

## Dalmatian (Vegliote)

### Summary

Dalmatian is an extinct group of Romance varieties spoken on the eastern Adriatic seaboard, best known from its Vegliote variety, spoken on the island of Krk (also called Veglia). Vegliote is principally represented by the linguistic testimony of its last speaker, Tuone Udaina, who died at the end of the nineteenth century. By the time Udaina's Vegliote could be explored by linguists (principally by Matteo Bartoli), it seems that he had no longer actively spoken the language for decades, and his linguistic testimony is imperfect, in that it is influenced for example by the Venetan dialect which he habitually spoke. None the less, his Vegliote reveals various distinctive and recurrent linguistic traits, notably in the domain of phonology (for example, pervasive and complex patterns of vowel diphthongization) and morphology (notably a general collapse of the general Romance inflexional system of tense and mood morphology, but also an unusual type of synthetic future form).

**Keywords:** Dalmatian; Vegliote; Bartoli; Udaina; language death; phonology; morphology; syntax; lexicon

### 1 Historical background and sources

On 10th June 1898, on the Adriatic island of Krk (in Italian, Veglia), a seventy-four-year-old named Tuone Udaina (in Italian, Antonio Udina), died in an accidental explosion. It is generally assumed that with him died the Vegliote dialect, the very last remnant of the Dalmatian group of Romance varieties — and Udaina is certainly the last person of whom we know for sure that he had active knowledge of Vegliote.<sup>i</sup>

Dalmatian varieties had once been spoken along the coast of modern Croatia, from the islands of Krk, Cres, and Rab, in the Kvarner archipelago, through the mainland towns of Zadar, Trogir, Split, Dubrovnik (formerly Ragusa), and Kotor in Montenegro, in the south, but there seem never to have been more than 50 000 speakers (Muljačić 1971:400). There are few historical records, and much of our knowledge of earlier stages comes from loanwords into Croatian, toponyms, and attestations of Dalmatian words in Venetian or Latin texts. The Dalmatian varieties rapidly lost ground in the Middle Ages under pressure from the locally dominant Slavonic language, Croatian, and from the dominant Romance language of the eastern Adriatic, Venetian. There are some fourteenth century texts from Ragusa, but these show heavy influence by Venetian and Croatian, and it is not certain that any of the distinctive characteristics of these texts (almost exclusively in the vocalism) are authentically 'Dalmatian', and more recent views invoke Croatian influence (see, e.g., Dotto (2008) and Dotto and Vuletić (2016)). By the nineteenth century, the language survived only in its Vegliote form, among a few farming and fishing families on Krk. It enjoyed no cultural prestige and lacked any normative tradition.<sup>ii</sup> The notion of an original 'Dalmatian language', or a 'Dalmatian branch of the Romance languages' may be misleading: it is not clear that there was ever a single, uniform, linguistic entity which we might call 'Dalmatian' (indeed, the term is an invention of linguists and there is no evidence of an indigenous glottonym, other than the word 'veklisun' used to designate the distinctive speech of Veglia). 'Dalmatian' may never have constituted more than a cluster of structurally similar Romance varieties (see, e.g., Muljačić 1992 for discussion of the number of the 'Dalmato-Romance' languages that may have existed in the Middle Ages). It has even been suggested that Dalmatian could be considered part of the northern Italo-Romance

dialect continuum (cf. Bernoth 2008:2748), although the phonological differences, in particular, are profound, as are several of the morphological characteristics (notably the future tense, as discussed in section 4.3).

Practically everything we know about Dalmatian dates from late nineteenth century Vegliote, and in particular from Matteo Bartoli's *Das Dalmatische* (Bartoli 1906/2000). A very large part of our knowledge comes from the testimony of just one man: Udaina. Bartoli collected from him several thousand words of memories, tales, songs, and responses to grammatical and lexical questions. Udaina's Vegliote is clearly influenced by Venetian (a variety of which he habitually spoke).<sup>iii</sup> By the time Bartoli reached him, it seems that Udaina has not actively spoken Vegliote for twenty years. While the interaction with Bartoli seems gradually to have stimulated his memory of the language, what Udaina produces is a *recollection* of the speech he had heard from older generations, and which he had once spoken with his grandmother and others (see further Vuletić 2013:51). But this recollection, however imperfect, contains consistent and recurrent distinctive characteristics which legitimize a cautious description of the grammatical structure and phonology of the language. What follows is an examination of the structure of Vegliote, based principally, as it must be, on the attestations which Bartoli elicited from Udaina.

## 2 Phonology<sup>iv</sup>

### 2.1 General pronunciation and prosody

It seems that Udaina pronounced Vegliote in a manner indistinguishable from the pronunciation of the Venetan dialects of the region (Bartoli 1906/2000:II§263), including, for example, a retracted articulation of sibilants (Bartoli 1906/2000:II§276). Some peculiarities of his pronunciation may reflect a hypercorrecting tendency. Thus he often has [ʦ] for expected [s], e.g., 'kuoʦa for 'kuosa 'house' or ʦa'paite for sa'paite, the imperative of the verb 'know' (Bartoli 1906/2000:II§276), and this behaviour may be attributable to the fact that Venetan [s] frequently corresponds to Italian [ʦ] (cf. modern Venetan ra'gaso for It. *ragazzo* ra'gattso 'boy'). Only the sound [uɔ] (see below) seems truly distinctive of Vegliote.

We have no information about intonation or syllable structure, but we may at least surmise that these too were — at least in Udaina's speech — like those of the local Italo-Romance dialects. Nor is there any evidence for synchronic length distinctions. Word-stress is usually oxytonic or paroxytonic, many oxytones having arisen, historically, through the extensive deletion of word-final unstressed vowels; the proparoxytones tend to be loanwords from Italo-Romance or Slavonic.

### 2.2 Vowels

Romance word-final unstressed \*[e] and \*[o] have generally been deleted (e.g., *majs* 'month' < \*'mese < MENSEM, *pʌark* 'pig' < \*'porko < PORCUM), but deletion is often blocked after consonant clusters, and notably after *muta cum liquida* ('frutro 'brother' < \*'fratre < FRATREM, 'sanjlo 'alone' < SING(U)LUM, 'joŋko 'eleven' < \*'undeke < UNDECIM, 'vapto 'eight' < OCTO); in these cases, historically underlying unstressed vowels other than \*[a] all emerge as [o]. Other final unstressed vowels ([a], but also [e] — the outcome of unstressed final \*[i] and of \*[as]; cf. Maiden 1996) are better preserved (e.g., 'duote 'you give' < \*'dati < DATIS; ve'truna 'old.F.SG' \*vete'rana, ve'truna 'old.F.PL' < \*vete'ranas), yet these too frequently undergo deletion. Original word-initial stressed vowels and diphthongs generally acquire an onglide [j] (e.g., *jork* 'arches' < ARCI; *je'tʌot* 'age' < AETATEM; 'jojva 'grapes' < UUA). In unstressed

syllables only [a], [u], [o], [i], and [e] occur; the pretonic vowels in native, inherited, vocabulary are usually just [a], [e], and [o], and word-final [u] never occurs.

In stressed syllables, in addition to [a], [u], [o], [i], and [e], there is also a series of diphthongs. Two of these reflect early Romance diphthongization of \*[ɛ] and \*[ɔ] resulting (cf. Maiden 2016b), in Vegliote closed syllables, in diphthongs realized respectively as [jɛ] or [ja], and as [ɥa]. From original \*[ɛ], we have 'sjanpro 'always' < \*'sem.pre < SEMPER; p̄iat 'chest' < \*'pet.tu < PECTUS. Historically underlying \*[a] merged with \*[ɔ], in open and closed syllables (e.g., 'p̄ark 'pig' < \*'p̄r.ko < PORCUM, 'n̄uat 'night' < \*'n̄ot.te < NOCTEM; j̄ualb 'white' < \*'al.bu < ALBUM, 'b̄uarba 'beard' < \*'bar.ba < BARBAM). In original open syllables, the front vowel diphthongs monophthongized as [i] (mil 'honey' < \*'mje.le; dik 'ten' < \*'dje.ke < DECEM) while the outcome of original \*[a] and \*[ɔ], apparently [uɔ], frequently monophthongized as [u] (e.g., 'kuḡsa / 'kusa 'house' < \*'ka.sa < CASAM; fuḡk / fuk 'fire' < \*'fwo.ku < FOCUM).<sup>vii</sup> This diphthong appears to involve a high back vowel with a gradually opening articulation; Udaina himself denied that it resembled Italian *uo* ([wɔ]), describing it rather as a 'long, open [u]'. The other diphthongs have a final glide. One of them is directly inherited from Latin (e.g., 'paḡki 'few.MPL' < PAUCI); the remainder continue \*[e], \*[o], \*[i], \*[u] in open stressed syllables of paroxytones, yielding respectively [aj], [au], [ai], [oi]. These diphthongizations clearly occurred when distinctions of consonantal length still survived, since they are absent in open syllables which would originally have been closed by following long consonants (e.g., 'saḡta 'silk' < \*'se.ta < SETAM vs 'jala 'she' < \*'el.la < ILLAM; pe'laḡs 'hairy' < \*pe.'lo.so < PILOSUM;<sup>viii</sup> 'faḡka 'fig' < \*'fi.ka vs feλ 'son' < \*'fiλ.λu < FILIUM; a'voḡt 'had' < \*a.'vu.tu vs 'noλa 'nothing' < \*'nulja ).<sup>ix</sup>

