Romani Multilingualism in its Balkan Context[*]
Victor A. Friedman
University of Chicago
Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung, Vol. 54, 2001, 146-59

Abstract
Romani unidirectional multilingualism is especially important for illustrating the significance of social relations in structural change, e.g. different feature retentions, relative conservatism in some areas of grammar and relative openness in others. From a typological point of view, the Macedonian Arli dialect represents a dialect that has been spoken by a population that has been sedentary at the lower end of the social scale but thoroughly integrated into society for centuries, and it thus provides an example of a situation in which both social and internal linguistic boundary maintenance have taken place in a stable contact situation of considerable duration.

1. Introduction

Unlike the other Balkan languages, which were the objects of a bi-directional multilingualism resulting in the convergence area known as the Balkan linguistic league, Romani (and Judezmo) experienced, for the most part, unidirectional multilingualism. In other words, speakers of the "classic" Balkan languages (and also Balkan Turkish) learned other languages and heard their languages spoken by others. Owing to their socio-political marginalization, however, Romani-speakers were of necessity multilingual but their language was rarely learned by others. The occurrence of Romani words in slang and secret languages does not contradict this principle but rather is the exception that proves the rule, i.e. an indication of the relative rarity of bi-directional multilingualism affecting Romani. Romani unidirectional multilingualism is especially important for illustrating the significance of social relations in structural change, e.g. different rates and types of borrowing and feature retention (as boundary markers), relative conservatism in some areas of grammar (e.g. stress placement and nominal morphology) and relative openness in others (e.g. the treatment of affricates and and modal categories). Romani code-switching both in nineteenth century texts an in modern radio programs likewise reflects the social context of Romani usage (see FRIEDMAN 1995a). Moreover, although the formative conditions of the Balkan linguistic league were eliminated with the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire into nation states and the rise of Balkan standard languages, Balkan multilingualism continues to be practiced at the local level, and especially among Roms. It is thus the case that speakers of majority languages in Balkan nation states are more likely to know English than a minority language, as was demonstrated in the case of Macedonia by the census figures from 1994 (ZAVOD ZA STATISTIKA NA REPUBLIKA MAKEDONIJA 1997). In some cases the same is true of speakers of minority languages vis-à-vis the majority language of the nation state, i.e. pressures of modern globalization motivate them to learn English rather than the majority language of the state (cf., e.g. ISMAJLI 1988:18). Roms, however, are likely to know both minority and majority languages of the Balkan states in which they live. Of all the modern Balkan nation-states, Macedonia has the largest number of officially recognized minority languages as demonstrated by the 1994 census, for which, in accordance with the census law, all official documentation was translated from Macedonian into Albanian, Turkish, Serbian, Aromanian, and Romani. (Albania and Greece have similar numbers of minority languages, but not similar levels of recognition.) Moreover, Macedonia is

the only nation-state in the world that has taken the use of Romani to such a level of state bureaucracy. What follows is a case study based on Romani usage (mainly Skopje Arli) intended to provide typological implications for the nature of grammatical change that occurs or fails to occur in contact situations. In examining examples of both conservatism and contact-induced change, I shall argue that the difference between conservation and innovation constitutes a grammatically instantiated maintenance of boundary marking within a language's grammatical system. The distribution of these features varies from the pan-Romani to the locally specific, but from both sociolinguistic and typological points of view Arli is a suitable choice. From the sociolinguistic point of view, Skopje Arli is significant as the base of the emerging norm in the Republic of Macedonia that is used in education, bureaucracy, and the media. From a typological point of view, this dialect represents one that has been spoken by a population that has been sedentary for centuries (cf. FRIEDMAN/DANKOFF 1991), and it thus provides an example of a situation in which both social and linguistic boundary maintenance have taken place in a stable contact situation of considerable duration.[1]

2. Phonology

For Romani in general, the retention of distinctively aspirated consonants is a linguistic boundary marker at the phonological level in all the dialects (VENTCEL'/ČERENKOV 1976:293). It is a distinctive feature that does not occur any of Romani's European contact languages,[2] and moreover it constitutes a phonological dividing line between Romani and relexified contact languages such as Calo and Anglo-Romani (MATRAS 1998:11). The feature is distinctive within native vocabulary, e.g. *čorel* 'steal'/*čhorel* 'spill, empty, etc.', *perel* 'fall'/*pherel* 'fill', *te* 'modal subordinator'/*the* 'and', *ker* 'do!' /*kher* 'house'; at the same time, however, since aspiration is limited to native vocabulary items, the feature sometimes serves to distinguish non-native from native items: *čaj* 'tea'/*čhaj* 'girl', *kula* 'tower'/*khula* 'nonsense'.[3]

Some dialects also preserve a distinction between original /r/ and original retroflex /d/ as a distinction between two types of /r/ one flapped or tapped the other trilled (as is the case in Arli), uvular, or a retroflex tap, but this distinction is not shared by all dialects and in some cases may actually have been encouraged by contact with languages such as Albanian, which also distinguishes a tapped and a trilled /r/. It may thus function as a boundary marker locally,

---

[1] Arli, whose name comes from Turkish *yerli* 'local' represents a dialect of long-settled Roms.

