.g. It. *maggiore* 'bigger' < MAIŌREM (alongside *più grande*, lit. 'more big'). Romanian does not even preserve such scanty remnants and has generalized the periphrastic formation without residue, as shown in (16b). The same holds for superlatives, where remnants of the Latin synthetic formation never persist in the relative superlative, which consists of a periphrasis with the definite article (in most languages: e.g. Italian *il più grande* 'the biggest') while in Romanian it involves an articoloid (*cel/cea mai mare*, M/F; see (16c)).

   If the one seen in (16) must be the starting point for IR too, contact with Croatian has impacted the system. Unlike Romance, and like Latin, Slavic as a whole has retained synthetic comparatives and superlatives, as exemplified with Croatian in (17).[20] Small caps in (17c) highlight stress, as superlative form-

---

20   This is one of the structural properties which Breu (1996; 2019) capitalizes on to classify the types of contact-induced changes in Slavic languages. Note that it is not the case that

TABLE 14.6   Synthetic and analytical comparative and superlative formation in Slavisano

Slavisano	i. synthetic (irregular)	ii. analytical (regular)
a. comparative:	*bolji/bolje* 'better' (adj./adv.), *gori/gore* 'worse' (adj./adv.)	*veča velki/bògati* 'bigger/richer'
b. superlative:	*nâ(j)bolji* 'best', *nâ(j)gori* 'worst'	*naveča velki/bògati* 'the biggest/richest'

ation involves a tone/stress shift by which the superlative prefix receives prominence (see Jachnow 2001: 494):

(17) a. *jasan* 'clear'   b. *jàsnij* 'clearer'   c. NÂI-*jasnij* 'clearest'
         lêp   'beautiful, nice'   *lèpšij* 'nicer'   NÂI-*lèpšij* 'nicest'

Given this substantial difference between the strategies in the two languages, it comes as no surprise that this is a privileged locus for contact-induced change, as witnessed especially in verbal repertoires where a Slavic minority language coexists, under full contact, with a Romance dominating language (several such cases are discussed in Breu 1996: 26–35; 2019: 414–415). Consider the following data from Slavisano (a Croatian dialect spoken in Molise, southern Italy; see Rešetar 1911: 127; Breu 2019: 415) displayed in Table 14.6.

As seen in Table 14.6 (i), just a few adjectives—the same as in standard Italian—retain the synthetic comparative and superlative, which becomes then in this dialect an irregular form while productive comparative and superlative formation is realized via a preposed adverb (Table 14.6ii) thus calquing the Romance pattern.

A similar situation obtains in Resian, a Western Slovenian dialect spoken in an enclave in Friuli under total contact with both Friulian and Standard Italian,

---

Slavic languages, on the whole, do not have any analytic formation processes at their disposal, as shown e.g. by the alternative, available in Russian, between (ia-b):

(i) a. *on*   *umn-ejš-ij*   *paren'*   *v mire*
        3SG.M smart-SUP-NOM.M.SG guy(M)[NOM.SG] in world
     b. *on*   *sam-yj*   *umn-yj*   *paren'*   *v mire*
        3SG.M most-NOM.M.SG smart-NOM.M.SG guy(M)[NOM.SG] in world
        'he's the smartest guy in the world'

Rather, the criterial property of Slavic, inherited from PIE, is the availability of synthetic formation, even if it co-occurs with alternatives. This generalized availability contrasts sharply with the non-occurrence in Romance.

TABLE 14.7   Synthetic and analytical comparative and superlative formation in Resian

Resian	i. synthetic (irregular)	ii. analytical (regular)
a. comparative:	*lípi* 'beautiful' → *líwča* 'nicer.NOM.SG.F'	*ko si bila bọ́ na mála* 'when I was smaller'
b. superlative:	*najlíwča* 'the nicest.NOM.SG.F'	*kíra jẹ bọ́ ta krátka* 'which one is the shortest?' (= thread)

where "[s]ynthetical comparative and superlative forms do not occur very frequently" (Steenwijk 1992: 115). Instead of those inherited forms (Table 14.7i), the analytical ones in (Table 14.7ii) occur more often in Steenwijk's corpus.

