

CHANGE OF ADDRESS? THE HISTORY OF THE T/V SYSTEM IN ISTRO-ROMANIAN¹

MARTIN MAIDEN², OANA UȚĂ BĂRBULESCU³

Abstract. In this study we show how the T/V distinction became grammaticalized/pragmatized in Istro-Romanian (in comparison with Daco-Romanian) and we use textual and recorded attestations to establish: a) when the distinctions of deference appear and what parameters are involved in the selection of V forms; b) under what conditions the distinctions of deference appeared (is it an internal phenomenon or an effect of language contact?); c) whether there were other systems which were organized differently; d) whether third person plural forms acquire the value /+deference/ and whether they are allocutive or delocutive; e) the syntax of deferential address forms.

The data show that we are dealing with a late phenomenon which appeared in the 19th century due to language contact, most probably under German and Croatian influence. Germanic and possibly Croatian/Čakavian influence explains the use of third person plural to address an individual. The rise of second person plural for deferential address is solely due to Croatian/Čakavian influence. In Istro-Romanian, the preferred agreement is mixed, with the verb having grammatical agreement and the adjectives having referential agreement. Under Croatian influence, speakers also seem to accept uniform grammatical agreement, where adjectives appear in the masculine plural, even when the addressee is one woman.

Keywords: T/V distinction, language contact, vertical distance, horizontal distance, uniform agreement, mixed agreement.

1. INTRODUCTION

Daco-Romanian has the most complex pronominal allocutive and delocutive pronominal deference system in the Romance languages (see, among others, Reinheimer, Tasmowski 2005: 149, Vasilescu 2008: 212; 2013: 402, Zafiu 2013: 282). The complexity of the deference⁴ system is manifested not only in the inventory of grammaticalized forms

¹ This study arises from research conducted as part of the project HISTROX – *History of the Istro-Romanian Language*, in the Faculty of Linguistics, Philology, and Phonetics, University of Oxford, and generously funded by the Leverhulme Trust.

² University of Oxford/University of Bucharest – ICUB, martin.maiden@mod-langs.ox.ac.uk.

³ University of Oxford/University of Bucharest/Institute for South-East European Studies, oana.uta@ling-phil.ox.ac.uk.

⁴ Goffman 1956: 481, Goffman 1982: *passim*, Hickey, Vázquez Orta 1994: 267–286.

expressing the relationships between the participants in the act of communication, but also in its development and susceptibility to change, so that initially unmarked forms tend to become specialized in marked contexts involving ironic distancing while others may be maintained artificially in grammars, although they are no longer in use. Romanian also has a first person honorific of self-designation – which has been an archaism since the nineteenth century and today can be used exclusively in ironic contexts – as well as fully grammaticalized (third person) deferential reference forms.

The pronominal system of deference in Daco-Romanian is generally described as being gradient, where three or even four levels of politeness are recognized (Niculescu 1965: 43, Hobjilă 2003: 114–115, Reinheimer, Tasmowski 2005: 149, Vasilescu 2013: 403). This description works for the modern address system and, up to a point, for current spoken Romanian, but not for the old language before 1780. There, it develops from having no deferential distinctions to a system with binary oppositions, with a system with three terms emerging later.

While the pronominal deferential system of Romanian has been discussed in various studies and in grammars (Maiden, Dragomirescu, Dindelegan, Uță Bărbulescu, Zafiu 2021: 150–158), that of Istro-Romanian has been relatively neglected. We propose here to illustrate the organization of the pronominal politeness system of Istro-Romanian (compared with Romanian) and do our best to establish: a) when the distinctions of deference appear and what the parameters involved in the selection of V-forms are; b) under what conditions the distinctions of deference appear (is it an internal phenomenon or a language contact phenomenon?); c) whether there were other systems organized differently; d) whether third person plural forms acquire the value /+deference/ and whether they are allocutive or delocutive; e) what the syntax of the forms of deferential address is.

2. CORPUS

Our data come from materials collected from the nineteenth century until 2015. We have used the collections of dialect texts, the two atlases, various glossaries, the Istro-Romanian dictionary and recent archives. We have particularly focused on dialect text collections and recent materials collected by Zvezdana Vrzić and collaborators.

3. IS THERE /+DEFERENCE/ MARKING IN ISTRO-ROMANIAN AND IF SO WHEN DID IT APPEAR?

Initially there were no deference/politeness distinctions in the pronominal system. From data from the first Romanian texts, and from comparison of Daco-Romanian with the varieties spoken south of the Danube (Caragiu 1975: 137, TDR: *passim*, Maiden 2016:105), we find that:

a) the late Latin distribution of T/V-forms – where the V-form is used not only as a plural form but is grammaticalized as a deferential form of address to a single addressee – was not inherited in any Daco-Romance variety. In all Daco-Romanian varieties, *tu* was the singular address form and *voi*, in the plural, the form referring to the designated group to which the addressee belongs;

b) in Daco-Romanian, the T/V distinction was introduced later, after the separation of the four varieties, through the grammaticalization of a nominal phrase *domni(i)a + ta* ‘thy lordship’ and *domni(i)a + voastră* ‘your_{PL} lordship’, for the plural. This nominal phrase belonged to the class of honorifics and, being grammaticalized, gave rise to a corresponding pronominal form. Even later, distinctions of deference were introduced in the other Daco-Romance varieties.

What separates Daco-Romanian from Vlaski and Zejanski is not only the fact that deferential distinctions seem to appear even later in Istro-Romanian varieties, but also the nature and inventory of deferential allocutive forms.

3.1. Canonical use of the pronominal forms *tu* and *voi*

The configurations attested in Istro-Romanian present both the canonical use of the pronominal forms *tu* and *voi*:

- (1) e tse nu l₁ a₁ putut **tu** putut ɛn krijɔntsije ɛnmetso (Pu-I 1/17, son to father, emph. supp.)
- (2) tse nu rɛ maj bire fi se **ve voi** do₁ tsevo *pogovorits* (Pu-I 5/22, farmhand to his masters; when addressing one of them he uses the T-form),

and a usage in which the V-form is selected for a single addressee, where vertical distance⁵ (= power⁶, social and professional status⁷, age etc.), horizontal distance⁸ (intimate, familiar, acquaintance, stranger, etc.) and “weightiness” (in terms of cost or benefit) of the transaction⁹ essentially determine the selection of this form of address:

- (3) e je domnu ku **voi** gospodine si hvɔla (Pu-I 12/33, a stranger to the chief of the thieves)

Is the configuration in (3) where the additional value /+deference/ is attached to the V-form old (a fact that would contradict the initial hypothesis that the grammaticalization and pragmaticalization of this form of deferential addressing are late, the addressing with the V-form to a single addressee not being preserved from Latin) or is it more recent (a fact that implies Croatian/Čakavian influence in its development in Vlaski and Zejanski)? The corpus data belie the hypothesis that the T/V distinction was continued from Latin because:

- i) the use of the V-form to single addressee as an expression of deference was not a procedure of popular, spoken language, as we see, for example, in the Daco-Romanian regional varieties;
- ii) in the earliest collected texts, using a V-form to a single addressee is neither generalized nor completely integrated into the system, since in exactly the same situations speakers can select either a T-form or a V-form.

⁵ In the terms of Leech 2014: 84.

⁶ For power, see, among others, Brown and Gilman 1960; Brown and Levinson 1987.

⁷ For status, see, among others, Haase 1994: 21–22.

⁸ For horizontal closeness, Brown and Gilman (1960) use solidarity.

⁹ Leech 2014: 99.

If we were to allow that the distinction is continued from Latin, then we would also have to allow that at some point the selection constraints on the V-form weakened, only to be strengthened again later on. Such an assumption is not confirmed by the data.

3.2. A stage lacking deferential distinctions

The idea that in the Daco-Romance varieties there was a stage lacking deferential distinctions is typologically unexceptionable. The absence of deferential distinctions is nothing unusual, being attested (to this day) both in the Romance area (for example some Italo-Romance dialects of Abruzzo, southern Marche, southern Umbria, southern Puglia, parts of northern Calabria and Campania (Rohlf 2021: 181, Niculescu 1974: 58–63, Maiden 1995: 178, Renzi 1997: 113, Ledgeway 2015: 105, Ashdowne 2016: 899–900) and in languages genetically unrelated to Daco-Romance (see Helmbrecht 2013). Nor is there anything typologically unusual in saying that the distinctions of deference arose late. In German, addressing a (single) person with the V-form is first attested in the second half of the ninth century (Simon 2003: 88) and then, from the end of the sixteenth century, third person forms are accepted (Besch 1998: 94, Hickey 2003: 403) eventually becoming established. And in the various Slavonic languages the T/V deference opposition is grammaticalized and pragmaticalized at different stages: for example in Russian the phenomenon is attested late in the eighteenth century (Betsch 2003:125), likewise in Serbian (Kocher 1967, Keipert 1998), while in Czech it is already attested in the second half of the fourteenth (Betsch 2003: 126), in Polish in the fifteenth century (Stone 1984, Berger 1996), and in Croatian in the sixteenth (Berger 1998: 313, ARj s.v. ti, for other observations, see Kocher 1967).

3.3. Lost in translation?

There are relatively few data for the nineteenth century, but they do show that sometimes a single person may be addressed with the V-form.¹⁰ The V-form is selected in communication with an outsider (the researcher):

- (4) jo ve spur tʃ_a foʃt ʃi tʃe n_a foʃt *skutnts* bire (Nestor Scrobe telling Weigand a story, We-II 1/124)

There is no denying that this example is formulaic, being an introductory formula, but the V-form still needs explaining. Weigand's German translation contains only second person plural forms: „Ich erzähle *euch*, was gewesen ist und was nicht gewesen ist; *gebt* gut acht!” (We-II 1/125), which would contradict the hypothesis that the V-form in the Istro-Romanian example is /+deference/, for according to modern German address rules, one would have expected *Ihnen* and the verb-form *geben*. We cannot, after all, rule out the possibility that more than one person is being addressed by Nestor Scrobe, in which case the distinction between formal and informal addressed forms would be neutralized.