### 2.3 Consonants

The consonant inventory of Vegliote is unremarkable (note that [ʃ] and [ʒ] are absent):

Table 1: Consonantal inventory of Vegliote Dalmatian

	bilabial	labiodental	dental	alveolar	palatal	velar
plosive	p	b	t	d		k g
nasal		m		n	ɲ	ŋ
trill				r		
fricative		f	v	s	z	j
lateral					l	λ
affricate			ts	ɟ	tʃ	ɟʒ

A well known comparative distinguishing feature of Dalmatian historical phonology is the absence of Romance palatalization of velar consonants before proto-Romance front vowels: compare 'kaḡna 'dinner', It. *cena* ('tʃena) < \*'kena < CENAM, ge'lut 'cold', It. *gelato* (ɟʒe'lato) < \*ge'lato < GELATUM (see also Bartoli (1906/2000:II§425.2) for the treatment of voiced velars). The Ragusan texts show no sign of palatalization before front vowels (Bartoli 1906/2000:II§429) and Dalmatian thereby seems to pattern with central Sardinian (and probably with Daco-Romance generally; cf. Skok 1926; Maiden forthcoming). The change [k] > [tʃ] before [i] (e.g., 'tʃiḡko 'bedbug' < CIMICEM, pwartʃ 'pigs' < PORCI) is internal to Vegliote and appears to be a development historically independent of the older Romance palatalizations (cf. Solta 1980:148f.). Evidence that it is an internal development lies in the fact that it

has also been caused by the initial glide of the diphthongs [je] or [ja] (e.g., mun'tʃal 'hill' < \*mun'kje < ?MONTICELLUM; cf. kor'tʃal 'knife' < CULTELLUM) and, apparently (cf. Bartoli 1906/2000:II§425.2), by the high front rounded vowel \*[y], the assumed historical reflex (see Bartoli 1906/2000:II§§299;302) of \*[u] in stressed open syllables (e.g., ʃol 'arse' < \*kyl < \*'kulu < CULUM).

There is much devoicing of word-final consonants. Udaina offers both voiced and voiceless alternatives in the single utterance el dzaʊk / dzaʊg de i butʃ 'the yoke of the oxen' (< IUGUM); also mut 'now', vit 'I see' (< MODO, UIDEO), but fjad 'faith' or gruʊnd 'big' (< FIDEM, GRANDEM), nuf 'new' (< \*'novu < NOUUM) but viv 'alive' (< \*'vivu < UIUUM).

The word-final nasal is usually [ŋ] (e.g., muŋ 'hand' < MANUM), but [n] may occur after [i] (e.g., SG jaŋ 'year' PL jaŋ). This velarization applies even after synchronic deletion of word-final [-a] (e.g., noŋ for 'nona 'grandmother'). Word-internally, a nasal assimilates to the position of a following consonant, yet generally appears as [n] before labials (e.g., kan'puŋa 'countryside', kinp 'field').

### 3 Inflexional morphology of the nominal system

#### 3.1 Number and gender in the noun and adjective

Vegliote inflexionally distinguishes two values for number (singular and plural), adjectives usually also inflecting for gender (masculine vs feminine); there is no inflexional marking of case. Gender and number marking is cumulative and principally expressed through word-final unstressed vowels. Given the frequent deletion of these, inflexional endings are often absent, with resultant morphological invariance (see examples 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, below). It is noteworthy that inflexional gender and number marking is preserved most consistently on determiners and pronouns.

Nouns and adjectives have two inflexion classes. One has singular [-a], predominantly associated with feminine agreement (but masculine 'tuŋta 'father'), and such feminines have a plural desinence -e (example 3); the second class shows zero inflexion in the singular (or ends in [-o]). This second class — which generally continues Latin second and third declensions — in the masculine, may take the plural desinence [-i] (1), and normally do so if they have singular [-o] (e.g. SG 'frutro - PL 'frutri 'brother'); the feminines of this class are usually invariant, but sometimes take plural -e (5). In the plural there is strict alignment of gender with endings with gender: -i is uniquely masculine, and -e uniquely feminine. Adjectives generally follow the pattern shown by MSG ve'truŋ, FSG ve'truna, MPL ve'truni, FPL ve'trone 'old'. Unlike other eastern Romance varieties where the plural ending -i may be associated with either gender (cf. Italian and Romanian feminine plural (*le*) *volpi* and *vulpi(le)* '(the) foxes' < UULPES), and may continue either Latin -I or -ES (for the phonological development, see Maiden (1996)), it is a noticeable feature of Vegliote that plural [-i] is exclusively associated with masculine agreement, and apparently continues only the Latin second declension masculine nominative plural ending -I. Indeed, it is an outcome of \*-[i] found in Vegliote only in non-phrase-final position, and may originate in the plural ending, specifically, of the determiners (see further Maiden (2019)).

Although Bartoli (1906/2000:I§506) believed otherwise, it seems that Vegliote could in fact distinguish gender in the numeral 'two' (MPL doj 'feldʒi 'two boys' vs FPL 'doe krea'tojre 'two girls'). In most cases, however, the form doj serves for either gender.

There are remnants of an old class of 'ambigeneric' nouns, which have masculine agreement in the singular and feminine agreement in the plural (cf. Loporcaro 2016:928-30). Udaina utters several times a feminine plural 'lane '(pieces) of wood' or 'firewood'. In repeating an old song, he utters FPL de'nakle 'nojide 'naked knees', a phrase which he says he does not understand. Ive (1886) obtained from Udaina, again in a song, the feminine plural 'mojre 'walls'. The singular counterparts of these words are masculine (although Udaina also has FSG 'lana 'wood').

### 3.2 Allomorphy in nouns and adjectives

There is relatively little root allomorphy, although there are some remnants of the phonological effects of the plural desinence  $-[i]$ : one is assimilation of original stressed  $[a]$  in the root, whose outcome is  $[i]$  (but  $[a]$  in the reflex of ANNI 'years'). To the extent that the effects of this change survive they rarely involve actual alternation: rather they have been analogically extended into the singular (note for example the two forms of the singular 'year' in examples (12) and also (10), where the originally plural allomorph has penetrated the singular).<sup>15</sup> There are also signs of allomorphy caused by historical palatalization of preceding root-final velars, dentals and laterals (cf. Bartoli 1906/2000:II§500), but these have mostly been eliminated in favour of the singular allomorph, except for 'tojfi kuñtʃ lit. 'all as many', 'all of', whose second element (used also in the feminine singular and plural 'tojfa kuñt, 'tojfe kuñtʃ), derives from Latin QUANTI 'how many' — cf. singular kuont), and for SG puant 'stitch' PL puantʃ. Palatalization of laterals persists, systematically, in the plural of reflexes of the Latin diminutive suffix  $-ELLUM$  (example 11).

- (1) i ve'truni 'fero kon'tjanti  
the.MPL old.MPL were happy.MPL  
'The old people were happy.'
- (2) jojñ jag doj jag  
one needle two needles.
- (3) 'kosta 'lanğa 'koste 'lanğe  
this.FSG language these.F languages
- (4) la muask 'koste muask  
the.FSG fly these.F flies
- (5) la kluf le kluf also 'jojna kluv 'tuõnte 'kluve  
the.FSG key the.FPL keys a.FSG key so.many.F keys
- (6) jojn pjas kunt pjas  
a.MSG fish how.many.M fish
- (7) 'jojna krauk doj krauk  
a.FSG cross two crosses
- (8) 'jultro 'jiltri  
other.MSG others.M

- (9) kuɔŋ 'kuini  
dog dogs
- (10) kinp kinp (also 'kinpi)  
field fields
- (11) kor'tʃaj kor'tʃaj  
knife knives
- (12) el jain 'tranta, el 'jultim de l jaŋ  
the.MSG year 30 the.MSG last.MSG of the year  
'the year (18)30, the last day of the year'

### 3.3 Articles

As in most other Romance languages, the source of the Dalmatian definite article is the Latin demonstrative adjective *ILLE* 'that, yielding the Vegliote forms MSG *el*, FSG *la*, MPL *i*, FPL *le*. The masculine singular is often [l] immediately after a vowel, and systematically so when the vowel belongs to a preceding preposition; the feminine singular is [l] when followed by a vowel. As in all other Romance languages, the singular indefinite article comes from the numeral *UNUS* 'one': it is generally *join* (F 'joina), a stressed variant of a modern form which also appears as *uŋ*. Nonetheless, it is not clear that variations of stress alone can explain the distribution of the forms, as may be seen in (13, 14, 15).

- (13) 'duo me uŋ paʊk, 'saŋglo join fla'tiŋ  
give =me a bit, only a little.bit  
'Give me a bit, just a little bit.'
- (14) 'tuonte 'pire ke 'fero int-una konpa'naja 'maʊra  
so.many sheep that are in a company big  
'fero joina 'maura 'gredʒa<sup>xi</sup>  
are a big flock  
'Lots of sheep that are in a big group are a big flock.'
- (15) ju de'kaja k el 'fero join prat gruɔnd, uŋ vi'kuɔr  
I said that he was a priest great, a vicar  
'I said he was a great priest, a vicar.'

There is a partitive construction comprising the preposition *de* 'of' + definite article (16):

- (16) le'vur de l gruŋ  
to.take of the grain  
'to take some grain'

The plural form corresponding to the singular indefinite article is made up of the originally partitive construction *de* + definite article (17):

- (17) in kost luag 'fero d i 'jarbul de le o'lee

in this place were of the tree of the olives  
 ‘in this place there were some olive trees.’