Bukovina Polish, a dialect spoken in North-Western Romania within a repertoire which includes Romanian as a roofing language, takes a further step (see Breu 1996: 33–34). Not only do we find the calque of the Romance periphrasis but in addition, the adverb used in both comparative and superlative formation is directly borrowed from Romanian, as evident from the comparison of (18) with (16):

(18)   Bukovina Polish (Breu 1996: 33–34):
 a.   comparative: *maj novyj* 'newer', *maj dobryj* 'better' (= Romanian *mai nou/bun*) instead of the autochtonous Polish synthetic comparative *nowszy*, *lepszy*.
 b.   superlative: *ten maj novyj* 'the newest', *ten maj vjel'ki* 'the biggest' (= Romanian *cel mai nou/mare*) instead of the autochtonous Polish synthetic superlative *najnowszy/największy*.

In Bulgarian too, comparative formation was reshaped under contact pressure, with the demise of the inherited comparative suffixation which was replaced by a prefix which somehow imitates the preposed adverb used to form comparatives in (Balkan-)Romance. Compare Bulgarian *по-силен* (*PO-silen*, where small caps stand for stress prominence, as in (17c)) 'stronger' (← *силен* [*silen*] 'strong'), with the inherited suffixation exemplified by Russian *сильнее* (*sil'nee*) ← *сильный* (*sil'nyj*) 'strong'. Bulgarian, in turn, provided the model for the closest match to the IR facts which is described in the literature on contact influence in the opposite direction (Romance > Slavic) in this area of grammar. According to the description by Andreeva et al. (2017: 175), Bulgarian influence led Djudezmo—the variety of Spanish spoken in the region since the turn of the 16th century—to reshape the prosody of the inherited superlative (rather

than the comparative) to yield *MÁS fuerte* 'stronger' (vs. Spanish *más FUERTE*), as illustrated by the intensity curve on the sound wave in Andreeva et al.'s (2017: 175), figure 5.[21]

While, however, in Bulgarian Djudezmo the change is only superficial (as it affected only the phonetics), in IR the same prosodic device has acquired a grammatical function, signalling the superlative vs. comparative contrast, as seen in (19) (see Kovačec 1971: 108):

(19) a. *måre*   'big'   b. *mai MÁRE*   'bigger'   c. *MÁI måre*   'biggest'
       bur   'good'   *mai BÚR*   'better'   *MÁI bur*   'best'
       dróbna 'small'   *mai DRÓBNA*   'smaller'   *MÁI drobna*   'smaller'

Compared to DR in (16), IR has kept the inherited formation of the comparative, through the adverb *mai*, followed by an adjective carrying the main stress in the phrase as is usual in Romance and as exemplified with Spanish a few lines above. By contrast, the superlative has been reshaped by dropping the articoloid, making it segmentally identical to the comparative, except for the stress prominence, which falls on the adverb, as highlighted through the small caps in (19c). This calques the prosody of the Croatian superlative which, as seen in (17c), is formed by adding a stressed prefix *nâi-* to an inflected form of the adjective which is identical with the comparative (17b). However, while in the Croatian superlative this stress/tone pattern is just a concomitant of a morphological means (prefixation) distinguishing it from the comparative, in IR on the contrary it is just stress that signals the morphological contrast.

This makes the case now discussed, as stressed in Gardani et al. (2020), a virtually unique instance of contact-induced morphological change by which a prosodic calque (or pattern replication, in Sakel's 2007 terms) is introduced from the contact language to signal a contrast in inherent inflection (Booij 1994; 1996).