¹⁰ We consider the realization of the feature /+deference/ not only through the tonic forms of the personal pronoun, but also through clitics, possessives, and verbal forms.

On the other hand, in the texts collected by Weigand the V-form may appear within the stories themselves as an indicator of vertical distance:

- (5) *nu ȳemirits zupone (...) verits zupone* (by a villager to the mayor, We-II 6/142, in a tale gathered from Franz Stroligo; but Stroligo uses a T-form in another tale, where a villager from Lovran addresses the mayor with another formula and selects the T-form: *vezi wo (...) kume (...) kume din slobo te aȳ maȳnt ke te aȳ kukot pre vȳle*, We-II 8/148, but in Bartoli the V-form is selected in the same formula: *kume verits ots*, in Pușcariu 1926: 256)

Does the German translation of the example under (5) constitute indirect evidence that the form in example (4) could be a form with the value /+deference/? Weigand translates the intervention in example (5) as “Seid nicht böse, Bürgermeister... Kommt, Bürgermeister” (We-II 6/143). As can be seen, Weigand translates here too with the second person plural (imperatives *seid* and *kommt*), which indicates a translation that preserves the structure of the Istro-Romanian sequence. Again, by the rules of modern German, *sein* and *kommen* would have been expected. Why would Weigand decide to translate in both cases with second person plural? He might be translating too faithfully from the Istro-Romanian, to the detriment of the German structures. However, German deferential address had also undergone profound transformations, developing from a system without oppositions of respect, to a binary *du-ihr* system (based exclusively on the second person forms in old High German and middle High German), to a complex one, in which third person forms were used (seventeenth century), which became established with the plural form as marker of deference (from the 18th century). At the beginning of the nineteenth century, several pronominal forms and several strategies to mark deference coexisted (even with a change in the hierarchy in expressing the value /+respect/, when “[T]he pronouns *ihr* and *er/sie* exchanged their places in the politeness hierarchy, probably due to several independent reasons (degree of explicitness of grammatical specification, French influence)” (Simon 2003: 98, for more observations, see Simon 1997, 1998)). The system in modern standard German is a simplified one, with a binary opposition, *du-Sie*. By choosing to translate with marked forms for second person plural, Weigand was indeed offering a translation that kept to the original, but at the same time he was resorting to a strategy which, although in decline in late nineteenth-century German, had nevertheless been viable in his native language.

3.3.1. Formulas of addressing the outsider are caught in the texts collected from the nineteenth century onwards, they are rarer at first, but gradually they appear more often in the dialectal materials, as the methods of dialectal investigation also change and diversify. In the middle of the nineteenth century, Maiorescu makes a series of observations in the field, highlighting the difficulty of choosing an address formula when communicating with a Vlaski speaker. It should be noted that the latter interprets the V-form in Maiorescu’s questions as a simple plural form:

- (6) Eu îl întrebai atunci: „De ce **nu vorbești** in limba **voastră**?” El: „In limba *noastră*?” ... Acum repet întrebarea: „De ce **nu cuvențați**” (eu pronunțai ca noi, adecă *e* cu ton nasal) „de ce **nu cuvențați** in limba **voastră**?” Istrianul: „Cu cire (cine) cuvinta in limba *noastră*? ... Cire sci limba *noastră*?” Eu: „Io sci limba **voastră**, o cunosc că e și limba mea.” Istrianul: „Bire (bine) că **sciți**, *cuvintăm*.” (Ma 10–10)¹¹.

¹¹ We have reproduced Maiorescu’s text with the original spelling.

The whole passage shows how problematic it can be to distinguish between the V-form with plural value and the V-form with additional deferential value. Indeed Maiorescu shifts between address with the singular form and with the plural form, sometimes implying that the interlocutor belongs to a group, sometimes as a polite formula. On the other hand, the addressee interprets the V-form as plural when Maiorescu addresses him, but uses the V-form as a mark of deference when he addresses Maiorescu.

In leave-taking formulas, Maiorescu records the V-form, reproducing exactly what the Istro-Romanians tell him („Ei respunsere asemenea: „Domnul și cu voi, bura nopte,” dar într’auzii și câte un „Bohu și cu voi.””, Ma 24, see also „când mă sculam dintre ei, să plec in alte comună or să merg acasă, la salutarea mea „Domnul cu voi” mi se respundea afară de *Domnu și cu voi* încă și aceasta *bura coale*”, Ma 29, and 48, 57).

Maiorescu also offers some reflexions on the presence or absence of specific address formulae towards an:

- (7) Le cerui pe urmă să-mi arăte calea mai dreaptă peste montana la Berdo, la care una respunse **mai familiar in a doua persoană singulară**: *Când veri (vei) esi d’oancea foara preste codru* (arătă cu mâna), *subito veri vedè Berdo*. (Ma 47).

The note accompanying this pasage throws some light on usage in deferential addressing and in-group communication in Vlaski:

- (8) Ei intre sine vorbesc tot cu **tu. D-ta etc. nu-s cunoscute. Când vor să distingă o persoană, zic *eli* (illi) or *voi***; ear a doua persoană singulară e familiaritate.” (Ma 47, n. ****)

Deferential address to outsiders works according to the same parameters for over a century after Maiorescu’s enquiry, as can be seen form the material gathered by Sârbu between 1982 and 1996:

(9)

southern variety	northern variety ¹²
voi <i>pts</i> ganejt cu Frone lu Fbro 47 – MB, Šušnjevică, aged 55	voi <i>pts</i> zis dende ke ftiq 48 – MS, Žejane, aged 82
Ji <i>voj</i> ko je ontrebaveja piseja ku fetele tfuda Ji tfb ... besedele ko_i si voi ... 53, DC, Šušnjevică, aged 60	acmo kum om kuvintot mnt/ke on ftudi ku voi ke zetfe_i deset 48 – MS, Žejane
	voi <i>zicets</i> festnojst nu <i>zicets</i> festnajst 57 – AD, Žejane, aged 55

¹² Most of the texts reproduced in the 1998 volume belong to the northern variety, hence the discrepancy between the number of southern and northern forms.

	domnu ku voi tʃɔsta tʃe-ɔm bire kuvintɔt tʃe nu v_ɔm. vɛts spure tʃe-ɔm kuvintɔt – 58 – JD, Žejane, aged 66
	e dende <i>stets</i> voi dende <i>stets</i> voi baʃ 59 – ZS, Žejane, aged 45
	ʃi jɔko <i>vets</i> voi de lɔ mire pozdrovi a <i>voʃtri</i> frɔts rumunije ʃi surɔrle kɔnd <i>vets</i> ɛnka veri l 16 – MD, Žejane, aged 82 ¹³

The informants continue to use the V-form, even after the horizontal distance between them and the investigator is reduced:

(10)

year	informant DT
1992	<i>ʃiits</i> voi kən ɔ fost Ivina? 80 – DT, Žejane, aged 66
1995	<i>vedets</i> profesore tʃɔʃtʃi/kʲa_s a mele rogiakiɲe 140
1996	ʃi profesore <i>nts</i> tʃevɔ mɛnkɔt (...) nu vɔ -i fome (...) 149 kum <i>stets</i> ... e juva vɔ -i fiʎa 159

Yet the T-form is also used by the same informant in addressing an outsider (the investigator).

- (11) ɐ *ʃiij* tʃe-i porku ... ke ʃi **voi** *zicets* pork 63 – MS, Žejane, 78 de ani (the V-form could be a plural, referring to the linguistic group to which the investigator belongs, *voi* = Romanians).

3.3.2. In the early twentieth-century letters between Cantemir and two of his informants, Ive Jurman and Francesco Stroligo, V-forms are used by the latter, even where the horizontal distance between the investigator and the informants is reduced (see the examples from the materials collected by Sârbu above). We mention V-forms in letters precisely because they are extremely consistently used by informants in addressing the investigator. This consistency might be to some extent due to the written communication channel, written messages having a higher degree of formality compared to oral messages.

¹³ For space reasons we have restricted the number of examples.

(12)

ve dōvu fti k _{om} katsōt a vostra kōrta pre kōra fost _a litratējte de a vostri omir – IJ, I, Ca 139	jo _{om} dobēndit vostra kartulina – FS, Ca 151
drōgi gospodine jo ve dōvu fti k _{om} akatsōt a vostra pisma e kōra om tot bire kapit ali ve dōvu fti ke n _{om} putut mōnke odpisej ke uro n _{om} avut vrēme e ōto a fost t̥fōsta t̥fē voj m _{nts} ēntrebōt ke v _{om} spuravējt kum se la noj ēnsoru ali t̥fuda a ōj trekut ke om me jo ēnsurōt pak om fī jo vutōt kum <i>nts</i> fī voj fī afo om fakut tardi za odpisej – IJ, II, Ca 139	akmot̥fē pisejts _{om} kum ve tret̥fets fī kletu verits inke la noj voj ve spure t̥fuda f̥torijj ve pozdraves jo fī tots Domnu ku voj – FS, Ca 151
se rets voj de kolo mije pute tremete t̥fēvō pre pipēj ali pre tabōk pa rejt jo a vo plati ku mufōte f̥toritse e se nu bire tot uro fī akmo ve auguresk bure feste di natōl nu <i>zemerits</i> ke nu _i bire pisejto ke _i pre nopte la noj akmo ēj ploje dosta fī <i>odpisejts</i> t̥fē vred <i>putets</i> – IJ, II, Ca 141	
drōgi gospodine om dobēndit a vostra pisma fī om tot bire kapit t̥fē <i>nts</i> voj pisejt fī maj mōnke de tot ve augures bur fī vesel srit̥fīn noj ōn de <i>rets</i> stō maj bire nego t̥fela t̥fē av trekut voj mije <i>pisejts</i> ke neka ve jo pises tot t̥fē _{av} fost ku t̥fela om – IJ, III, Ca 141	
akmo ve pisesk zōlik ... <i>pisejts</i> kum <i>nts</i> trekut kōse kēnd <i>nts</i> fost fī <i>tremetets</i> fotografija de voj ke ve rejt rōd vede fī <i>pisejts</i> fī voj t̥fēvō maj mund de kolo – IJ, III, Ca 141 ¹⁴	

The selection of V-forms is consistent and uniformly distributed in the letters (V-forms appear both in the introductory and final sequences, which have a more pronounced formulaic dimension, and in the rest of the text). Conceivably, the sociolinguistic profile

¹⁴ For ease of presentation, we have reduced the number of examples with the V-form from Ive Jurman's letters to Cantemir.