### 3.4 Demonstratives

The Vegliote demonstrative system involves an apparent two-term opposition between proximal to the speaker (e.g., MSG kost) and non-proximal (e.g., MSG kol) (18):

- (18) kost ku'tjal me pluk de ple de kol  
 this knife me= pleases of more than that  
 ‘I like this knife more than that one.’

### 3.5 Possessives

The system of possessive adjectives comprises terms corresponding to first person (singular and plural), second person (singular and plural), and third person (without distinction for number) possessors. They generally precede the noun but may follow it, and agree for number and gender. They are usually combined with a determiner (19, 20, 21).

- (19) el 'majo o'livo, una 'maja 'amja,  
 the.MSG my.MSG Olivo, a.MSG my.MSG friend the.MPL  
 i maj' feldži, le 'maje 'feldže  
 the.MPL my.MPL sons the.FPL my.FPL daughters  
 ‘my Olivo, an aunt of mine, my sons, my daughters’

- (20) i 'nuestri ve'truni  
 the.MPL our.MPL old.MPL  
 ‘our old people’

- (21) il su 'frutro, i suj  
 the.MSG POSS.3.MSG brother the.MPL POSS.3.MPL  
 'frutri, la 'soa so'raula, le  
 brothers the.FSG POSS.3.FSG sister the.FPL  
 POSS.3.FSG  
 'soe so'raule  
 POSS.3.FSG sisters  
 ‘his/her/their brother, his/her/their brothers, his/her/their sister, his/her/their sister’

There is also a shorter (clitic) form of the first person singular possessive adjective, mi, apparently limited to nouns denoting close male relatives (22-25):

- (22) el mi 'tuqta e la 'maja 'niena  
 the my father and the my mother  
 ‘my father and my mother’

- (23) mi feλ or fel me  
 my son son my  
 ‘my son [address form]’

(24) 's̘ante 'frane mi  
listen.IMP Frane my  
'Listen, my Frane!'

(25) el 'tuta su  
the father their  
'their father'

Possession, both alienable and inalienable, is generally expressed by the syntagm 'NP + preposition de + NP'. The full range of semantic relationships expressed by this construction goes from literal 'possession', 'ownership' to looser associations of various kinds (26-29):

(26) la 'luona de le 'pire  
the wool of the sheep

(27) la 'kuoṣa de la 'maja 'niēna  
the house of the my mother

(28) la muart de l su 'tuota  
the death of the his father

(29) 'joīna puart de l muand  
a part of the world

### 3.6 Adjectives

In general, adjectives follow the noun (30, 31):

(30) el 'vaklo ka'tiv  
the eye evil  
'the evil eye'

(31) 'kualke 'laṅga fo'rjast  
'some foreign language'

The adjectives 'good', 'beautiful', 'bad', 'big', and 'small' usually precede their noun:<sup>vii</sup>

(32) doj 'buone a'fure  
two good deals

(33) 'joīna 'bjala 'besta  
a fine beast

(34) la sen'taja ri tjanp la 'jakua  
PRON3SGF smelled bad weather the water  
'The water smelled of bad weather.'

(35) ju jai fuat 'joına 'maura fa'tajka  
 I have made a big effort

(36) 'joına 'pela vali'tfala  
 a little valley

Note the contrastive use of postposition in el pias 'pelo 'the little fish' (Bartoli 1906/2000:II§44), where 'small' fish are distinguished from 'large'. The word ve'truŋ 'old' occurs in both positions but there are too few examples to be certain about the significance of the distinction. The expressions 'poper maın 'poor me!', 'poper djaul 'poor devil!' indicate that the preposed adjective means 'deserving of sympathy' (cf. Ledgeway 2011b:399). Quantifiers precede the noun:

(37) 'tofa sta 'jakua  
 all this water

(38) el 'jultro buf  
 the other bullock

(39) 'kuonta 'rauba ke ge ve'naro iŋ buak  
 as.much stuff that to.him= will.come in mouth  
 'whatever stuff comes into his mouth'

(40) la 'praıma nuat e l 'praımo dai  
 the first night and the first day

(41) mualt veŋ  
 much wine

Occasional examples of pre-positioning of adjectives may reflect the influence of a formal, official style, possibly via Italian:

(43) el mi de'fuant 'tuota  
 the my late father

(44) l an'tik ve'truŋ dis'kuars  
 the ancient old speech

Relative clauses are generally introduced by the relativizer ke (sometimes ko) 'who, which' (invariant for gender and number). The relativizer is frequently followed by a clitic subject pronoun on the verb marking the number and gender and also case (cf. 48) of the antecedent. It also regularly occurs in combination with locative, temporal, and adverbial relatives an'du 'where', kuond 'when', and kuŋ 'how'. Note that ke alone can also express relative 'where', 'when' (e.g., 47).

(45) po'tajte aju'tur 'kosti 'poper ke i plaŋ'gua 'sjanpro  
 can.2PL help.INF these poor REL they cried always  
 ke i no a'vas 'noła de ko man'tfur  
 that they not have nothing of which eat.INF

‘You can help these paupers who always complain they have nothing to eat.’

- (46) avajme una si'kuar ko no po'tajme sopor'tuor  
 we.have a drought REL not we.can tolerate  
 'We have a drought we can't stand.'
- (47) iŋ 'kola 'kuosa ke jo aġ na'suot  
 in that house REL I have been.born  
 'in that house where I was born.'
- (48) jal ke ge pluk de ple dor'mar  
 he REL to.him= pleases more to.sleep  
 'he to whom it is more pleasing to sleep'
- (49) kuond ke 'fero i ve'truŋ viv  
 when REL were the old alive  
 'when the old folk were alive'
- (50) mi ju doman'dut an'du ke 'fero el profe'saŋr  
 me= has asked where REL was the teacher  
 'He asked me where the teacher was.'
- (51) kun ke 'blajite  
 how REL you.want  
 'as you want'

### 3.7 Pronouns

Vegliote, like other Romance languages, has a double set of pronouns, a 'stressed' series, used in isolation, for contrastive emphasis, or after prepositions, and an 'unstressed', 'clitic' series, attached to the verb, whose members can never stand in isolation or receive contrastive stress. Stressed pronouns are, in many Romance languages, one of the last redoubts of morphological distinctions for case, especially in the first and second persons singular, where at least a subject form is distinct from a non-subject form. This is generally not true of Vegliote, however. The stressed first person singular pronoun is mostly *ju* (< nominative EGO) regardless of case-function, and what was, historically, the subject form of this pronoun also appears after prepositions (e.g., *jel 'fero de a'kuard koŋ ju* 'he agreed with me', *per ju me 'buosta* 'for me it's enough'), although there is also *viŋ koŋ majŋ* 'come with me', where the pronoun apparently derives from \*'mene (cf. Ro. *mine*) and sometimes there is also the form *me*, which (cf. Bartoli 1906/2000:II§491) apparently derives from Latin dative MIHI. Bartoli (1906/2000:II§115) cites *junda con maic* 'come with me', showing a remnant of Latin comitative MECUM 'with me' (cf. Salvi 2011:323). The second person singular stressed form is *te* (or *ti*), apparently from Latin dative TIBI (on phonological grounds, *te* cannot continue Latin accusative TE, the form preserved in many Romance languages): e.g., *kos te 'bule* 'what do you want?'; *ti se gra'tua* 'you scratch yourself'; *te te a ra'zaŋ* 'you are right'. The first person plural stressed pronoun is generally *no'jiltri*, combining first person plural *noj* with 'jiltri, which means 'other.MPL': e.g., *'jali po'taja fur ko'sajk e no'jiltri na* 'They could do that and we couldn't'. We do not know whether this form can agree for gender (in principle there

could have been a feminine ?no'jultre, but we lack examples). For the second person plural, the text offers both vo'jiltri and direct reflexes of Lat. UOS 'you.PL', usually voĵ.

The stressed third person pronouns continue Latin demonstrative ILLE 'that', and inflect for number and gender. Indeed, the desinential marking of these categories seems better preserved on the pronouns than anywhere else in the grammar: MSG jal, FSG 'jala, MPL 'jali, FPL 'jale. The singular first and second person (direct and indirect) clitic object pronouns are invariant: me and te. We have few examples of the corresponding plurals, but we find 2PL ve (also vi) (see 52-54). The third person direct object forms are (55-59) MSG lo / l, FSG la, MPLli, FPL le. Udaina has a third person indirect object clitic ge (apparently a Venetism; see 1906/2000:II§493), but also, occasionally, je (or ju), which is probably the indigenous Vegliote development (< ILLI): see examples (57), (60), (61). There is no evidence that either of these forms varies for gender or number.

(52) 'duo me dik 'sualdi  
give.IMP= me ten soldi (= coins)

(53) e ti fats ve'dar ke no ti po'taja por'tuor la  
and you.SG= I.make see.INF that not you can wear.INF=it.FSG  
'And I show you that you cannot wear it.'

(54) ju ve de'kaja ki ke 'fero 'kosti  
I you.PL= tell who that were these  
ve'truni  
old.MPL  
'I'll tell you who these old people were.'

(55) ju lo ka'tsure 'drante  
I him= chase.FUT in  
'I'll chase him in.'

(56) i maj la'vur li aj fat  
the.MPL my.MPL jobs them.M= I.have done  
'I've done my jobs.'

(57) ke ju, 'tune u'dajna, ge la ju dat 'fure  
for I, Tuone Udaina to.him=it.FSG have given out  
'For I, Tuone Udaina, provided it to him.'