5   Conclusion

At the end of this guided tour through the grammar of IR, the reader will have appreciated that this Romance variety is a paradigmatic example of the kind of mixture of (originally) distinct systems that the pioneers of the study of lan-

---

21   What was replicated here is just the stress prominence of the comparative prefix, which "is always stressed, while the word to which it is affixed at the same time maintains its own word-level stress" (Leafgren 2011: 42).

guage contact qualified in the ways exemplified in the following definition of Romansh given by Ascoli (1880–1883: 411 f.), when he speaks of "lo spirito [...] tedesco, di cui la parola romana qui s'impregna" ['the ... German spirit, with which the Roman [i.e. Latin-Romance] speech is here imbued']. As we have seen, IR has reshaped its grammar by taking on board not only patterns but also linguistic matter from Croatian in all structural domains. Given the uniformitarian principle (Labov 1972: 101), a living language of this nature—observable in what are probably the last decades in which this is still feasible, because of the rampant language shift—may provide insights into the dynamics that also governed the crystallisation of mixed varieties in antiquity, as in the case of the one reflected in the Gallo-Roman texts from which I have taken my cue.

References

Adams, James. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adams, James N. 2007. *The regional diversification of Latin 200 BC–AD 600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Andreeva, Bistra, Snezhina Dimitrova, Christoph Gabriel, Anna Gazdik & Jonas Grünke. 2017. Intonation and convergence: evidence from Bulgarian Judeo-Spanish. *Надмощие и приспособяване. Международна научна конференция на Факултета по славянски филологии. Софийски университет "Св. Климент Охридски"* [Domination and Adaptation. International Conference of the Faculty of Slavic Studies. Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"], ed. by Ekaterina Tarpomanova & Krasimira Aleksova, vol. II. LINGUISTICS, 169–177. Sofia: University 'St. Kliment Ohridski'.

Ascoli, Graziadio Isaia. 1861. *Colonie straniere in Italia. Studi critici*. Vol. 1, 37–85. Milan: Politecnico.

Ascoli, Graziadio Isaia. 1880–1883. Annotazioni sistematiche al *Barlaam e Giosafat* soprasilvano. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 7: 406–602.

Bara, Mariana. 2004. *Le lexique latin hérité en aroumain dans une perspective romane*. Munich: LINCOM Europa.

Bartoli, Matteo. 1906. *Das Dalmatische. Altromanische Sprachreste von Veglia bis Ragusa und ihre Stellung in der apennino-balkanischen Romania*. 2 vols. Wien: Hölder [It. translation 2000. *Il Dalmatico Resti di un'antica lingua romanza parlata da Veglia a Ragusa e sua collocazione nella Romània appennino-balcanica*, ed. by Aldo Duro. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana].

Booij, Geert. 1994. Against split morphology. *Yearbook of Morphology 1993*, 27–49. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Booij, Geert. 1996. Inherent versus contextual inflection and the split morphology hypothesis. *Yearbook of Morphology 1995*, 1–16. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Breu, Walter. 1996. Überlegungen zu einer Klassifizierung des grammatischen Wandels im Sprachkontakt (am Beispiel slavischer Kontaktfälle). *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49(1): 21–38.

Breu, Walter. 2011. Language contact of minority languages in Central and Southern Europe: A comparative approach. *The Languages and Linguistics of Europe. A Comprehensive Guide*, ed. by Bernd Kortmann & Johan van der Auwera, 429–451. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Breu, Walter. 2019. Morphosyntactic change in Slavic micro-languages: the case of Molise Slavic in total language contact. *Slavic on the Language Map of Europe. Historical and Areal-Typological Dimensions*, ed. by Andrii Danylenko & Motoki Nomachi, 385–432. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Capidan, Theodor. 1921. *Meglenoromânii*. I. *Istoria şi graiul lor*. Bucureşti: Cultura Naţională.

Cioranescu, Alexandre. 1958–1966. *Diccionario etimológico rumano*. La Laguna: Universidad de la Laguna.

Combi, Carlo. 1859. *Porta orientale*, Anno III. Fiume: Schubart—Rezza/Trieste: C. Coen.

Cuenca, Maria Josep, Sorina Postolea & Jacqueline Visconti. 2019. Contrastive Markers in Contrast. *Discours* 25: 3–31.