(level of education, exposure to foreign, Croatian, Italian politeness models, etc.) contributed in the case of these two informants to the crystallization of this use of V-forms in deferential address.

3.3.3. Collections of dialect texts from the twentieth century contain longer stories, and short personal narratives including V-forms. It is obvious that the stories are *retold* by informants, so that in some dialogues between characters V-forms appear following the application of selection rules that the informant actually follows in deferential address or as he imagines they would be used in those dialogues.

3.3.3.1. Comparing the distribution of V-forms from the texts collected by Pușcariu, Popovici, Morariu, and Cantemir, we find:

a) the extremely fluctuating nature of V-form selection. This characteristic could be attributed to the nature of the collected texts (most often they are stories and short stories, while personal narratives or actual interaction are marginal or not recorded at all).

b) the importance and preeminence of vertical distance in the selection of V-forms. V-forms are selected in deferential address according to the social status of the interlocutor, his belonging to a social, professional class that enjoys prestige: *krɔʎ*, *prevt*, *səndets*. But even then, when the vertical distance is great (see how the *krɔʎ* is addressed), there is a great deal of variation (cf. V-forms Pu-I 8/25 but T-forms Pu-I 4/92, 8/38, 8b/18, sometimes from the same speaker in the same text).

3.3.3.2. In Ive Jurman's letters to Cantemir there are also two versions of some stories that had been recorded in the field previously from the same informant. Comparison of the two versions, oral and written, highlights sometimes a similar distribution of deference strategies in the two variants and sometimes a more careful selection of the V-form in the written version. The V-forms vs T-forms distribution appears as follows in the first story, *mɔja ʃi fiʎa*, both in the oral and in the written variants¹⁵:

(13) *mɔja ʃi fiʎa*

<i>fiʎa</i> → un tirer	V-form	<i>fiʎa</i> → fratəru	V-form
	<i>tʃe ste voɨ bura zi</i> (24) <i>ben verits ən kɔse</i> (24) <i>ʃi ʃɔ mɔ e drɔg k-ɔts verit ...</i> <i>vets dosigni pərʃutu</i> (24)		<i>este voɨ bura zi</i> (144) <i>otʃ verits</i> (145) <i>kavɔts ən vərhu de kɔsa</i> <i>nostra ...</i> <i>ʃi ɔts verit vets mere</i> <i>dosegni</i> (145)
tireru → <i>fiʎa</i>	T-form		T-form

¹⁵ The first column gives the forms recorded in the field, the second column gives the forms recorded in the written versions.

fiġa → un tirer	V-form	fiġa → fratəru	V-form
	tʃe rɛġ ku mire (24)		ke tʃe rɛġ (144) tʃe rɛġ ku mire (145) samo ver tsire bire skolele (145)

The short tale *mōja fī fiġa* it shows a uniform distribution of V – and T-forms in the two variants. Addressing a stranger or friar, respectively, involves the selection of the V-form on the part of a younger person, while the stranger (from the oral version) or friar (from the written version) addresses her with the T-form, highlighting an asymmetric power relationship. In the second story, *hləpətsu kørle a prevtu privarit*, a more consistent use of the V-form is found in the written version:

(14) *hləpətsu kørle a prevtu privarit*

	oral	written version
muġera → prevt	V-form	V-form
	jo n_oġi fti juva voġ ve dutʃe obedu (85) tʃe v_om fakut om avzit ke_ste bolən v_om dus ontʃa o bure zeme ke se va okripi fī ke_ts pojdi un kus de kapun (86-87)	kum fī voġ vets arə kənd mərə vor fī a meġ arə kum voġ ve jo dutʃe munkə fī bə (146)
	but also T-form	V-form
	viro pta sere (86)	skuzeġts ke m_om privarit ... verits tʃasta sera kolo dupa po de nopte ... fī aʃə dupa po de nopte verits ən stəle kətra mire (148)
hləpətsu → gospodər	T-form	V-form
	kəvte prevtu kole obrone fī je (85) ke se veriri tu_l klemə ke va veri (86)	but also
		but also T-form

	oral	written version
		ſi <i>vj</i> zis ke neka <i>lvje</i> ... nu <i>rej</i> fost niſ munko ni be (148)
gospodoru → mułere	T-form	T-form
	tſe <i>vj</i> tu vstez mislit ſo bire foſtſe ke n <i>vj</i> nikad ſo (85)	kum <i>ver</i> (147)
hlopotsu → prevt	T-form	V-form
	<i>fui</i> ku drøku de vntſ ke se gospodoru me verire va ku ərpi ən tire hiti (85)	<i>skapvts</i> k'v de vntſ ke se verire a mev gospodor je ve va stuſſi tot ku ərpile ke <i>i</i> kuntru de voj (147)
	but V-form, when the servant deceives him by pretending to be a woman	
	tſe <i>ste</i> voj prevtu (86)	
gospodoru → prevt	T-form <u>kume</u> otſ <i>viro</i> (86)	T-form kume (<i>əm</i>) <i>ne</i> otſ ku mire pre merinde (147)
prevtu → gospodor	T-form s <i>vj</i> drøku <i>n</i> tire n <i>er</i> tu mire ku ərpi (86)	
prevtu → mułere		T-form ſi aſv <i>ver</i> ſti juva <i>ver</i> veri (146) <i>voj</i> kətra tire veri (148) <i>voj</i> veri kum <i>ganeſti</i> (148)
mułera → gospodor		T-form <i>əmna</i> <i>l</i> klemv tu (147)
mułera → hlopots		T-form tu <i>əmne</i> durmi ən kəse (148)
gospodoru → hlopots		T-form <i>əmne</i> ju <i>ver</i> (148)

In principle, it is quite clear how the parameters of vertical distance and horizontal distance control the selection of the V-form and the T-form (addressing the *prevt* is done either mainly through the V-form, even when the horizontal distance decreases, as it happens in dialogues with *mułera*, or through T-form, in dialogues with *gospodbru*, while *prevtu* uses T-form regardless of the interlocutor, *hlppstsu* uses mostly V-form in dialogues with *prevtu* and with *gospodru*, but in *voru* addressed to him, all others resort to T-form, between spouses, where horizontal distance does not exist, the T-form is used). It is obvious that the power parameter is an important one in the V-form vs T-form selection. In addition, the second story shows a much more consistent selection of V-forms in its written version, which implies that the informant was more careful and tried to follow the rules of deferential address more closely. Although we have no concrete information about Cantemir's informant (for example, we do not know his level of education), it is nevertheless evident that he writes his letters himself, which implies that he has received some form of education. His higher degree of education might also have played a role in the choice of deferential forms.

3.3.4. In the vast majority of texts from the collections published to date, the opinions of the speakers on their practice in using address forms within the community are not recorded. But this is not true in recent recordings. The data can be consulted in the archive of materials recorded both in the north and in the south by Zvezdana Vrzić and collaborators.

As a general rule, speakers of southern varieties more readily accept the V-form when they are being addressed by the interrogator (see ruov_013-1, ruov_014-1, ruov_015-1, etc.). There are of course misunderstandings, when an intentional, explicit, verbal stimulus (V-form) is correctly identified from the investigator's point of view, but the informant requests clarifications by asking a wh-question, a partial question or a question seeking confirmation he has correctly interpreted a form:

- (15) ruov_014-1
juv_ats **voj** živit ɛntʃa ɛn ʃuʃnevitse kɔn v_ats ɛnsurɔt ali?
tʃire
voj
- (16) ruov_016-1
e **voſtri** frɔtsi ʃi ʃi sorɔrle tʃ_a živit ɛntʃa ali vrur mes_a fɔra živi
tʃire
voſtri
meʌ
ja

We did not come across any examples in the archive of southern materials where the speakers participating in the inquiry resorted to negotiating their communicative identity. Conversely, in the north, an informant negotiates his relative communicative identity, by rejecting power differences and resorting to strategies of inclusion (in-group). The speaker rejects the V-form which he considers overly polite and negatively marked (Locher 2008):

- (17) ruoz_002-1
kum kum je **voſtra** nu... lumele

ən zɛjən ə tots kuvintu **tu** kum **te** *kʰemi* rɛjm noj zɪtʃe samo se le sutle zɪtʃe **voj** ʃi le
 (...) le mɔje lu omu a tots ɒʎts se kuvinta **tu**
 bire

The speaker mentions that V-form address is normal to her godmother and her husbands's mother as a sign of respect. Another informant specifies that the T-form was used in Zejanski (even when the vertical distance was considerable, as in addressing an elderly person), where in Croatian a V-form was used (but horizontal as well as vertical distance may also have played a role):

- (18) ruoz_007-1
 ja n__am zis hm **voj** nego **tu**
 ʃi a betər om am zis hm po zɛjənski **tu** e kənd am hrvətski kuvintət atuntʃe am zis
 hm ka ʃi **vi**