(58) e le skirp le a'vas ko'sajk a'pjarte  
and the.FPL shoes them.F= have thus open.FPL  
'And they had their shoes open like that.'

(59) le'vur le a 'kuoŕsa  
take.INF= them.F to house  
'to take them home'

(60) ju ge de'karo ke l te 'dua per el ŕjol  
I to.him= tell.FUT that he= you.SG= give on the arse

'I'll tell him to smack your bottom.'

- (61) el je ju dat 'jojna zle'puta  
he to.him= has given a slap  
'He gave him a slap.'

Most Romance languages (including Italian and Venetan) have a dedicated clitic reflexive pronoun only in the third person, which originates in the Latin reflexive pronoun *SE* (both singular and plural). Vegliote is distinguished by the fact that the continuant of this originally only third person form has been extended to first and second person constructions as well, so that there is an invariant reflexive clitic for any combination of persons and numbers. A similar development has taken place in Surselvan Romansh, but it is perhaps relevant also that Croatian also neutralizes person and number marking in reflexive constructions.

- (62) ju se a<sub>i</sub> re'fut  
I REFL= have remade  
'I have got better.'

- (63) 'jala se ju re'fut  
she REFL= has remade  
'She has got better.'

- (64) koŋ kul kor'tjal te se a ta'ʌut  
with which knife you REFL= have cut  
'With which knife did you cut yourself?'

- (65) se veda'tsarme diz'muŋ  
REFL= we.will.see tomorrow  
'Will we see each other tomorrow?'

Vegliote has unstressed subject pronouns, but they are unsystematic and one cannot always be sure from the texts whether a given subject pronoun is stressed: it very probably is stressed in cases where subject pronouns are co-referent with a topicalized overt, strong subject which is clearly in the left periphery, and followed by a focalized constituent, while it is certainly not stressed in contexts where a noun phrase would be impossible. The use of an unstressed subject form seems particularly common for the first person and second persons singular and in contrast rare for the first and second persons plural (but cf. Renzi and Vanelli 1983; Pescarini 2016:745-48). The third person forms are M.SG (e)l, M.PL i, F.SG l(a), F.PL l(e). Clitic doubling (the use of a subject clitic form in combination with an overt pronominal or nominal subject) is common but not systematic. Thus examples 66-70:

- (66) ju ja<sub>i</sub> res'puast ke ju noŋ po'taja fav'lur iŋ  
I have answered that I not could speak in  
slav  
Slav  
'I answered that I couldn't speak in Slav.'

- (67) ju kuank kal ju dor'maja in pins

I some time I sleep in feet  
 'I sometimes sleep standing up.'

(68) 'guorda kost p̄ias ke viv k (el) 'fero  
 look this fish how alive that (it) is  
 'Look how alive this fish is.'

(69) i 'peli nom nat i 'bule fu'mur  
 theMPL littleMPL not born they want to.smoke  
 'The little ones want to smoke even before they are born.'

(70) po'tajte aju'tur 'kosti 'poper ke i plaŋ'gua 'sjanpro ke  
 you.can help these poor that they cry always that  
 i no a'vas 'noʎa de ko man'tʃur  
 they not have nothing of what to.eat  
 'You can help these paupers who always complain that they don't have  
 anything to eat.'

Clitics generally precede the verb, but follow imperative and infinitive forms (71).  
 There is evidence for clitic climbing with modal verbs (72, 73):

(71) el fu 'paɲa a sen'tuor lo  
 it make pain to hear= it  
 'It's painful to hear it.'

(72) ju ve ve'nare a ka'tuɔr  
 I you= will.come to seek  
 'I'll come to look for you.'

(73) ju no lo po'taja a so'frur  
 I not it= could to suffer  
 'I could not stand it.'

Subject clitics precede object clitics (but may be preceded by a negator, as (74)  
 shows):

(74) ju a'vas doɲ ba'riɛt ma no le me 'viza buɲ ne  
 I have two berets but not they me= go good nor  
 'joɲa ne la 'jultra  
 one nor the other  
 'I have two berets but neither suits me.'

#### 4. Verb morphology

##### 4.1 The system

Udaina's verb morphology is peculiar, from a comparative Romance perspective. It is clear from his testimony that, as in Italo-Romance and elsewhere, Vegliote once had a system with three non-finite forms (infinitive, past participle, and gerund) and, among finite forms, present, two pasts (imperfect and preterite) and a future.<sup>xiii</sup> There are also traces of a distinction between indicative and subjunctive in present and past tenses.

The imperative is generally identical to the third person present form in the singular, and to first and second person present forms in the plural. We also see remnants of the four major Romance conjugation-classes in the verb, principally associated with a thematic vowel located between root and inflectional ending, in parts of the paradigm (notably the infinitive). Yet in Udaina's speech the familiar Romance system is disintegrating, especially where tense and mood are concerned. Infinitives and past participles are well preserved, but there are few attestations of gerunds (e.g., *lavo'rund se le kan'tua*, lit. 'working they sang them to themselves'). Number distinctions are wholly neutralized in the third person (this characteristic is general in Vegliote and not merely in Udaina's speech), originally third person singular forms having replaced those of the third person plural (e.g., *e* meaning both 'is' and 'are' < 3SG.PRS.IND EST):

(75) *el mi 'tʉota l e ple ve'truŋ de l su*  
 the my father he- is more old of the his  
 'My father is older than his.'

(76) *le 'mie so'raʉle l e ple ve'trone de le 'soe*  
 the my sisters they= are more old of the his  
 'My sisters are older than his.'

Third person and first person singular are also generally inflexionally identical (e.g., *'bule*, both 'I want' and 'he wants'), and this identity often extends to the second person singular. First and second person plurals, in contrast, retain their distinctive desinences *-me* and *-te* (e.g., *fav'lume*, *fav'lute* 'we/you speak', *de'kaʃte* 'you say', *'barme* 'we will drink').

Verbs are arrhizotonic (i.e., not stressed on the lexical root) in most of the paradigm, but rhizotonic (stressed on the root) in singular and third person forms of the present (and in some past participles). Mainly because of regular sound change affecting vowels, the stress alternation entails root vowel allomorphy (e.g., *prik* 'I pray' vs *pre'kur* 'pray.INF'; *pluk* 'it pleases' vs PRS *pla'kua*; *'pʉarta* 'they carry' vs IPF *por'tua*).

#### 4.2 Conjugation classes

The Romance conjugation-classes, principally distinguished by a characteristic thematic vowel, are extensively effaced: in particular, the first conjugation marker ([u] or [uo] < Romance \*[a]) permeates other conjugations. The distinctions are best preserved in the infinitive, but even these are subject to the change: e.g., *fav'lur* 'talk' < FABULARI, *ve'dar* 'see' < \**ve'dere* < UIDERE, *'dekro* 'say' < DICERE (but cf. *plaŋ'gur* 'weep' for expected \*\**'pluŋgro* < PLANGERE); the fourth conjugation (historically in *-ire*) should have infinitives in *-er* (cf., *dur'mer* 'sleep' < DORMIRE), but Udaina replaces this with *-ar* (*dor'mar*).

#### 4.3 The tense system

In Udaina's speech (especially when he was speaking to Bartoli, less so in his earlier testimony to Ive) the system of morphological tense-distinctions is overall disintegrating, even though he seems perfectly capable of making morphological tense distinctions when he needs to (cf. Maiden 2004:92). There is also a remarkable use of imperfect tense-forms with present-tense and even future meaning, and of future tense-forms with present or past reference. For example, when Udaina lists

various body parts which are causing pain (Bartoli 1906/2000:II§145) there are five instances of the 'correct' present tense form *dul* ('it hurts/they hurt') but eight of *do'lua* (formally, an imperfect), without temporal distinction. For the historical reasons for this striking tendency to efface tense-distinctions, rooted in an accidental resemblance, originating in certain first conjugation verbs, between imperfect indicative endings and present tense affixes, see Maiden (2004 and 2016a:131f.). These phenomena are by no means entirely restricted to Udaina's idiolect, by the way.

In the subjunctive, the functional distinction between Romance present and imperfect forms is barely conserved. The disintegration of the relation between subjunctive forms and their modal functions can be seen in (77), in the context of an expression of necessity in the main clause. In the first clause we have a historical non-first conjugation present subjunctive ('*tija*), but in the second, and in the same context, we find a second person singular present tense form *te'nua*, remodelled on the first conjugation imperfect indicative.

- (77) *bi'zup ke la mu'ler 'tija n̄jat 'kosta 'raḡba; el*  
 is.necessary that the woman keep.PRS.SBJV clean this stuff the  
*pa'ver de la loḡsa bi'zup ke te te'nua n̄jat*  
 wick of the light is.necessary that you keep clean  
 'The woman must keep this stuff clean; you must keep the wick clean.'

Both mood and tense distinctions are neutralized in the originally imperfect subjunctive form 'have.3SG' (*a'vas* < Lat. *HABUISSET*):

- (78) *a ku no la a'vas da tu'fuḡr*  
 to that not she have to stink  
 'in order that it should not have to stink'

- (79) *no a'vas ne el gal ne le ga'laḡne*  
 not have nor the cock nor the hens  
 'He had neither cock nor hens.'

- (80) *'guḡrda ke 'gruonde jal ke a'vas kol o'tsel*  
 look what big wings that have that bird  
 'Look what big wings that bird has!'