Cunia, Tiberius. 2010. *Dictsiunar a limbãljei armãneascã (di-aoa sh-vãrã 100 di anj) dupã dictsiunarili T. Papahagi, S. Mihãileanu shi I. Dalametra sh-cu turnarea-a zboarãlor armãneshti tu limbili rumãneascã, frãntseascã shi inglizeascã Editsii Timpurarã (proschirã)—Andreu 2008)*. Editura Cartea Aromãnã.

Dahmen, Wolfgang. 1989. *Areallinguistik III. Meglenorumänisch. Lexicon der Romanistischen Linguistik*. Vol. 3. *Die einzelnen romanischen Sprachen und Sprachgebiete von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart: Rumänisch, Dalmatisch / Istroromanisch, Friaulisch, Ladinisch, Bündnerromanisch*, ed. by Günter Holtus, Michael Metzeltin & Christian Schmitt, 436–447. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Dahmen, Wolfgang & Johannes Kramer. 2021. Rumänische „Dialekte" auf dem Balkan?. *Bornistik. Sprach- und kulturwissenschaftliche Perspektiven auf die Romania und die Welt*, ed. by Anna Ladilova, Dinah Leschzyk, Katharina Müller, Nicolas Schweitzer & Falk Seiler, 293–305. Giessen: Giessen University Library Publications.

DER = Cioranescu (1958–1966).

Dottin, Georges. 1918. *La langue gauloise. Grammaire, textes et glossaire*. Paris: Klincksieck [reprinted München: LINCOM Europa 2014].

Dragomirescu, Adina & Alexandru Nicolae. 2020. Particular features of Istro-Romanian pronominal clitics. *Studia UBB Philologia* 65: 147–158.

Dragomirescu, Adina & Alexandru Nicolae. 2021. Romance and Croatian in contact: non-clitic auxiliaries in Istro-Romanian. *Languages* 6, 187. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages6040187

EDPC = Matasović (2009).

Eska, Joseph F. 2004. Continental Celtic. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, ed. by Roger D. Woodard, 857–880. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Filipi, Goran. 2002. *Istrorumunjski lingvistički atlas. Atlasul Lingvistic Istroromân*. Atlante Linguistico Istrorumeno. Pula: Znanstvena udruga Mediteran.

Frăţilă, Vasile & Gabriel Bărdăşan. 2010. *Dialectul istroromân. Straturi etimologice. Partea I*. Timişoara: Editura Universităţii de Vest.

Gardani, Francesco, Michele Loporcaro & Alberto Giudici. 2020. *A borrowed prosodic marker for inherent inflection in Istro-Romanian*. Paper given at the *19th International Morphology Meeting*, Vienna, 6–8 Febuary 2020.

Hurren, Anthony H. 1969. Verbal aspect and archi-aspect in Istro-Rumanian. *La Linguistique* 5(2): 59–90.

Hurren, Anthony H. 1999. *Istro-Rumanian: A Functionalist Phonology and Grammar*. PhD dissertation, University of Oxford.

IHR = Kovačec (1998).

ILTG = Wuilleumier (1963).

Jachnow, Helmut. 2001. Komparationskategorie und Graduierung im Kroatischen/Serbischen. *Quantität und Graduierung als kognitiv-semantische Kategorien*, ed. by Helmut Jachnow, Boris Norman & Adam Suprun, 483–511. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kalsbeek, Janneke. 2011. Contact-induced innovations in Istrian Čakavian dialects. *Language Contact in Times of Globalization* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 38), ed. by Cornelius Hasselblatt, Peter Houtzagers & Remco van Pareren, 133–154. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

Kovačec, August. 1966. Quelques influences croates dans la morphosyntaxe istroroumaine. *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia* 21–22: 57–75.

Kovačec, August. 1971. *Descrierea istroromânei actuale*. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

Kovačec, August. 1998. *Istrorumunjsko-Hrvatski Rječnik* (*s gramatikom i tekstovima*). Pula: Znanstvena udruga Mediteran.

Labov, William. 1972. Some principles of linguistic methodology. *Language in Society* 1: 97–120.

Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 1997. *La langue gauloise*. Paris: Errance.

Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 2002. *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises: II. 2 Textes gallo-latins sur instrumentum. XLVe supplément à "Gallia"*. Paris: CNRS.

Leafgren, John. 2011. *A Concise Bulgarian Grammar*. Durham, NC: SEELRC [= The Slavic and Eurasian Language Resource Center, Duke University].

Loporcaro, Michele. 2012. A new strategy for progressive marking and its implications for grammaticalization theory: the subject clitic construction of Pantiscu. *Studies in Language* 36(4): 747–784.

Loporcaro, Michele. 2018. *Gender from Latin to Romance: history, geography, typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Loporcaro, Michele, Francesco Gardani & Alberto Giudici. 2021. Contact-induced complexification in the gender system of Istro-Romanian. *Journal of Language Contact* 14(1): 72–126.

Loth, Joseph. 1916. Remarques aux inscriptions latines sur pesons de fuseau trouvés en territoire gaulois et, en particulier, à l'inscription celtique de Saint-Révérien (Nièvre). *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 60(2): 168–186.

Maiden, Martin. 2004. Perfect pedigree. The ancestry of the Aromanian conditional. *Oxford Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology and Phonetics* 9: 83–98.

Maiden, Martin. 2008. Osservazioni sul futuro dalmatico (e guascone). *Bollettino linguistico campano* 11/12 [2007]: 1–19.

Maiden, Martin. 2016. Dalmatian. *The Oxford Guide to the Romance languages*, ed. by Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden, 126–138. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maiden, Martin. 2018. *The Romance verb. Morphomic structure in diachrony*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Maiden, Martin. 2020. Dalmatian (Vegliote). In *Oxford Encyclopedia of Romance Linguistics*, ed. by Michele Loporcaro (part of *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics* ed. by Mark Aronoff). New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.726

Maiden, Martin. 2021. The inflexional paradigm of the verb. *The Oxford History of Romanian Morphology*, ed. by Martin Maiden, Adina Dragomirescu, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Oana Uță Bărbulescu & Rodica Zafiu, 278–341. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matasović, Ranko. 2009. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden: Brill.

Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meid, Wolfgang. 1980. *Gallisch oder lateinisch? Soziolinguistische und andere Bemerkungen zu populären gallo-lateinischen Inschriften*. Innsbruck: IBS [reprinted in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. 11.29.2 *Sprache und Literatur* (*Sprachen und Schriften* [*Forts.*]), ed. by Hildegard Temporini & Wolfgang Haase, 1019–1044. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter 1983].

Mullen, Alex. 2013. *Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean. Multilingualism and Multiple Identities in the Iron Age and Roman Periods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mullen, Alex. 2022. Materializing epigraphy: archaeological and sociolinguistic approaches to Roman inscribed spindle whorls. *Dynamic Epigraphy: New Approaches to Inscriptions*, ed. by Eleri H. Cousins, 39–64. Oxford/Philadelphia: Oxbow Books.

Papahagi, Tache. 1974. *Dicţionarul dialectului aromân general şi etimologic / Dictionnaire aroumain (macédo-roumain) général et étymologique*. Ediţia a doua augmen-

tată / Deuxième ed. augm. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste Românía.

Pizzolotto Giuseppe. 1991. *Bilinguismo ed emigrazione in Svizzera. Italiano e commutazione di codice in un gruppo di giovani*. Bern: Peter Lang.

PL = Migne, Jacques Paul (ed.). 1844–1864. *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*. Parisiis : venit apud editorem in via dicta D'Amboise, près la Barrière d'Enfer ou Petit-Montrouge.

Puşcariu, Sextil (în colaborare cu d-nii M. Bartoli, A. Belulovici și A. Byhan). 1906. *Studii istroromâne*. Vol. 1. *Texte*. Bucureşti: Cultura naţionala.

Puşcariu, Sextil (în colaborare cu M. Bartoli, A. Belulovici și A. Byhan). 1926. *Studii istroromâne*. Vol. 2. *Introducere, gramatica, caracterizarea dialectului istroromân*. Bucharest: Academia Română.