This distinction by the speaker significantly captures the distinctive functions of Zejanski and Croatian: given in-group social relations speakers used to select the T-form, but when switching to Croatian, most likely in other communication situations, speakers resorted to the V-form. The specialization in spheres of use of Zejanski and Croatian meant a shift in the address formulas. The same informant also talks about a change in the discursive behaviour of younger speakers, which shows how the address system in Zejanski has aligned with that of Croatian:

- (19) ruoz_007-1
Po žejanski se svima govori „tu“?
 ja ma akmo ʃi po zɛjənski hm tʃuda ditsa ziku hm **voj**
 ne **tu** nego **voj**

Asked when the V-form is used in Zejanski, the same informant mentions addressing godparents and grandparents. But he admits there is a good deal of variation:

- (20) ruoz_007-1
 a kuɪ se zɪtʃe samo **voj**
voj
le sutle
lu sutəlu ʃi lu nono s__av vro vota zis vro vota ali ne tʃuda samo vetɛinom le sutle
 ʃi lu sutəlu s__av zis **voj**
 e le none am vetɛinom kuvintət hm tʃire av avut nona
 hm ke p... av uʒɛit zɪtʃe mɔja polina nu__ts **voj** mɔja polo ji adutʃe nu__ts **voj** aʃɒ e
 jo n__am avut nona e le mɔje s__av ʃi lu tʃɔja noj am vək **ti** hm **tu** kuvintət

As the community changes, with emigration to the city, and deep exposure to the Croatian model through school, media, etc., young people resort more often to the V-form in Zejanski on the Croatian model. But in addition to vertical distance, which has proved an important parameter in the selection of V-forms, horizontal distance weighs more and more,

since the young people did not grow up in the community and have a different representation of it, and when they return, they consider it normal to use V-forms in address, according to the Croatian model.

3.3.5. Data from the recordings highlight V-form selection in dialogues/interactions/interventions entered in direct style, free indirect style, etc. The communication situations from which these dialogues and interventions are *extracted* are either those in which the informant participated directly as an interlocutor, or some in which he did not participate directly (these dialogues were either played back to him or are simply imagined). A second category consists of dialogues from stories, which have no personal character.

3.3.5.1. In the archive there are situations where the informant selects V-forms to address - a relative (in example 21, addressing a maternal uncle with the V-form) or an older member of the community (in examples 22, 23, 24). In all of the situations in examples 21–24, age is the social variable that controls deferential address. Moreover, in examples 23 and 24 the age differences are explicitly mentioned, see the statement about the membership of one of the informants to the *noi fetşori* group and the self-assessment of the other informant that *am fost mika* at the time when the verbal interaction mentioned in the interview took place (for the rest of the examples, the wider context provides enough data to claim that age is the parameter requiring V-form selection):

- (21) ruov_034-1
ke je me  ntreba kum  j  t f jo m zis bire s  rets  fuda pinez. ... e jo m zis nu j ka i k n ats **voi** fost z d ne vota ... jo m zis hmo *rets*  i  pa  i  rets **ve** juva skad  ...  i jo m zis pre tsesta v je jo m zis lampadari ka i  n gr d jo m zis a  fe *rats* v   to din merika *vets*  n merika veri pa se  rde
- (22) ruov_017-1
pokojni  ... dus a  n ola jo nu  tivu litra  i podije do  fela negru vir tot iskrele mu ot pre je ... pokusit am  fa sm rdit a ka i ku lif je... na na na *dajets* m  pa  i n am putut b 
- (23) ruov_028-1
 i mije i k bro z  ke pokojni d z... uze t a veri la noi ma mund vote  i noi fet ori ze ni ke ne nu kare nu te spure noi ran fost lu je zit e *dajets spurets* ne  k / oritsa...  i saka vota  fe ra fost veri  u  u *spurets* ne *spurets* ne sta   /k oritsa vro   /k oritsa
- (24) ruov_012-1
 i jo m mes am la r...  i je s a priste b   k negnit kum am fost mika  i gane ma rozitsa zi **tu** mije ma  fe *raj tu* ma mije zis a nono nu te neka kumparu ma *zit ets voi*  fe ...    tik mj a zis ma jo nu  tivu k t *zit ets voi*

When enacting a dialogue he has himself heard, the informant resorts to the V-form, but horizontal distance activates its selection (as in example 25, where the

informant reproduces the dialogue between his parents and a stranger). Ceremonial relationships, including that involving godparents, are also encoded by the V-form in example 26:

- (25) ruov_024-1
 verit_a ur la noi ku bitsikleta noi an zos biveit fi ganē ke juva_i zōnkovtsi e noi
 ʎ_an ratōt ke_i ɒntʃ ən zgoru ke va lasō ɒntʃ bitsikleta e noi an zis fa *lasōts* kən *vets*
 veri din jō a ne ne trazets ve kōt kodri vets zis_a
- (26) ruov_021-1
 verit_a ɐntʃa tʃe_i frɒntʃina ɐntʃa lu bodolo lu tʃa pokoina bini sutle i... ke sutle i...
 s_a tʃavota kʎemōt (...) sutle i... sutle i... verit_a nemtsi juva m_or porku lō e pa
 tʃe voj jo vaime bojze **voj** *tijets* ganēi ni-(...) jo_i provei ma ku muftōt ganē fi k_a
 pozdravit nemōtsu fi ganē se *putets* lasō_ʎ jō_i siromōjka pa va ve dō ɒto va **ve** dō
 gaʎir va **ve** dō ova bep bire_i ran ran ran

Much more complicated is the interpretation of the V-form in the interaction between the informant's father and the stranger (in example 26, the informant's father addresses a single person, but seems to have in mind the group of which the latter is part).

In dialogues where the informant was not present, there is still encoding of respect for an elderly person, whom even he knew very well as a child. When he enacts a dialogue between a stranger and the person whom he is talking about (aiming to authenticate a personal interpretation of certain aspects, which belongs to him as the enunciator), the informant uses the T-form, but when he enacts a dialogue between an acquaintance of his and the same elderly person, respect is conveyed:

- (27) ruov_024-1
 ja nuʎkare i... fost_a nu ʃtivu se ɒi tu avzit je fost_a slip fi slip s_a rodit... fi je tot
 a ʃtivut fi de ɒntʃ mizēja ən zgoru pa tʃire ʎ_a zis ive ʃa ʃkuro_i kum *ver* mere a
 mije_i vajk ʃkuro
 atuntʃe g... ke ganē ʃa *barba i...* juva *mezets* (...) e ma **voj** *ats* zbaʎeit **voj** *ste* la frōnu
 vezut s_a sta mije ke sēm jo la frōnu

At other times, when enacting a dialogue that he did not witness and which took place in Croatian, the informant takes into account the formal communication situation (in the hospital, see example 29) and horizontal distance (example 28, a dialogue between the informant's mother and a person she was meeting for the first time):

- (28) ruov_024-1
 pokle tʃōsta kujina ke ganē ke_i tʃija ur ʃtroligo tʃe ʃtrolige ma ke ʎ_or pure okoli
 de gut ke jō_j sta ʃōrta ke ʎ_a muftōt pus fatsolu tot tʃō ran vedē ke se va je ʃti s_a
 jō operatsijonu fakut fi je vo kōvta fi ke ganē tʃela buke tʃ_ats nemisli lu mōjke
 bojze dutʃe zōtʃ ke nu l_ats dus k_a zis jō v_a oʃʃuveit jō va oʃʃuveit **voj** *ats* ʃō
 mōre operatsijon vut

(29) ruov_036-1

kən a sora verit ən ən kəmara juva juva juva durmit_a e kopta ma ən pət nu_i nițfur
 alora sora ɛntrebət_a okoli e juva m_je frɔtele ke nu_i ɔntʃa e tot tatʃbət_a ma
 zitʃets juva m_je frɔtele no ma **vostru** frɔte mila mɛ ʃinora **vostru** frɔte murit_a

3.3.5.2. In stories that are not personal, the T-form is mostly used, regardless of how great the vertical distance and horizontal distance are (see, for example, the address to the *kroʔ* in *Pepeljuga*, the version narrated in ruov_021-1). There are also cases where the informant uses the V-form, sometimes with their normal (plural) value, as well as with the special one, /+deference/, but the entire fragment is narrated without much consistency in the use of pronominal forms (borrowed forms appear alongside native forms):

(30) ruov_021-1

ʃi tʃiʃa fost_a devet frɔts ʃi tʃbʃe ʃi tʃiʃa k_a dobar vetʃer dobar vetʃer tʃe rats_{2PL} me
 pute lasɔ prispi ja juva meri sritʃ/ke meg... tʃe raj_{2SG} ɛntrebɔ ʃi za nɔs_{1PL} vero voʔ
 drak_a je ɛntrebɔt ʃi muʃbɔt prispiʃa tʃiʃa ʃi ən damarets a partit ʃi mere mere verit_a
 la o ɔpa mɔre *lasnts*_{DEFERENCE/2PL} me prik juva meri_{2SG} meg sritʃa tʃere ke n_am vo sɛm
 siromɔh n_am niʃ bire bire ʃi ke s_a rezdvojit ma ʃi zɔ me_{1SG} ɛntreba ja voʔ ʃi za
vɔs_{DEFERENCE/2PL} ɛntrebɔ k_a verit la ur mɔre kodrina ... k_a verit la tʃɛsta ɔpa nɔzata
*lasnts*_{2PL/2DEFERENCE} me prik tʃa_j ɛntrebɔt sritʃa za nɔs_{1PL} voʔ **ve**_{2PL/2DEFERENCE} spure ma
*lasnts*_{2PL/2DEFERENCE} me prik

The value of V-forms is not easy to establish in example (30), both because morphologically there is no differentiation between the form with the features /+singular, +deference/ and the one with the features /+plural, - deference/ and because in the same context sometimes the first person singular form is selected, which implies an interpretation of the V-form address as differential, and sometimes the first person plural form, which would favour interpretation of the V-form as a simple plural form.