Vegliote has an unusual type of synthetic future-tense form (whose origins are discussed in Maiden in 2008). Unlike most Romance languages of western Europe, Dalmatian lacks a future tense-form historically built from an infinitive + stressed present tense form of the verb 'have'. It is always stressed on the root or the thematic vowel, and typically has in first person singular and third person forms the endings -ro or -re (sometimes -ra); the second person singular ending is always -re and the first and second persons plural -rme and -rte. This future originates in the future perfect and / or the present perfect subjunctive forms of the Latin verb (these two sets of forms were already largely identical in Latin) and is thereby cognate with the Portuguese (and old Spanish) future subjunctive, and the old Romanian (and modern Aromanian and Istro-Romanian) conditional. It can have not only future-time reference, but also conditional and counterfactual value (note that continuants of the Latin pluperfect indicative assume conditional value in several western Romance

varieties, while the continuants of the future perfect/perfect subjunctive provide conditionals in Daco-Romance). It can function as a future-in-the past (84) and can appear both in the protasis and the apodosis of counterfactual constructions (85):

- (81) man'ʦurme e 'barme da'pu  
eat.FUT.1PL and drink FUT.1PL later  
'We'll eat and drink later.'
- (82) ju ʦa'pure de i bej sʷald se ju ven'das  
I get.FUT of the nice money if I sold  
la mi 'raɣba  
the my stuff  
'I'd get some nice money if I sold my stuff.'
- (83) ju lo ka'tsure 'drante  
I him chase.FUT inside  
'I'll chase him inside.'
- (84) el mi 'tuota e l su 'fero dakɣard ke  
the my father and the her were agreed that  
'furme el matri'moŋ no'jiltri doj  
make.FUT.1PL the marriage we two  
'My father and hers agreed that we two would get married.'
- (85) se ju ve'dar 'praɣma ju te 'dure su l ʦol  
if I see.FUT first I you= give.FUT on the arse  
'If I'd seen you first I'd have slapped your bottom.'

#### 4.4 Verb periphrases

Vegliote expresses the past perfective via a periphrasis comprising a present-tense<sup>xiv</sup> auxiliary verb inflected for number and person followed by the past participle of the lexical verb. The synthetic preterite tense-form, which can perform this function in some other Romance languages, is virtually extinct. The auxiliary is almost always a form of the verb HAVE. Nonetheless, a number of verbs indicating continuation or change of state, or motion, such as 'die', 'be born', 'remain', 'fall', 'go', 'come', 'pass', may also select the verb BE (the last redoubt of auxiliary BE in a number of Romance languages: cf. Loporcaro 2016). Thus

- (86) a'vaiɣme por'tuot la 'puasta  
we.have carried the mail
- (87) li ai ve'dut fuars dik 'vualte e da'pu  
them= I.have seen perhaps ten times and after  
ju no li ai ve'dut ple  
I not them= I.have seen more  
'I saw them perhaps ten times and then I never saw them again.'
- (88) ju ai stuot iŋ aba'tsi; ju jai foit  
I have been in Abbazia; I have been

in arb; ju jai an'duot in arb; ju jai dzait a  
 in Rab; I have gone to Rab I have gone to  
 kai'zol; jai an'dut a l 'plavnik  
 Caisole have gone to the Plavnik  
 'I've been in Abbazia; I've been in Rab; I've gone to Rab; I've gone to  
 Caisole; I've gone to Plavnik.'

(89) ju kas'kut 'tuonta niav  
 has fallen so.much snow  
 'So much snow has fallen.'

(90) ju jai kas'kuot ne la buz  
 I have fallen in the hole  
 'I have fallen in the hole.'

(91) te se a ta'kut  
 you REFL= has cut  
 'You've cut yourself.'

(92) l e res'tut un 'pelo or'fan per'ko l  
 he= is remained a little orphan because he=  
 e muart el 'tuota e la 'niena  
 is died the father and the mother  
 'He ended up a little orphan because his father and mother died.'

(93) el e kas'kut a guonb le'vute  
 he is fallen to legs raised  
 'He fell over with his legs in the air.'

(94) l e kas'kuota 'tuonta 'jaku  
 it is fallen.FSG so.much.FSG water.FSG  
 'So much rain has fallen.'

(95) tʃɪŋk mi'nut 'fero pa'sut  
 five minutes are passed  
 'Five minutes went by.'

(96) el ju dzai nel lat  
 he has gone in.the bed  
 'He went to bed.'

(97) el ju foit in guer  
 he has been in war  
 'He has been in the war.'

There is some evidence (98) of agreement of past participles for number and gender with the direct object of the verb, but this is overall hard to detect, because of the deletion of word-final vowels.

(98) el guab ju man'tfute le 'faike

the hunchback has eaten.FPL the.FPL figs.F

The only other examples in Udaina's speech come from his testimony to Ive (1886), and involve feminine singular direct object clitics:

- (99) jal la jajt 'praiza, el la jajt  
 he it.FSG has taken.FSG he it.FSG = has  
 inpe'guḡta e la jajt 'tʃuḡta 'vaja  
 wrapped.FSG and it.FSG has taken.FSG away  
 'He took it, wrapped it, and removed it.'

It is apparently possible to use the auxiliary without the participle under certain circumstances (cf. Salvi 2011:356): asked whether he has had breakfast, Udaina replies *si, ju jaj*, literally 'yes, I have'.

The passive periphrasis is generally formed from auxiliary BE + past participle (100). There are, of course, other ways of demoting the subject of a transitive verb, most prominently use of a third person clitic reflexive pronoun *se*. The reflexive clitic *se* also has 'indefinite subject' value (i.e., 'one') and then it may function as a subject pronoun of verbs taking direct objects.

- (100) da'pu ke la 'fero ta'ʌuta 'la vjadz  
 after that PRON3SGF is cut.FSG the cabbageFSG  
 'after the cabbage is cut'

- (101) se de'kaja struts  
 REFL= says ostrich  
 'It's called an ostrich.'

The Vegliote texts offer few examples of causative structures, but these follow a widespread Romance pattern using the verb 'make' (*fur*) or sometimes 'let' (*la'sur*) + infinitive (with clitic climbing—cf. 102—a conservative phenomenon shared with Romanian and southern Italo-Romance dialects, but not with northern Italo-Romance dialects, such as Venetan):

- (102) ti fats ve'der  
 you= I.make see.INF  
 'I make you see.'

- (103) 'fua me'tuor 'jojna sual 'naḡva ne la skirp  
 make.IMP put.INF a sole new in the shoe  
 'Have a new sole put in the shoe!'

- (104) la jaj la'suḡta 'fure  
 her= I.have let.FSG do.INF  
 'I let her do (so).'

## 5. Adverbs

Vegliote (with, e.g., Daco-Romance and southern Italo-Romance) generally lacks a morphologically distinct class of adverbs, using in adverbial functions a masculine

singular form of the adjective. Thus, corresponding to the adjectives (MSG) *buŋ* 'good', *bil* 'fine, beautiful', 'sanglo' 'alone' we find:

(105) *dzaj*                      *buŋ*  
*gO*<sub>3SG.PRS</sub>                      *good*<sub>MSG</sub>  
 'It's going well.'

(106) 'fero *fuat* *bil*  
*be*<sub>3SG</sub> *done* *beautiful*<sub>MSG</sub>  
 'It was done beautifully.'

(107) *res'tua*                      'sanglo                      el                      *fuant*  
 remains                      alone<sub>MSG</sub>                      the                      bottom  
 'Only the bottom remains.'

There is however a distinctive adverb *mul* 'badly' (< MALE): *mul mjas* 'badly put'. Vegliote does show some examples of the \*-mente class of adverbs (derived historically through combination of an adjective with a reflex of Latin *MENTE* '(with a mind)', for example *fuar̥te'mjant* 'strongly', *pari'mjant* 'similarly', *jultra' mjant* 'otherwise', *mula'mjant* 'badly', but it is unclear whether these forms are genuinely Vegliote developments or loans from Italo-Romance. The language also possesses a range of periphrastic adverbial expressions, usually involving prepositions, such as *de ple* 'too much' (literally 'of more'), *de kjur* 'rarely' (literally 'of clear').

Positive comparison of adjectives and adverbs is effected almost exclusively by preposing *ple* 'more' (< PLUS) to the relevant form. Vegliote does, however, possess synthetic comparative adverbs *mjej* or *maj* 'better' (< MELIUS; cf. *buŋ* 'good, well'), and *pjas* 'worse' (cf. < PEIUS; cf. *ri* 'bad'). The comparator 'than' is usually the preposition *de* (although the *ke* is also attested). The texts are lacking in examples of negative comparison ('less than'),<sup>30</sup> and indeed in superlative marking, although there is evidence that the phrase *de ple* (+ adjective or adverb) can express 'most', and there are a number of incidences of *de tofj* 'of all' being used to convey superlative meaning:

(108) *fav'lur*                      *iŋ*                      'diŋe                      'fero                      *fav'lur*                      *ple*                      *buŋ*,                      *ple*  
 to.speak                      in                      dice                      is                      to.speak                      more                      good                      more  
*maj*                      *ke*                      *de*                      *kol*                      *ke*                      *fav'lua*                      *i*                      *vetruni*  
 better                      than                      of                      that                      which                      spoke                      the                      old  
 'To speak in Italian is to speak better than the old folk spoke.'

(109) *fero*                      *mjej*                      *ko'sajk*  
 is                      better                      thus  
 'It's better like that.'

(110) *ple*                      *ke*                      *l*                      *kri'ua*                      *pjas*                      'fero  
 more                      that                      he                      shouted                      worse                      was  
 'The more he shouted the worse it was.'