Puşcariu, Sextil. 1976. *Limba română*. I. *Privire generală*, Bucureşti: Minerva.

Rešetar, Milan. 1911. *Die serbokroatischen Kolonien Süditaliens*. Wien: Hölder [It. translation 1997. *Le colonie serbocroate nell'Italia Meridionale*, ed. by Walter Breu & Monica Gardenghi. Campobasso: Amministrazione Provinciale].

RIG II.2 = Lambert (2002).

Sakel, Jeanette. 2007. Types of loan: matter and pattern. *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-linguistic Perspective*, ed. by Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel, 15–29. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sala, Marius. 2006. *De la latină la română. Ediţia a II–a revăzută*. Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic.

Sala, Marius. 2013. Contact and borrowing. *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*, vol. 2. *Contexts*, ed. by Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith & Adam Ledgeway, 187–236. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salvioni–Faré = Faré, Paolo. 1972. *Postille italiane al "Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch" di W. Meyer-Lübke. Comprendenti le "Postille italiane e ladine" di Carlo Salvioni*. Milan: Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere.

Sârbu, Richard. 1992. *Texte istroromâne şi glosar*. Ediţia a II–a revizuită şi completată. Timişoara: Tipografia Universităţii din Timişoara.

Schmid, Stephan. 2020. Swiss German dialects spoken by second generation immigrants: bilingual speech and dialect transformation. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*: 1–16.

Skok, Petar. 1971–1974. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika = Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue croate ou serbe*. 4 vols. Zagreb: Jugosl. Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti.

Steenwijk, Han. 1992. *The Slovene dialect of Resia-San Giorgio*. Amsterdam/Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

Tagliavini, Carlo. 1949/1972. *Le origini delle lingue neolatine*. 6th ed. Bologna: Pàtron.

Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 1997. Non-First as a Default Clitic Position. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 5(2): 301–323.

Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 2004. The syntax of the Balkan Slavic Future tenses. *Lingua* 114: 517–542.

Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 2006. *Balkan Sprachbund morpho-syntactic features*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Untermann, Jürgen. 1980. Trümmersprachen zwischen Grammatik und Geschichte. *Rheinisch- Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Vorträge G 245. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Untermann, Jürgen. 1983. Indogermanische Restsprachen als Gegenstand der Indogermanistik. *Le lingue indoeuropee di frammentaria attestazione—Die indogermanischen Restsprachen. Atti del Convegno della Società Italiana di Glottologia e della Indogermanische Gesellschaft* (*Udine, 22–24 settembre 1981*), ed. by Edoardo Vineis, 11–28. Pisa: Giardini.

Vrzić, Zvjezdana & Robert Doričić. 2014. Language contact and stability of basic vocabulary: Croatian words for body parts in Vlashki/Zheyanski (Istro-Romanian). *Fluminensia* 26(2): 105–122.

Vuletić, Nikola. 2014. Les minorités linguistiques invisibles et/ou cachées de la Croatie: les communautés arbënishtë, istro-roumaine et istriote. In *Les minorités invisibles: diversité et complexité* (*ethno*)*sociolinguistiques*, ed. by Djordjević Léonard Ksenija, 182–192. Paris: Michel Houdiard Éditeur.

Wuilleumier, Pierre. 1963. *Inscriptions Latines des Trois Gaules* (*ILTG*). *XVIIe supplément à "Gallia"*. Paris: CNRS.

Zafiu, Rodica. 2021. The morphological history of auxiliary verbs. *The Oxford History of Romanian Morphology*, ed. by Martin Maiden, Adina Dragomirescu, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Oana Uţă Bărbulescu & Rodica Zafiu, 359–368. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zegrean, Iulia-Georgiana. 2012. *Balkan Romance*: *Aspects on the syntax of Istro-Romanian*. PhD dissertation, Università Ca' Foscari Venezia.

MAP 14.1   Istro-Romanian

■ = Istro-Romanian; ◆ = Croatian ; ● = Italo-Romance and Croatian; ○ = Italo-Romance