3.3.6. The syntactic behaviour of the forms by which the difference is encoded may at first sight seem simple: while a T-form selects agreement with the singular verb a V-form selects agreement with the plural verb, even if the addressee is a single person. Things are more complicated when there are several inflected constituents (adjectives, nouns) that should also obey the agreement rules.

3.3.6.1. In Romanian, when the trigger is the deferential pronoun *dumneavoastră*, then there is an asymmetry in agreement realization for two target types, namely verbs (finite forms and auxiliaries) and adjectives:

(31) *Dumneavoastră* puteți_{2PL} veni la 4, vă rog? (a secretary to a candidate to be interviewed for a job)(32) *Dumneavoastră* sunteți_{2PL} foarte bine pregătit_{MSG}/pregătită_{FSG} (in addressing a single person during a job interview)

As can be seen from examples (31) and (32), the asymmetry is manifested between verbs that are always plural and adjectives in the predicative position, which are singular, masculine (if the referent is a man) and feminine (if the referent is a woman). In example (32), therefore, the number of the adjective indicates the semantic cardinality of the subject denotation, and this could be called semantic or referential agreement (see, among others, Wechsler and Hahm 2011: 250). When there is a noun phrase (noun+adjective) in the predicative position, the noun is singular, and the adjective agrees with it in gender and number:

- (33) *Dumneavoastră* sunteti_{2PL} un_{MSG} bun_{MSG} profesor_{MSG} (addressing a man)/o_{FSG} bună_{FSG} profesoară_{FSG} (addressing a woman)/un_{MSG} bun_{MSG} manager_{MSG} (addressing either a man or a woman)/o_{FSG} persoană_{FSG} bună_{FSG} (addressing either a man or a woman)

Standard Romanian is, from this point of view, a mixed agreement language (Wechsler and Hahm 2011: 250). The mixed agreement pattern with V-form has been attested in various Romance languages (also, for example, French, Neapolitan, Calabria, northern Puglia, Rome, Canton Ticino, Corsica, and also some Tuscan varieties (Rohlf 2021: 182, Ashdowne 2016: 900), in Balkan languages (see Modern Greek) (Comrie 1975: 410), but also in some Slavonic ones (Macedonian, Bulgarian, Czech, Slovak, Ukrainian, Belarusian, and in Russian with long forms adjectives favour this type of agreement, Corbett 1983: 56–80; 2000: 193–194; 2006: 230–232, Wechsler and Hahm 2011: 250). On the other hand there are languages in which V-forms trigger plural agreement on both verbs and predicate adjectives. These are therefore uniform agreement languages (Wechsler and Hahm 2011: 250). The uniform agreement pattern with the V-form has been identified in Serbian/Slovenian, and in Russian for short adjectives (Corbett 1983: 56–80; 2006: 230–232; 2010: 20, Puškar-Gallien 2019: 3–4). Thus in Serbian/Croatian:

- (34) *Vi* ste_{2PL} bili_{MPL} dobri_{MPL} ‘You_{DEF} were good’ (from Comrie 1975: 407)
Vi ste_{2PL} vrlo ljubazni_{MPL}, gospodine_{VOCP}! ‘You_{DEF} are very kind, sir’ (from Alexander 2006: 45)

The dialects do show a tendency for mixed agreement patterns where the verb is plural but the predicative adjective and the *I*-participle are singular (see Comrie 1975: 407, Corbett 1983: 49, Wechsler and Hahm 2011: 250). Čakavian presents mixed agreement patterns:

- adjective and *I*-participle in the feminine singular, but 2PL verb
 (35) ste_{2PL} dobrā_{FSG} ‘you are good (at something)’¹⁶
 (36) Jūšto ste_{2PL} reklā_{FSG} ‘you said it correctly’
 (37) Ne znān ku ste_{2PL} kadā rībeš vīdela_{FSG} ‘I don’t know whether you ever saw a grater’
 (38) Ku bite_{2PL} tēla_{FSG} rēc (...) ‘if you wanted to say (...)’
 – adjective and *I*-participle in the masculine singular, but 2PL verb
 (39) ma nīste_{2PL} škōdo stōri_{MSG}, sāmo ūrto, takō ‘but you didn’t do any harm, you just [did it out of] spite, like that’

¹⁶ All examples from Kalsbeek (1998:309).

In Serbian/Croatian, if there is a noun phrase (noun+adjective) in predicative position, then the noun (and the adjective that modifies it) are in the singular when referring to a single person:

- (40) *Vi ste_{2PL} ljùbazan_{MSG} čòv(j)ek¹⁷_{MSG}* ‘You are a kind person’ (from Alexander 2006: 45)¹⁸

3.3.6.2. In the southern and northern varieties of Istro-Romanian, V-forms require agreement with the plural of the verb. As for the form of the adjective, this is the situation in the letters to Cantemir from Ive Jurman and Francesco Stroligo:

(41)

<i>ſi mi je a fost ʒp avzi k_—pts fost voĭ boln_{MSG} – IJ, IV, Ca 142</i>	<i>kredu ke_—ste ſi voĭ sər_{MSG=PL} – FS, I, Ca 151</i>
<i>ſi ȳm katsȳt ſi a voſtra fotografĭja kȳra a fost muſȳt tot bine ſi muſȳt_{MSG} pts ramȳs – IJ, V, Ca 142</i>	
<i>ȳsȳm veſel ke piſeĭts ke se furets bire sər_{MSG=PL}, ke vets veri do doi miſets inke me aflȳ – IJ, V, Ca 143</i>	
<i>jo ve dȳvu ſti k_—am katsȳt a voſtra piſma kȳra ȳm tot bire kapit ke_—ste akmoſȳe sər_{MSG=PL} ſi ve dȳvu ſti – IJ, VI, Ca 145</i>	

Many adjectives show neutralization of the number distinction, but among those that do not show the neutralization of the number opposition *boln_{MSG}* and *muſȳt_{MSG}* display semantic and referential agreement (the plural would be *bolni* and *muſȳts*). In the case of *sər*, the number opposition is neutralized (see, for example, the example *sno tots sər*, also from Ive Jurman’s letters to Cantemir, IJ, IV, Ca 142, IJ, VII, Ca 150).

In the texts collected by Sȳrbu, the agreement with the predicative element *rumun* is not diagnostic, however, because it shows the neutralization of the number opposition (Sȳrbu and Frȳȳilȳ note in the texts a plural form with neutralization, see the example *jeĭ a fost rumun*, 111, but also a form with an assumed palatal nasal, see the example *kole_—s rumun nuſkȳrȳi*, 119):

- (42) *ma voĭ nu stets rumun ke rumuni isto nu ne_—ȳm putut ȳntseleȳze ku jeĭ kȳnd vȳ ontȳ*
fost Sȳ-Fȳ 133

¹⁷ J čovjek / E čovek, see Alexander 2006:45.

¹⁸ The example is accompanied by the comment: „[W]hen a single person is addressed by the polite form *vi*, a predicate adjective agrees with the pronoun’s grammatical status of plural. But a predicate noun refers to the real-world fact of a single person, and appears in the singular” (Alexander 2006: 45).

Not every V-form encodes deference and sometimes additional information is needed to detect its value. Normally if an adjective ends [-r], it shows the neutralization of the number distinction:

- (43) (jɔ̃_i de dvɔ̃iset ʃi dõi) ne de trej **voj** stets mai betəri ka jo ... (sedemdeset ʃi ur ɔ̃re ʃaptezɔ̃tʃ ɔ̃n ...) Sâ-Fă 91

In the example in (42), *voj* encodes deference to the outsider, while in the example in (43), *voj* is a plural form (the speaker uses the V-form not for deferential address to one in-group member, but is referring to him and his wife). Example (43) highlights overt marking of the plural for the adjective ending in [-r]. It would seem that speakers use adjective agreement to distinguish the V-form with features /+singular, +deference/ from the V-form with features /+plural, ±deference/. They allow mixed agreement only for deferential address.

In the recent materials collected by Zvezdana Vrzić and collaborators, both singular (masculine and feminine) and plural forms of adjectives are attested:

(44)

	Adj + SG	Adj + PL
Ruoz_009-1	I: E voj _{ste2PL} hm ste fakut _{MSG} ɔ̃n tʃɔ̃sta kɔ̃sa ili ¹⁹ = A Vi ste rodeni u ovo _j kući ili?	
Ruov_013-1	I: kɔ̃n ats _{2PL} fost mika _{FSG} ku tʃa tʃe v _{ats2PL} igrẽit = Kada ste bila mala, s čime ste se igrati? I: kɔ̃n ats _{2PL} fost mika _{FSG} tʃe ve domislits de kakove igre = A kada ste bila mala, da li se sjedate kakvih igara? I: ʃi kɔ̃n ats _{2PL} fost tirara _{FSG} juv _{ats2PL} mes pre ples = I kada ste bila mlada, gdje ste išla na ples? I: kɔ̃re fost _a lukru lu ur fetʃor kɔ̃n ats _{2PL} fost mika _{FSG} = Koji je bio posao jednog djeteta kada ste bila mala? I: tʃe ve domislits _{2PL} de kakova ʃtʃ/kʃoritsa kɔ̃n ats _{2PL} fost mika _{FSG} tʃ _a spuravẽit _a ? = Da li se sjedate koje priče koje su pričali kada ste bila mala?	I: tʃe s _a slavit rodʒendani kɔ̃n ats _{2PL} fost miʃ _{PL} ? = Da li se slavio rođendan kada ste bila mala?
Ruov_014-1	I: tʃe ve domislits _{2PL} kɔ̃n ats _{2PL} fost mik _{MSG} ... kum tʃ _a fost _a kɔ̃n ats _{2PL} voj fost mik _{MSG} = Da li se sjedate kada ste bili mali-- /Kako je to bilo kada ste vi bili mali?	I: e tʃe voj mislits _{2PL} tʃ _a fost majlɔ̃hko lu zenske ali lu muʃki kɔ̃n ats _{2PL} fost tirari _{MPL} = A što vi mislite?