(111) *jal*                      'fero                      *ple*                      'pelo                      *de*                      *ju*  
 he                      is                      more                      small                      of                      I

'He is smaller than me.'

- (112) 'jara uŋ jom ple rispe'tabil de 'toŋi kuintŋ  
was a man more respectable of all as.many  
per'ko el 'era re  
because he was king  
'He was a man more respectable than everybody because he was king.'

- (113) i mi 'frutri 'fero ple ve'truni ke  
the my brothers were more old than  
i su  
the his  
'My brothers were older than his.'

- (114) la ga'lajna de ple 'maura 'fero la 'ŋauka  
the hen of more big is the brood\_hen  
'The largest hen is the brood hen.'

## 6. Derivational morphology

There is not much evidence for productive Vegliote derivational morphology in Udaina's usage.<sup>vi</sup> We may note the use of the feminine singular ending of original first conjugation past participles (in -'uta or -'uota) to form nouns (both deverbal and denominal) expressing a (usually) rapid, completed action. Thus 'jojna pe'truta 'a stoning' < 'pitra 'stone', 'jojna ka'kuoŋa 'a shit, act of shitting' (cf. ka'kuoŋ 'shit'). Diminutive suffixal formations are -ajŋ- (< Lat. -in-), -'uoŋ and -(ŋ)al (< -(C)ELLUM): ape'luoŋ 'little lamb'; bate'lajna 'little boat'; por'ŋal 'piglet' (cf. puark 'pig'); basal'ŋala 'little church' (cf. ba'salka 'church'). There are also diminutive suffixes -ajk-, -auk-, possibly from \*-ik-, \*-uk-: san'tajko '(little) saint', mo'rauŋa '(little, female) lover'. The Romance device of forming compounds by combining second person singular imperative of the verb (cf. Maiden 2007) with a noun, may appear in gruta'kuoŋsa 'cheese grater' (from 'gruta 'grate' + 'kuoŋsa 'cheese'), but this is probably a phonologically adapted loan from Venetan (see Bartoli 1906/2000:476).

A rather unusual feature of the formation of numerals from eleven to nineteen inclusive, at least in Udaina's usage, is that all of them may be preceded by the word for 'ten' (dik). In most other Romance languages the higher teens from sixteen or seventeen upwards have the basic structure 'ten (and) seven', 'ten (and eight)', 'ten (and nine)'. (e.g., Italian *diciassette*, *diciotto*, *diciannove*), while the lower teens (although they contain a reflex of Latin DECEM 'ten') generally have more opaque forms in Romance (e.g., Italian *undici* '11' < UNDECIM, *dodici* '12' < DUODECIM,  *tredici* '13' < TREDECIM, *quattordici* '14' < QUATTUORDECIM, *quindici* '15', *sedici* '16' < SEDECIM).<sup>vii</sup> In Vegliote, however, the type 'ten + numeral' may extend down to 'twelve': dik'doi '12', dik'tra '13', di'kuater '13', dik'ŋiŋk '15', dik'sis '16'. Udaina's dik'joŋko '11' combines 'ten' with the inherited opaque form for '11', 'joŋko.

## 7. The structure of the sentence

The basic word-order of the Dalmatian sentence is subject + verb + object.<sup>viii</sup> The subject tends to follow the verb when the latter is unaccusative, or where the subject constitutes new information.

- (115) el be'kuor dra'mua o la 'pira o  
the butcher slaughters either the sheep or  
el kas'truot  
the castrated  
'The butcher slaughters either the sheep or the castrated pig.'
- (116) no'jilitri mut dope'rume i bo'tuaj  
we now use the buttons
- (117) da'pu ju jaj duot 'jojna zlep al 'majo 'frutro  
after I have given a slap to.the my brother  
'Then I gave a slap to my brother.'
- (118) la ga'lajna mut la 'kua el uf  
the hen now she hatches the egg  
'The hen is now hatching the egg.'
- (119) a ju me pluk el muor  
to I me pleases the sea  
'I like the sea.'
- (120) ke ve'naro el 'tuota  
that will.come the father  
'for father will come.'
- (121) tra di a du'rut el fuok  
three days has lasted the fire  
'The fire lasted three days.'
- (122) in kost diz'muj l e kas'kuota 'tuonta  
in this morning pron is fallen so.much  
'jakua  
water  
'This morning it has rained so much.'

In Udaina's speech the direct object is sometimes positioned before the verb (and in example 125) it is intercalated between the auxiliary 'have' and the lexical verb:

- (123) join vuas 'mauro per i fiaur te'nur 'drante  
a vase big for the flowers keep.INF within  
'a big vase to keep flowers in'
- (124) ju pa'kura dik du'kat per sa'puor 'kosta  
I pay.COND ten ducats for know.INF this  
'laŋ ga fav'lur  
language speak.INF  
'I'd give ten ducats to know how to speak this language.'

(125) je kre'dua ke a'vait de 'nosko la'suot  
 I thought that you.had something left  
 'I thought you'd left something.'

Sentential negation is simply marked by placing a reflex of Latin NON (no, nu, noŋ) immediately before the verb; only clitic pronouns (including subject clitics) can intervene between negator and verb. The negator can also bear primary stress, in which case it takes the form nauŋ (note that in combination with the verb 'be', the latter almost always takes the form e in the third person present):

(126) noŋ dementi'kuote el ve'truŋ u'daiŋa  
 not forget the old Udaina  
 'Don't forget old Udaina.'

(127) 'kosti pias 'nauŋ e friesk  
 these fish not are fresh  
 'These fish are not fresh.'

Verbs must be preceded by the negator (noŋ, etc.) when they are combined with negative pronouns, quantifiers, and adverbs, such as 'noʌa, 'nɔante 'nothing', 'naŋka 'not even', ne ... ne 'neither ... 'nor', muɔ 'never', and regardless of whether the the negative pronoun or adverb precedes or follows the verb:

(128) ju no ka'paja 'noʌa  
 I not understood nothing  
 'I understood nothing.'

(129) 'nɔante no l ja det  
 nothing not he has said  
 'He said nothing.'

(130) 'naŋka joɔn deɔ si'ŋaʊri noŋ sa'paja fa'vlur iŋ vekli'suŋ  
 not.even one of.the gentlemen not knew to.speak in Vegliote  
 'Not even one of the gentlemen knew how to speak Vegliote.'

(131) ju muɔ ple no jaɔ pɔars  
 I never more not have lost  
 'I never lost again.'

'No' is na (vs se, si 'yes'):

(132) 'jali po'taja fur ko'saɔk e no'jiltri na  
 they could do thus and we no  
 'They could do that and us no.'

It can apparently also be used to negate an adverbial phrase (na 'fenta 'tara 'not down to the ground'). Na (and se) can also be used clausally: me pur de na / se lit. 'it seems to me of not / yes', 'it seems to me not / so'.

As also in Italian and Romanian, negation of a second person singular imperative involves the structure negator + infinitive, or (as in 133) negator + the infinitive of the verb *stu* ‘stand’ + infinitive of the lexical verb:<sup>xxx</sup>

- (133) no    stu    dor'mur / kan'tuor / man'tfur  
 not   stand   sleep.INF / sing.INF / eat.INF  
 ‘Don’t sleep / sing / eat!’

Modal verbs, and also motion verbs, take infinitival complements when the subject of the subordinate clause is coreferential with that of the modal. Note that infinitival complements with *po'tuor* ‘be able’ may be preceded by the preposition *a* ‘to’ (and that the resulting construction still allows clitic climbing).

- (134) ju    no    lo    po'taja a    so'frur  
 I    not   hit=   can   to   suffer  
 ‘I can't bear him.’

- (135) jal    'bule ven'dur    toŋ   per'ko    la    'tsua    'njiena  
 he   wants sell.INF   all   because   the   his   mother  
 'blaja ke   la   ven'dua  
 wants that it=   sells  
 ‘He wants to sell everything because his mother wants him to sell it.’

- (136) el    dzaj   a    'kuoŋsa    sua   ka'tuor    la  
 he   goes to   house   her   seek.INF   her  
 ‘He goes to her house to look for her.’

Finite subordinate clauses are generally introduced by the complementizer *k(e)* (a *ku* ‘in order that’). The general neutralization of morphological mood distinctions makes it difficult to discuss mood selection, but examples (141) and (142) contain what are, at least historically, subjunctive subordinate verbs:<sup>xxx</sup>

- (137) ju   jai̯   res'puast   ke ju   noŋ   po'taja   fav'lur   iŋ   slav  
 I   have answered that I   not can   speak.INF in Slav  
 ‘I replied that I could not speak Slav.’

- (138) ju   vit   ke   ve'naro    la    'kisa  
 I   see   that   come.FUT   the   drizzle  
 ‘I see it’s going to drizzle.’

- (139) ju   de'kua k    el   de'kaja    a    voi̯  
 I   said   that   he   say    to   you  
 ‘I said that he should tell you.’

- (140) ju   vis da l   bar'ber k   el   me   ra'zua la   'buorba  
 I   go to the barber that he to.me= shave the beard

- (141) a'vajme mjas   'drante   de l   de'fuant   'veskovi   fe'retiŋ   'kuatri  
 we.have put   inside   of the late   bishop   Feretić four

'litr i mias de 'joina medi'tsiŋ a ku no l a'vas da tu'fuor  
 litres and half of a medicine to that not he had to stink  
 'We put into the late bishop Feretić four and a half litres of a medicine so that  
 he should not stink.'