¹⁹ We have also provided the Croatian translation that accompanies the Istro-Romanian materials.

	Adj + SG	Adj + PL
	<p>I: tʃe ve <i>domislits</i>_{2PL} de kakova igra kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost mik_{MSG} = Da li se sjedate kakve igre kada ste bili mali?</p> <p>I: e tʃ <i>ats</i>_{2PL} lukrət kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost mik_{MSG} tʃ <i>ats</i>_{2PL} vut vro lukru tʃ a tʃ <i>ats</i>_{2PL} morejt fəʃe voj kaj fəʃforu_{MSG} = A što ste radili kad ste bili mali, da li ste imali neki posao što što ste morali raditi vi kao dijete?</p> <p>I: tʃe s a munkət tʃe s a kuhivejt kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost mik_{MSG} = Što se jelo? Što se kuhalo kad ste bili mali?</p> <p>I: kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost voj mik_{MPL} kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} mes pre dotrina tʃe ən baserika s a ganejt hrvōtski ne talijōnski = kada ste bili mali, kada ste išli na vjeronauk, što se u crkvi govorilo hrvatski, a ne talijanski?</p>	<p>Da li je bilo lakše ženskama ili muškima kada ste bili mladi?</p> <p>I: e tʃe kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost tirari_{MPL} plesu fost a ən fuʃnjevica fī juva inka = A što kad ste bili mladi, ples je bio u šušnjevici i gdje još?</p> <p>I: kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost tirari_{MPL} juva fost a plesu = kada ste bili, kada ste bili mladi, gdje je bio ples?</p>
Ruov_015-1	<p>I: tʃe m <i>putets</i>_{2PL} zitʃe kum a fost životu ɔntʃa ən fuʃnjevitse fī ən noselo kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost mik_{MSG} = Da li mi možete reći kakav je bio život ovdje u Šušnjevici i u Novoј Vasi kada ste bili mali? Čega je bilo?</p>	
Ruov_016-1	<p>I: e voj kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost mika_{FSG} tʃ <i>ats</i>_{2PL} vut vro lukru kōsa kaj feč kaj feta = A vi kada ste bila mala, da li ste imali kakav posao u kudi? Kao dječ- kao djevojčica?</p> <p>I: e tʃ <i>ats</i>_{2PL} lukravejt kōsa tʃ <i>ats</i>_{2PL} žutət lu mōje kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost mika_{FSG} = A što ste radili u kući? Da li ste pomagali majci kada ste bila mala?</p> <p>I: e kum <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost ənmeʃtita_{FSG} =</p> <p>I: e kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost mika_{FSG} de sera tʃ <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fa tʃ <i>ats</i>_{2PL} lukrət sera = A kada ste bila mala, u večer, što ste ra što ste radili? Uvečer?</p> <p>I: tʃ a mes vrur ʃtudiјај de vostri priјpteʃi kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost mika_{FSG}? = Da li je netko išao studirati od vaših prijatelja, kada ste bila mala?</p> <p>I: tʃe ve <i>domislits</i>_{2PL} tʃe s a slavīt rođžendānu kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost mika_{FSG} = Da li se sjedate, da li se slavio rođendan kad ste bila mala?</p> <p>I: kən <i>ats</i> fost feta_{FSG} fī mika_{FSG} = kada ste bila djevojčica i malena</p>	<p>I: e kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost tirari_{MPL} kum <i>ats</i>_{2PL} kum <i>ats</i>_{2PL} ve zebavʃejt = A kad ste bili mladi, kako ste kako ste se zabavljali?</p> <p>I: e kən <i>ats</i> fost fəʃfori, kum <i>ats</i> ve igrejt? = A kada ste bili djeca, kako ste se igrali?</p>

	Adj + SG	Adj + PL
	<p>I: tʃe ve <i>domislits</i>_{2PL} kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost mika_{FSG} = Da li se sjedate, kada ste bila malena</p> <p>I: kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost tirara_{FSG} juva s_a kumparot mobilije = nekad, kada ste bila mlada, gdje se kupovao namještaj?</p> <p>I: e juv_a <i>ats</i>_{2PL} lukrot kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost tirara_{FSG} = A gdje ste radila kada ste bila mlada?</p>	
Ruov_017-1	<p>I: ʃi kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost mik_{MSG} kakove kakov lukru fost_a vostru ən kosa? = Kada ste bili mali, koji je vaš posao bio u kući?</p> <p>I: e kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost fetʃoru_{MSG} tʃ_a <i>ats</i>_{2PL} vut tʃuda prijpote_{li} = A kada ste bili dijete, da li ste imali puno prijatelja?</p> <p>I: kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost mik_{MSG} tʃe ve <i>domislits</i>_{2PL} de pərva pritʃfest = Kada ste bili mali, da li se sjedate Prve pritʃfesti?</p> <p>I: kən kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost mik_{MSG} tʃe ve <i>domislits</i>_{2PL} = Kada kada ste bili mali, da li se sjedate?</p> <p>I: kən <i>ats</i>_{2PL} fost mik_{MSG} tʃe ve <i>domislits</i>_{2PL} tʃ_a vut vro medižija tʃ_a lukrot kosa kən a vrur fost bolən = Kada ste bili mali, da li se sjedate nekog lijeka kojeg se radilo kod kude, kada je neko bio bolestan?</p>	

The forms come from the investigator (=I), who learned Vlaski as L2 and who exhibits sequential elective bilingualism (dominant in Croatian). In standard Croatian Vi requires agreement with the second person plural form of the verb and the masculine plural form of the adjective (so that they belong to the class languages with uniform agreement, see the full discussion in Wechsler and Hahm 2011), while in Čakavian Vi requires agreement with the second person plural form of the verb, but the semantic, referential agreement with the adjective (which is masculine singular if the addressee is a male and feminine singular if the addressee is a female). Moreover, colloquial Croatian exhibits the same type of mixed agreement as Čakavian (Stevanović 1974: 127, Corbett 1983: 49). Before this uniform type of agreement became standard for deferent addressing with Vi, there had been the mixed agreement type (attested in the eighteenth and nineteenth century in Slavonian writers, Herrity 1972: 262-263), in which adjectives and I-participles were in the singular (see also Corbett 1985: 49). Why does so much variation occur in these recent materials? It can be argued from older material that the V-form with features /+singular, +deference/ exclusively requires agreement of the singular adjective (masculine or feminine), thus distinguishing it from the V-form with features /+plural, ± deference/, which requires agreement of the plural adjective (masculine, if there is a male in the group, feminine, for an exclusively female

group). This distinction is still functional in Istro-Romanian. But the system seems to be reorganizing itself under pressure from the standard language. And the first type of context to succumb are those where scenarios favouring the plural reading are activated alongside activation of the /+deference/ value (see, for example, e tʃe voĭ mislits_{2PL} tʃ_a majləhko lu zenske ali lu muʃki kən ats_{2PL} fost tirari_{MPL}). Sometimes one cannot safely invoke the plural reading, even if it cannot be ruled out. In the very same scenario (when asking about *ples*), the investigator resorts to structures with mixed agreement (ʃi kən ats_{2PL} fost tirara_{FSG} juv_a_{2PL} mes pre ples) or uniform agreement (e tʃe kən ats_{2PL} fost tirari_{MPL} plesu fost_a ən ʃuʃnjevice ʃi juva inka/ kən ats_{2PL} fost kən ats_{2PL} fost tirari_{MPL} juva fost_a plesu, although addressed to a single person. Although there is much variation in the realization of agreement in structures with V-forms, the investigator more consistently uses mixed agreement when the addressee is female than when the addressee is male. We believe that what we have here is an interference phenomenon, determined by standard Croatian, which leads to the alternation between structures with mixed, semantically motivated, notional, referential agreement between V-form and adjective and those with uniform agreement, especially when the addressee is male (also being *favoured* or *motivated* by the possibility of a plural reading, in the sense that the addressee is part of a group).

3.4. „Now you *Sie* me, now you don’t...”²⁰

We repeat here²¹ Maiorescu’s observation made in the mid nineteenth century, when he travelled in Istria:

„Ei între sine vorbesc tot cu **tu**. **D-ta etc. nu-s cunoscute. Când vor să distingă o persoană, zic *eli* (illi) or *voi***; ear a doua persoană singulară e familiaritate.” (Ma 47, n. ****, emph. supp.)

Maiorescu’s observation has gone unnoticed until now, just as these brief comments by Pușcariu have not been discussed:

- (45) „*Formula de politeță* se redă mai rar prin pers. 2 plur., mai des prin pers. 3 plur.” (Pu-II 255)

Maiorescu and Pușcariu thus indicate the presence of deferential address formulas in which the second person pronoun is not used, but the third person plural is. In Pușcariu’s texts contain several examples in which a single person is addressed as Maiorescu had mentioned in the mid nineteenth century:

- (46) dobro jutro kɔɫe tse rɛ **je** vrɛ di la mire Pu-I 16/53
 (47) e je zitse gospodine tse un tɔt se va ənsurɔ dupa **a lor** fiɫe Pu-I 16/55
 (48) kum **vor je** gospodine Pu-I 22/3
 (49) ma kum ne ren pogodi/ e kum **vor je** Pu-I 22/15

²⁰ After the title of an article by Kretzenbacher, Hajek, Lagerberg, and Bresin 2019.

²¹ See above (8).

- (50) nu səm jo jədən nego **je** vor fi *jadni* Pu-I 22/18
 (51) si gospodaritsa zitse se **r**ε vinde n **o**i vinde ma l **o**i dō samo neka me lōsu durmi
 ɔn kōmare iuvε **j**ole si gospodōru *dormu* Pu-I 30/22
 (52) kamaɬera ɔntrebe gospodinū gospodine tse nu **je** *avdu* nopta nis se **r**ε **je** avzi kum
 nuntru plōnze si vike **je** nu **r**ε durmi Pu-I 30/26

In Pușcariu's texts, these constructions come from a single informant (Josif Belulović, who worked at a bank in Fiume/Rijeka). None of the examples presents indirect reporting, so they are not a matter of switching from direct to indirect speech. Moreover, in some examples the marks of direct address are overt (see, for example, the vocatives in examples 46, 47, 48, 52), and other referents which might be the antecedents of anaphora relations cannot be made available. The only possible interpretation is that of V address in the third person plural.

3.4.1. This phenomenon occurs in German (see above), but is also attested in other languages from the most diverse areas (Amharic, see Cohen 1936, Tagalog, see Bautista 1980), in Giarratana, Sicily (Rohlf 2021: 183), Danish (Hansen and Heltoft 2011: 437), Norwegian Bokmål (Faarlund, Lie, and Vannebo 2006: 330), Swedish (Ahlgren 1978: 73), in several Slavonic languages, Czech (onikání, see Berger 1995, Berger 1996, Betsch 2000, Kretzenbacher, Hajek, Lagerberg, and Bresin 2013), Slovenian (Reindl 2008: 165-170, Lipavac Oštir 2010: 43-44), Slovak (onikanie, see Kretzenbacher, Hajek, Lagerberg and Bresin 2019)²². As for the origin of this phenomenon, a calque from Germanic has been proposed for Danish, Swedish, Norwegian Bokmål, and Slavonic languages respectively (see Kretzenbacher, Hajek, Lagerberg, and Bresin 2019). Other interpretations have been proposed for Slovak, Isačenko (1960: 414) arguing that it is a combined German-Hungarian influence. Such an interpretation has been rejected with solid arguments by Kretzenbacher, Hajek, Lagerberg and Bresin (2019), who show that “[T]here is no 3PL V address for single interlocutors in Hungarian; both V pronouns for single interlocutors in Hungarian, *őn* and *maga*, show 3SG verbal agreement (Reményi 2001: 51). In fact, 3PL V address in Slovak was always understood to be the result of German influence (...) and was consequently rejected by the proponents of a Slovak national language in the nineteenth century.”

Given the paucity of our data, we can only propose that in Istro-Romanian we have a recent phenomenon which has never become generalized. It is a contact phenomenon of contact, calqued on the German model, either directly or through a Slavonic intermediate (even Croatian, as Pușcariu 1929: 284 assumed, showing that “in the neighbouring Croatian dialect, it is not used, as in the Croatian literary language, pers. 2 (vi) but pers. 3 plur.: *kako*

²² Indeed this phenomenon also exists in northern Croatian dialects, especially in the towns where, for deferential address the pattern followed is calqued on German, with the third person plural of the verb and the third person plural masculine pronoun (*oni*):

(Gospodine/Gospodo,) *Oni su mi rekli...*

(Mein Herr/Gnädige Frau,) *Sie haben mir gesagt...*

Professor August Kovačec tells us (personal communication) that this phenomenon is probably present not only in the towns but in rural communities as well. While the rest of northern Croatia, as part of the Hungaro-Croatian Kingdom, was exclusively under Austrian (and linguistically German) rule, Istria (except for the towns on the western coast which were Venetian and Venetized) was ruled by (German-speaking) Bavarian and Austrian counts.

će oni”, Slovenian?). The attestations of third person plurals as /+deference/ V-forms support the idea of calquing on a German model, since Maiorescu mostly encounters people in the administration, and Pușcariu’s informant works in an environment that presumably requires exposure to the German language.

3.4.2. In German, for example, third-person plural deferential address develops from an anaphoric pronoun referring to a V-form with a plural noun (or at any rate understood as plural), such as *Euer Gnaden* („Your_{PL} Grace”), selecting a third-person plural verb-form in Early Modern High German (for other details, see Listen 1999). Now no such development is attested in Istro-Romanian, which suggests that it must be a contact phenomenon rather than an internal one.

3.4.3. But not every third person form additionally acquires the value /+deference/, just as not every V-form has the value /+deference/. Pușcariu (1926: 256) assumes that the third plural in the following fragment is a deferential form of address:

- (53) verit_a la o mōre boske ɛn tsa boske ɛn polovitsu fost_a ramnitsa s_a jple spravit
din tote bōnzile saka ku se kō juve jple vut_a se tsire su nuk si saka zōlika
spuravejt_a/ a ʎej hlapōts av stresit ku kōpu docle ʎ_a uzda kazut dispre kōp kēn
ʎ_a uzda kazut je n_ɔ fost kō nego om/ kēnd_a jple finit a se sedutē tuntse mergu
saka la se kō e jɔ nu afle se Pu-I 31/5-7

But as can be seen, the third person plural forms do not appear in a direct speech context and have a clear anaphoric link to third person antecedentes (which can be controlled in context, *jɔ* ↔ *strige*, *jple* ↔ *strige*), so do not qualify as V-forms for deferential address.

In the same story, however, there is a form which does have these features:

- (54) vire hlapōtsu kōtra gospodōru si zitse lu gospodōru gospodine tse_i draku lu a lor
mułere Pu-I 31/14

4. CONCLUSIONS

The data from Istro-Romanian tell us something about how these distinctions were grammaticalized and pragmaticalized in Daco-Romance. They show that deference distinctions were introduced at different times, earlier in Romanian than in Istro-Romanian (most likely after the eighteenth century, because in the nineteenth century they were still not generalized). Again, the situation in Daco-Romance is part of a type of development also recorded in the Slavonic languages (where, as shown, there are major chronological differences in the grammaticalization and pragmaticization of deferential distinctions).

The Istro-Roman system is based, as expected, on distinctions sensitive primarily to vertical distance: power, social and professional status, authority, which determine the selection of the V-form. In the family sphere, age and authority require V-forms (the two variables act in solidarity, as in addressing godparents, aunts, grandparents with V-forms). Horizontal distance is also an important parameter (as on addressing outsiders,

strangers, etc.). Relationships are marked asymmetrically, using forms circumscribed to non-reciprocal use: whoever receives V-form replies, as a rule, with the T-form. Recent recordings show expansion of the V-form to reciprocal use between adults who do not know each other well:

- (55) (ruov_013-1)
 a **voĭ**/tĭjets ganĕĭ po nɔʃe
 a kum tʃ_ats kɔsa ganĕĭt ali ku nona
 ma ne *fedets* **ve**

The channel of communication plays an important role in V-form selection, as informants resort to V-forms more consistently than in speech. Likewise, when they enact dialogues/interactions at which they were or were not present, the informants take into account the degree of formality with which the dialogue/alleged interaction took place and, last but not least, they are influenced in their choice of the deference form, by the language in which the dialogue/interaction took place (if it was Croatian, then transfer of the V-form to Istro-Romanian is more likely).

The syntax of the deferential V-form shows that originally speakers had a mixed agreement system (as in Čakavian or the older phases of Croatian). Under the pressure of standard Croatian, especially in sequential, Croatian-dominant bilinguals, structures with uniform agreement begin to appear, more often when it comes to a male addressee and when a plural reading is also allowed.

There are, by the way, no delocutive deferential forms. In Istro-Romanian third person plural was (for a short time) a V-form, but this usage is nowhere near the situation in Daco-Romanian, where there is a special form for deferential delocution. Third person had in Istro-Romanian the function of a deferential address forms, as happens in German, and it might also have been calqued from German in Istro-Romanian (directly or through a Slavonic intermediary).

Is the T/V distinction an internal innovation in Istro-Romanian? The fact that we are dealing with a (relatively) recent phenomenon makes it hard to believe that it is a metaphorical or metonymic development of the use of V-form or a consequence of pragmatic weakening of this form, which led to fossilized grammatical forms expressing indirectness. This distinction was most probably introduced on the model of Croatian/Čakavian, since it was still incompletely assimilated at the beginning of the twentieth century.

SOURCES

- Ca = Cantemir, T., *Texte istroromâne*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1959.
 Ma = Maiorescu, I., *Itinerar în Istria şi vocabular istriano-român (Din manuscriptele postume)*, Iaşi, Tipo-Litografia H. Goldner, 1874.
 Pu-I = Puşcariu, S., *Studii istroromâne*, I. *Texte*, Bucureşti, Institutul de Arte Grafice „Carol Göbl”, 1906.
 Ruov and Ruoz = Vrzić, Z., *Documentation of Vlashki/Zheyanski ('ruo')*, Endangered Languages Archive.
 Sâ-Fă = Sârbu, R., V. Frăţilă, *Dialectul istroromân. Texte şi glosar*, Timişoara, Amarcord, 1998.
 We-II = Weigand, G., “Istrisches”, *Jahresbericht für rumänische Sprache*, 1, 122–155, 1894.