- (142) di'kaite ke l 'viza  
 say that he go  
 'Tell him to go!'

Vegliote does not appear to have had dedicated syntactic structures for interrogation. Yes-no questions are syntactically identical to assertions, although they were presumably distinguished by intonation:

- (143) e jal el 'duarmi  
 and he he sleeps  
 'and is he asleep?'

- (144) e a'vajte ve'dut kojza ke puart i pret mut  
 and you.have seen what that wear the priests now  
 'and have you seen what priests are wearing now?'

Interrogative pronouns, adverbs, and adjectives are ku 'who, what?', jo or an'du 'where', kuond 'when?', kul 'which?':

- (145) ku 'jera 'drante  
 who was inside  
 'Who was inside?'

- (146) jo te dzaj  
 where you go  
 'Where are you going?'

- (147) kuond ti dzaj in ba'tsalka  
 when you go to church  
 'When do you go to church?'

Exclamatives use the words for 'how', 'which', 'what' followed by ke:

- (148) ke ko'raja ke a'vas kol jom  
 what courage that has that man  
 'What courage that man has!'

- (149) kunt pias ke ju vi  
 how.many fish that I see  
 'How many fish I see!'

- (150) de ko ke to'naja  
 of what that it.thunders  
 'How it's thundering!'

## 8. Address system

It is difficult to discern how the Vegliote address system operated, but whenever Udaina addresses Bartoli directly, he uses second person plural forms, presumably as a formal (or 'polite') mode of address in the singular. In his testimony to Ive (1886:137), Udaina narrates an incident in which his wife is quoted as addressing him with a plural form, for example:

- (151) per'ko 'dʒaj̩te            'fure de la 'kuosa 'toʃe le 'sare  
why you<sup>PL</sup>.go out of the house all the evenings  
'Why do you go out every evening?'

to which he initially replies in kind, thereafter changing to second person singular:<sup>xxi</sup>

- (152) sa'paʃte,            'kara la me mu'ljer,            ju vis 'fure de  
know<sup>2PL</sup>.IMP dear the my wife, I go out of  
la 'kuosa 'toʃe le 'sare,            per'ko[...] ju pur'tura  
the house all the evenings because I will bring  
el kontra'bʋand; e tu kre'daj̩ ke ju vis[...] in  
the contraband and you.SG think.SG that I go in  
usta'raja  
inn  
'Know, my dear wife, that I go out every evening because I am going  
smuggling; and you think I am going to the pub.'

The force of this use of the plural is unclear. In the context (an altercation in which his wife reproaches him for unjustified absences from the marital home) it may convey distance and estrangement between the spouses. In other Vegliote texts the Prodigal Son addresses his father using plural morphology, and God is also so addressed.

## 9. The lexicon

The core lexicon of Vegliote has a recognizably common origin with that of most other Romance languages (cf. Bartoli 1906/2000:II§§536-40). To take a few examples from just one semantic field, that of the human body and bodily activities, words such as kup 'head', djant 'tooth', 'vaklo 'eye', muŋ 'hand', de'nakle 'knees', ve'dar 'see', dor'mer 'sleep', bar 'drink', mo'rer 'die' have Latin etyma (CAPUT, DENS, OCULUS, MANUS, GENUCULA, UIDERE, DORMIRE, BIBERE, MORI) whose reflexes recur across the Romance languages. While there is little that stands out as uniquely characteristic of the Dalmatian lexicon among the Romance languages (see also Bernoth 2008:2743f.), there are certain distinctive, and relatively 'local' onomasiological or semasiological characteristics, a number which are shared with Romanian (although this is no reason to assume, overall, any special kinship with Romanian: cf. Bonfante 1983:235). Whereas most Romance languages retain forms of Latin COLLUM for 'neck' (e.g., Sp. *cuello*, It. *collo*), the word has apparently disappeared in Dalmatian, as it also has in Romanian, having been replaced in Vegliote by 'zoglo (< IUGULUM 'collarbone'). Among other items of general and basic Romance vocabulary absent from Dalmatian and Romanian, are reflexes of Latin PATER 'father', replaced by 'tuota (cf. Romanian *tată*), SOLUS 'alone', replaced by 'sanglo < Lat. SINGULUS 'single'), FRIGIDUS 'cold' replaced by ge'lut (< GELATUS 'frozen'), SPONSA 'bride', replaced by ni'napta (probably

from NOUA NUPTA 'new wed' see Bartoli 1906/2000:II§541). The word for 'church' derives not from ECCLESIA (a Christian Latin word of Greek origin), as in the majority of Romance languages (e.g., Pg. *igreja*, Fr. *église*, It. *chiesa*), but from Latin BASILICA (again of Greek origin), yielding ba'salka. This development is shared, for example, with Romanian (*biserică*) and Romansh (e.g., Engadinish *baselgia*), although there is evidence that the word was once more widespread in Romance (Jud [1919] 1973:170; Bartoli 1906/2000: II§541). Vegliote also stands out in respect of names of one of the days of the week, 'Wednesday'. Nearly all other Romance languages have a reflex of MERCURII (DIES) '(day of) Mercury' (cf. Sp. *miércoles*, Fr. *mercredi*, Ro. *miercuri*), but Vegliote has mi'sedma. This is in origin a compound meaning 'half' (< MEDIUS) and 'week' (in a form derived from Greek HEBDOMAS 'week'), and has a cognate in old Italian *mezzedima* 'Wednesday'. Indeed, the autochthonous word for 'week' in Vegliote survives in the attested form 'jedma, while the form seti'muon used by Udina is probably a phonologically adapted importation from Venetian (cf. It. *settimana*).

There are also some lexical items retained just in Dalmatian and Romanian, or which have developed a particular meaning just in those varieties. The word for 'old', ve'trun (cf. Romanian *bătrân*, although unlike in Romanian the word is an antonym of 'new', as well as of 'young'), is from Latin UETERANUS, rather than UETULUS, the latter being the source of this word in most Romance languages. The reflex of Latin EXCUTERE 'shake (out)' (cf. It. *scuotere*), namely Vegliote *skutro* means 'lift up' (cf. Romanian *scoate* 'remove'), while that of LEUARE 'raise', namely le'vur, acquires the meaning 'take' (cf. its Romanian cognate *lua* which also means 'take'), and that of IN + PRAEHENDERE 'take', namely in'prandro, means 'set alight' (cf. Romanian *aprinde* 'kindle').

## References

- Bartoli, Matteo 1906. *Das Dalmatische. Altromanische Sprachreste von Veglia bis Ragusa und ihre Stellung in der Apennino-balkanische Romània. I, II*. Vienna: Hölder.
- Bartoli, Matteo 2000. *Il dalmatico*. [translation and edition of Bartoli 1906, ed. Aldo Duro]. Rome: Treccani
- Bernoth, A. 2008. 'Interne Sprachgeschichte des Dalmatischen', in Ernst, Gleßgen, Schmidt, Schweickard (eds). *Romanische Sprachgeschichte III*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2731-750.
- Bonfante, G. 1983. 'Il posto che spetta al dalmatico fra le lingue romanze'. *Atti e Memorie dell'Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere* 48:205-38.
- Doria, Mario 1989a. 'Dalmatico: storia linguistica interna', in *LRL* (III), 522-30.
- Doria, Mario 1989b. 'Dalmatico: storia linguistica esterna', in *LRL* (III), 530-36.
- Dotto, Diego 2008 *Scriptae venezianeggianti a Ragusa nel XIV secolo. Edizione e commento di testi volgari dell'Archivio di Stato di Dubrovnik*. Rome: Viella.
- Dotto, Diego and Vuletić, Nikola 2016. "“Le carte chi nug trovimo...”: variazioni e interferenze nei testi zaratini del Trecento". In Antonelli, Roberto, Glessgen, Martin, and Videsott, Paul (eds) *Atti del XXVIII Congresso internazionale di linguistica e filologia romanza*. Strasbourg: Société de Linguistique Romane / Éditions de linguistique et de philologie, 864-80 .
- Jud, Jakob [1919] 1973. 'Zur Geschichte der bündnerromanischen Kirchensprache'. *49. Jahresbericht der Historisch-antiquarischen Gesellschaft von Graubünden*, 1-56 [Id., *Romanische Sprachgeschichte und Sprachgeographie*. Ausgewählte Aufsätze