REFERENCES

- Ahlgren, P., 1978. *Tilltalsordet ni. Dess semantik och användning i historiskt perspektiv* (Studia Philologiae Scandinavicae Upsaliensia 12). Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Alexander, R., 2006, *Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian, A Grammar with Sociolinguistic Commentary*, Madison WI, The University of Wisconsin Press.
- ARJ = J. Jedvaj, S. Musulin, J. Nagy, S. Pavešić, S. Pavičić, S. Pelz, P. Rogić, M. Stojković, S. Živković, *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, vol. 18 *TAJ – TUSTOŠIJA*, 1962-1966, Zagreb, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Ashdowne, R., 2016, "Address systems", in: A. Ledgeway, M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 897–906.
- Bautista, M. L. S., 1980, "Address in Pilipino radio dramas: alternation and coconcurrence rules", *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 11, 2, 44–63.
- Berger, T., 1995, "Versuch einer historischen Typologie ausgewählter slavischer Anredesysteme", in: D. Weiss (ed.), *Slavistische Linguistik 1994: Referate des XX. Konstanzer Slavistischen Arbeitstreffens, Zürich 20–22.9.1994*, Munich, Sagner, 15–64.
- Berger, T., 1996, "Spuren älterer pronominaler Anredesysteme in west- und ostslavischen Dialekten und substandardsprachlichen Varietäten", in: W. Girke (ed.), *Slavistische Linguistik 1995. Referate des XXI. Konstanzer Slavistischen Arbeitstreffens, Mainz, 26–29.9.1995* (Slavistische Beiträge 342), Munich, Sagner, 7–36.
- Berger, T., 1998, "Äußere Einflüsse und interne Faktoren bei der Herausbildung der slavischen Anredesysteme", *Die Welt der Slaven*, 43, 307–322.
- Besch, W., 1998, *Duzen, Siezen, Titulieren: Zur Anrede im Deutschen heute und gestern*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Betsch, M., 2000, *Diskontinuität und Tradition im System der tschechischen Anredepronomina (1700–1850)* (Slavistische Beiträge 389), Munich, Sagner.
- Betsch, M., 2003, "The system of Czech bound address forms until 1700", in: I. Taavitsainen, A. Jucker, (eds), *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 125–146.
- Brown, R., A. Gilman, 1960, "The pronouns of power and solidarity", in: T. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, Cambridge, MA/Chichester: MIT Press/Wiley & Sons Ltd., 253–276.
- Brown, P., S. C. Levinson, 1987, *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage* (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics, 4), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Caragiu Marioțeanu, M., 1975, *Compendiu de dialectologie română*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Cohen, M., 1936, *Traité de langue amharique (Abyssinie)*, (Travaux et Mémoires de l'Institut d'Ethnologie 24), Paris, Institut d'Ethnologie.
- Comrie, B., 1975, "Polite plurals and predicate agreement", *Language*, 51(2), 406–418.
- Corbett, G., 1983, *Hierarchies, Targets and Controllers: Agreement patterns in Slavic*, London, Croom Helm.
- Corbett, G., 2000, *Number*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Corbett, G., 2006, *Agreement*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Corbett, G., 2010, "Agreement in Slavic", *Glossos*, 10, 1–61.
- Faarlund, J. T., S. Lie, K. I. Vannebo, 2006, *Norsk referansegrammatikk*, 4th edn., Oslo, Universitetsforlaget.
- Goffman, E., 1956, "The Nature of deference and demeanor", *American Anthropologist*, 58, 3, 473–502.
- Goffman, E., 1982, *Interaction ritual: essays on face-to-face behaviour*, New York, Pantheon.
- Haase, M., 1994, *Respekt: Die Grammatikalisierung von Höflichkeit* (Edition Linguistik, 3), München/Newcastle, Lincom Europa.

- Hansen, E., L. Heltoft, 2011, *Grammatik over det Danske Sprog*, Vol. 2 *Syntaktiske og semantiske helheder*, Copenhagen, Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab.
- Helmbrecht, J., 2013, "Politeness in pronouns", in: M. S. Dryer, M. Haspelmath, M. (eds), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, Leipzig, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Herrity, P., 1977, "Problem kongruencije u srpskohrvatskom i drugim slovenskim jezicima", *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane*, 7, 261–273.
- Hickey, L., I. Vázquez Orta, 1994, "Politeness as deference: a pragmatic view", *Pragmalingüística*, 2, 267–286.
- Hickey, R., 2003, "The German address system: binary and scalar at once", in: I. Taavitsainen, A. Jucker, (eds), *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 401–425.
- Hobjilă, A., 2003, *Microsistemul deicticelor în limba română vorbită neliterară actuală*, Iași, Casa Editorială Demiurg.
- Isačenko, A. V., 1960, *Grammatičeskij stroj russkogo jazyka v sopostavlennii s slovackim*, Vol. 2 *Morfologija*, Bratislava, Izdat. Slovackoj Akad. Nauk.
- Kalsbeek, J., 1998, *The Čakavian Dialect of Orbanici near Žminj in Istria*, Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 25, Amsterdam/Atlanta, Editions Rodopi B.V./Brill, III–608.
- Keipert, H., 1998, "Gesprächsstilisierung in E. Jankovićs Übersetzung "Blagodarni sin" (1789)", *Die Welt der Slaven*, 43, 239–258.
- Kocher, M., 1967, "Second person pronouns in Serbo-Croatian", *Language*, 43, 3, 1, 725–741.
- Kretzenbacher, H. L., J. Hajek, R. Lagerberg, A. Bresin, 2013, "Address forms in language contact and language conflict: the curious history and remnants of onikání in Czech", *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies*, 27 (1–2), 87–103.
- Kretzenbacher, H. L., J. Hajek, R. Lagerberg, A. Bresin, 2019, "Now you Sie me, now you don't. The history and remnants of the 3PL V address pronoun calque in Slovak (onikanie) and in Czech (onikání)", in: B. Kluge, M. I. Moyna (eds), *It's not all about you: New perspectives on address research*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 125–137.
- Ledgeway, A., 2015, "Varieties in Italy 1", in: K. Jungbluth, F. Da Milano (eds), *Manual of Deixis in Romance Languages*, Berlin/Boston, Walter de Gruyter, 75–113.
- Leech, G. N., 2014, *The Pragmatics of Politeness*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Lipavac Oštir, A., 2010, "Grammaticalization and language contact between German and Slovene", in: M. Nomachi (ed.), *Grammaticalization in Slavic Languages: from an areal and typological perspective*, Sapporo, Hokkaido University, 27–48.
- Listen, Paul. 1999. The emergence of German polite Sie: cognitive and sociolinguistic parameters (Berkeley Insights in Linguistics and Semiotics 32). Frankfurt (Main): Peter Lang.
- Locher, M. A., 2008, "Relational work, politeness and identity construction", in: G. Antos, E. Ventola, T. Weber (eds), *Handbooks of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 2 *Interpersonal Communication*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 509–540.
- Maiden, M., *A Linguistic History of Italian*, London, Longman.
- Maiden, M., 2016, "Romanian, Istro-Romanian, Megleno-Romanian, and Aromanian", in: A. Ledgeway, M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 91–125.
- OHRM = Maiden, M., A. Dragomirescu, G. Pană Dindelegan, O. Uță Bărbulescu, R. Zafiu, *The Oxford History of Romanian Morphology*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Niculescu, A., 1965, *Individualitatea limbii române între limbile romanice*, vol. 1 *Contribuții gramaticale*, București, Editura Științifică.
- Niculescu, A., 1974, *Strutture allocutive pronominali reverenziali in italiano*, Florence, Olschki.
- Pușcariu, S., 1926, *Studii istroromâne, II. Introducere–Gramatică–Caracterizarea dialectului istroromân*. București, Cultura Națională.
- Pușcariu, S., 1929, *Studii istroromâne, III. Bibliografie critică. Listele lui Bartoli. Texte inedite. Note. Glosare*. București, Cultura Națională.

- Puškar-Gallien, Z., 2019, "Resolving polite conflicts in predicate agreement", *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 4(1), 1–25.
- Reindl, D. F., 2008, *Language contact, German and Slovenian* (Diversitas Linguarum 20). Bochum, Brockmeyer.
- Reinheimer, S., L. Tasmowski, 2005, *Pratique des langues romanes*, vol. 2, *Les pronoms personnels*, Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Reményi, A. Á., 2001, "Language use and hierarchy: A dyadic analysis of address in workplace groups", *Review of Sociology*, 7 (1), 49–65.
- Renzi, L., 1997, "Expression of allocutionary distance", in: M. Maiden, M. M. Parry (eds), *The Dialects of Italy*, London: Routledge, 113–115.
- Rohlfs, G., 2021, *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*, vol. 2 *Morfologia*, Bologna, Il Mulino.
- Simon, H. J., 1997, "Die Diachronie der deutschen Anredepronomina aus Sicht der Universalienforschung", *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung*, 50, 267–281.
- Simon, H. J., 1998, "What typologists might be interested to know about the diachrony of the German pronouns of address", in: J. Strässler (ed.), *Tendenzen europäischer Linguistik. Akten des 31. Linguistischen Kolloquiums, Bern 1996* (Linguistische Arbeiten 381), Tübingen, Max Niemeyer, 211–216.
- Simon, H. J., 2003, "From pragmatics to grammar. Tracing the development of respect in the history of the German pronouns of address", in: I. Taavitsainen, A. Jucker, (eds), *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 85–123.
- Stevanović, M., 1974, *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik: gramatički sistemi i književnojezička norma*, vol. 2 *Sintaksa*, 2. izd., Beograd, Naučna knjiga
- Stone, G., 1984, "Honorific pronominal address in Polish before 1600", *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, 17, 45–56.
- TDR = Rusu, V. (ed.), 1984, *Tratat de dialectologie românească*, Craiova, Scrisul Românesc.
- Vasilescu, A., 2008, "Pronumele", in: V. Guțu Romalo (ed.), *Gramatica limbii române*, vol. 1 *Cuvântul*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 181–288.
- Vasilescu, A., 2013, "Pronouns", in: G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 379–409.
- Wechsler, S., H-J. Hahm, 2011, "Polite plurals and adjective agreement", *Morphology*, 21, 247–281.
- Zafiu, R., 2013, "Politeness pronouns", in: C. Dobrovie-Sorin, I. Giurgea (eds), *A Reference Grammar of Romanian*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 282–287.