- herausgegeben von Konrad Huber und Gustav Ineichen. Zürich/Freiburg i.B.: Atlantis 1973:161-211
- Ledgeway, Adam 2011. 'Syntactic and morphosyntactic typology and change', in Maiden / Smith / Ledgeway (eds) *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages I. Structures*. Cambridge, CUP, 382-471.
- Loporcaro, Michele 2016. 'Auxiliary selection and participial agreement'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds) *Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 802-18.
- Maiden, M. (forthcoming). 'Alberto Varvaro e la storia "interna" delle lingue romanze'. In Minervini, L. (ed.), *Filologia letteratura e linguistica di Alberto Varvaro: Atti delle giornate di studio*. Padua: Antenore.
- Maiden, Martin 1996. 'On the Romance inflectional endings -i and -e', *Romance Philology* 50:147-82.
- Maiden, Martin 2003. 'Il verbo italoromanzo: verso una storia autenticamente morfologica'. In Giacomo-Marcellesi, M. and Rocchetti, A. (eds) *Il verbo italiano. Studi diacronici, sincronici, contrastivi, didattici*. Rome: Bulzoni, 3-21.
- Maiden, Martin 2004. 'Into the past. Morphological change in the dying years of Dalmatian', *Diachronica* 21:85-111.
- Maiden, Martin 2007. 'On the morphology of Italo-Romance imperatives', in Bentley, Delia and Ledgeway, Adam (eds.) *Sui dialetti italoromanzi: saggi in onore di Nigel B. Vincent*. Norfolk: Biddles, 148-64.
- Maiden, Martin 2008. 'Osservazioni sul futuro dalmatico (e guascone)'. *Bollettino linguistico campano* [2007] 11/12:1-19.
- Maiden, Martin 2016a. 'Dalmatian'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds) *Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 126-38.
- Maiden, Martin 2016b. 'Diphthongization'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds) *Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 647-57.
- Maiden, Martin 2019. 'A note on the inflexional morphology of the Vegliote Dalmatian masculine plural'. *Philologica Jassyensia* 29, 81-88.
- Mihăescu, Haralambie 1993. *La Romanité dans le sud-est de l'Europe*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei.
- Muljačić, Žarko 1971. 'Dalmate', in Bec, Pierre (ed.) *Manuel pratique de philologie romane*. Paris: Picard, 395-416.
- Muljačić, Žarko 1992. 'Wieviele dalmato-romanischen Sprachen gab es im Mittelalter?', in Birken-Silverman, G./Rössler, G. (eds), *Beiträge zur sprachlichen, literarischen und kulturellen Vielfalt in den Philologien. Festschrift für Rupprecht Rohr zum 70. Geburtstag*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 109-18.
- Muljačić, Žarko 1995. 'Dalmatisch', in *LRL* (III.2), 32-42.
- Muljačić, Žarko 2000. *Das Dalmatische. Studien zu einer untergegangenen Sprache*. Cologne/Weimar/Vienna: Böhlau.
- Muljačić, Žarko 2006. 'Noterelle dalmatoromanze'. *Estudis romànics* 28:219-38.
- Pescarini, D. 2016. 'Clitic pronominal systems: morphophonology'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds) *Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 742-60.
- Renzi, Lorenzo and Vanelli, Laura 1983. I pronomi soggetto in alcune varietà romanze. In Benincà, P., Cortelazzo, M., Prodocimi, A., Vanelli, L., and Zamboni, A. (eds). *Studi in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini*. Pisa: Pacini.
- Salvi, Giampaolo 2011. 'Morphosyntactic persistence', in Maiden / Smith / Ledgeway (eds) *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages I. Structures*. Cambridge, CUP, pp. 318-81.

- Solta, G. 1980. *Einführung in die Balkanlinguistik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Substrats und des Balkanlateinischen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Strčić, P. 1998. 'Otok Krk u doba "posljednjega" dalmatofona Antona Udine Burbura.' *Folia Onomastica Croatica* 7:237-66.
- Trummer, Manfred (1998). 'Südosteuropäische Sprachen und Romanisch. 7. Dalmatisch', in Holtus, Günter, Metzeltin, Michael and Schmitt, Christian (eds.). *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik. Band VII. Kontakt, Migration und Kunstsprachen. Kontrastivität, Klassifikation und Typologie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. pp. 161-63.
- Vuletić, Nikola 2013. 'Le dalmate : panorama des idées sur un mythe de la linguistique romane'. *Histoire Epistémologie Langage* 35:45-64.
- Windisch, Rudolf 1998. 'Die historische Klassifikation der Romania II. Balkanromanisch', in Holtus, Günter, Metzeltin, Michael and Schmitt, Christian (eds.). *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik. Band VII. Kontakt, Migration und Kunstsprachen. Kontrastivität, Klassifikation und Typologie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 907-37.
- Zamboni, Alberto 1976. 'Note linguistiche dalmatiche', in *Atti della Tornata di Studio nel cinquantenario della fondazione di Zara*. Venice: Società dalmata di storia patria, 9-66.

### Further reading

- Bartoli, Matteo 1906. *Das Dalmatische. Altromanische Sprachreste von Veglia bis Ragusa und ihre Stellung in der Apennino-balkanische Romània. I, II*. Vienna: Holder.
- Bartoli, Matteo 2000. *Il dalmatico*. [translation and edition of Bartoli 1906, ed. Aldo Duro]. Rome: Treccani
- Bernoth, A. 2008. 'Interne Sprachgeschichte des Dalmatischen', in Ernst, Gleßgen, Schmidt, Schweickard (eds). *Romanische Sprachgeschichte III*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2731-750.
- Doria, Mario 1989a. 'Dalmatico: storia linguistica interna', in *LRL* (III), 522-30.
- Doria, Mario 1989b. 'Dalmatico: storia linguistica esterna', in *LRL* (III), 530-36.
- Maiden, Martin 2016a. 'Dalmatian'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds) *Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 126-38.
- Maiden, Martin 2016b. 'Diphthongization'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds) *Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 647-57.
- Muljačić, Žarko 1971. 'Dalmate', in Bec, Pierre (ed.) *Manuel pratique de philologie romane*. Paris: Picard, 395-416.
- Muljačić, Žarko 1995. 'Dalmatisch', in *LRL* (III.2), 32-42.
- Muljačić, Žarko 2000. *Das Dalmatische. Studien zu einer untergegangenen Sprache*. Cologne/Weimar/Vienna: Böhlau.
- Vuletić, Nikola 2013. 'Le dalmate : panorama des idées sur un mythe de la linguistique romane'. *Histoire Epistémologie Langage* 35:45-64.
- Zamboni, Alberto 1976. 'Note linguistiche dalmatiche', in *Atti della Tornata di Studio nel cinquantenario della fondazione di Zara*. Venice: Società dalmata di storia patria, 9-66.

### Notes

---

<sup>i</sup> Arguments that Udaina need not have been the 'last speaker', with the implication that the language survived into the twentieth century, are developed by Strčić (1998:260f.). There is little doubt, though, that Vegliote has now been extinct for many decades.

<sup>ii</sup> More details on the historical background may be found in Muljačić (1971; 1995; 2000), Zamboni (1976), Doria (1989b), Mihăescu (1993), Trummer (1998), Bernoth (2008:2731f.). For the classification of Dalmatian among Romance languages, see Windisch (1998), Bernoth (2008).

<sup>iii</sup> The extent to which Udaina also knew Croatian is moot. Muljačić (2006:321) finds that Udaina's mother had a mainland Croatian surname, which suggests that he might have learned at least some Croatian from her.

<sup>iv</sup> For ease of understanding, I have adapted into IPA Bartoli's system of phonetic transcription. However, since any re-transcription tends to distort the original, Bartoli's original transcriptions should always be consulted as well.

<sup>v</sup> In old Ragusan, \*[a] in stressed open syllables yielded a front vowel, written *e* (e.g., *chesa* 'house' < 'kasa).

<sup>vi</sup> Bartoli (1906/2000:II§286) believed that [u] was the original outcome in oxytones, and [uo] in paroxytones, but the evidence does not unambiguously support this claim.

<sup>vii</sup> The development of historically underlying \*[o] in closed syllables is problematic: see Bartoli (1906/2000:I§295).

<sup>viii</sup> Note that in closed syllables \*[i] and \*[u] > [e] and [o], and \*[e] > [a].

<sup>ix</sup> Cubich (cited in Bartoli 1906/2000: II§§101;108) records SG *schuav* 'servant' PL *schliv*.

<sup>x</sup> *toŋ* < \*'totu 'all', has [tʃ] throughout its paradigm, but this appears to result from analogical extension of a palatalization originating in MPL \*'toti.

<sup>xi</sup> Before the form *un*, Udaina never uses the preposition *in*, 'in', but *int*. This is reminiscent of the special use of *într-un* rather than \*\**în un*, in Romanian.

<sup>xii</sup> However: *joîn puoņ grund* 'a big loaf', with postposed adjective. Also *ju jaj be'vut [...]* 'joîna skode'laŋta 'maŋra de lat, literally: 'I drank a bowl big of milk'.

<sup>xiii</sup> The preterite is effectively extinct, excepting a few forms of the verb 'be'.

<sup>xiv</sup> In principle, future tense auxiliaries and past tense auxiliaries in this construction produce future perfect and pluperfect meanings respectively, but the effacement of morphological tense-distinctions makes such uses difficult to identify.

<sup>xv</sup> We find Latin MINUS 'less' in the expression *fu di meņ* 'do without', but *meņ* does not look phonologically indigenous, and may reflect Italo-Romance influence.

<sup>xvi</sup> The historical derivational morphology of Vegliote seems unremarkable from a comparative Romance perspective (cf. Bernoth 2008:2745).

<sup>xvii</sup> This type is also historically attested in Vegliote: see Bartoli (1906/2000:I§146; II§521). The agglutinative type 'two + ten', etc., is also found in Romanian, e.g. *doisprezece* literally 'two over ten'.

<sup>xviii</sup> Udaina freely uses left- (and right-) dislocation (usually with pronominal marking of a dislocated object): e.g., *el pias 'pelo i lo me'tua su le grade'luote* lit. 'the little fish they put it on the grills'.

<sup>xix</sup> In reciting the prohibitions of the Ten Commandments (Ive 1886), Udaina has negator + infinitive four times, but also three plain imperatives after negatives.

<sup>xx</sup> Cf. Bartoli (1906/2000:II§532) for old Ragusan.

<sup>xxi</sup> An additional complication is that 'tu' is not the phonologically predicted form of the second person singular pronoun, and may be an Italianism.