[2] I am excluding here the indigenous languages of the Caucasus. Unlike the Ural mountains and the Aegean and Black seas with their connecting waterways, the border between Europe and Asia between the Black and Caspian Seas, is variably defined and geopolitcally influenced, being variously placed at the Turko-Persian political border, the ridge of the Caucasus Range, or the limits of Russia proper (i.e., Russia itself as a constituent of the Russian Federation; cf. PROTHERO 1920:1, BETHEL 1949:74, 347).

[3] It must be noted that there is variation in the consistency of the realization of the preservation of aspiration in individual lexical items. Both BORETZKY/IGLA (1994) and PETROVSKI/VELIČKOVSKI (1998) have examples where both aspirated and unaspirated phonemes occur as variants in a given morpheme. In other instances, however, no such variation occurs. While the feature may have been weakened, it remains a vital part of the system. It should also be noted that in some dialects /čh/ has passed to /ś/ and that the loanwords will be different in different dialects. The examples here are all form Macedonia. Citations in Romani employ the spelling system in use in Macedonia for both official and unofficial documents (cf. FRIEDMAN 1995b).

but not universally.[4] Interestingly enough, in those regions where local Albanian dialects have merged the two types of /r/, so have local Romani dialects. In the Macedonian dialects of Romani, laterals behave as in Macedonian, i.e. clear before /j/ and front vowels, velarized elsewhere (see also CORTIADE 1988).

A particularly salient point of contact is the palatals, where Romani appears to be particularly open to contact-induced change. Thus, for example, dialects with Greek as the major contact language replace palatals with dentals, while those with Turkish as the major contact language lack dental affricates, as does Turkish.[5] The fronting of velars before front vowels in the various Balkan dialects, especially in Macedonia, also looks contact induced.

The basic Romani five vowel system tends to be fairly open to additions from contact languages, especially in loan words. Thus, for example, front rounded vowels, schwa, back unrounded vowels, etc., are present in those dialects in contact with languages whose systems include such sounds (cf. VENTCEL'?ČERENKOV 1976;295-296 and BORETZKY 1991. In the context of Macedonia, however, the accentual system is another site of boundary maintenance.[6] The western dialects of Macedonian all have stress fixed on the penultimate or antepenultimate syllable, whereas native Romani stress is oxytonic (albeit paroxytonic or even proparoxytonic if the word ends in an affix of clitic origin, e.g. *dženéskoro* 'person' GEN). In general, however, not only does Romani retain its stress on native words, but it avoids this same stress in European borrowings, although the difference is merged in the oblique, e.g. *džépo* 'pocket' (Turkish *ceb*), DAT *džepóske* vs *dženó* 'person', DAT *dženéske*; *sfíri* 'hammer' (Gk. *sfyrí*), DAT *sfiríske* vs *vogí* 'soul, belly, etc.' DAT *vogéske*.[7]

Intonation is another area of distinctiveness.[8] In the case of the dialects of Macedonia, instrumental studies have yet to be conducted, and so my conclusions are based on unstructured observation rather than systematic study. Nonetheless, it is clear and corroborated by numerous native informants that native speakers of Romani in Macedonia have different patterns of sentence intonation than native speakers of Macedonian, and the Romani intonation patterns can carry over from Romani to Macedonian when Roms speak Macedonian. Thus, for example, an ethnic Romani announcer on a Macedonian-language radio program is immediately recognizable to Macedonians as a Rom from his intonational

---

[4]Note that trilled /r/ can also occur in loans, even where it is not etymologically justified, e.g. *korro* 'blind' < Persian *kōr*. The Persian is also the source of Turkish *kör*, which, however cannot be the source of the Romani form owing to the vocalism and consonantism.

[5]It should be noted, however, that dental affricates are etymologically quite marginal in Romani except in dialects in contact with systems where they are prominent or where /t/ and /d/ have undergone affrication, as in the Bugurdži dialect of Macedonia and Kosovo/Kosova.

[6]The tendency to shift the stress away from the final syllable in the main dialect areas of Southern West South Slavic (the former Serbo-Croatian) known as the neo-štokavian acute is a similar phenomenon, albeit historically independent of the Macedonian insofar as the two are separated by the Zeta-Lovćen and Prizren-Timok dialects, which do not have this shift. In all these regions, Romani retains its distinctive accentual pattern.

[7]BORETZKY/IGLA (1994:370) record *šukáripe* 'beauty', attributing it to Macedonian influence, but it could be just a loss of shift from *šukár* 'pretty' to the nominalizer *-ipe* rather than a retraction. In any case, there is considerable variation (e.g., *sfiri* is feminine in BORETZKY/IGLA 1994 and PETROSKI/VELIČKOVSKI 1998 but masculine in JUSUF 1974).

[8]For the sake of convenience, I am including all such suprasegmental features as pitch, tone, timbre, etc.) under the term intonation.

patterns, in particular rises in pitch occurring where they would not in Macedonian.[9] A difference has been demonstrated instrumentally for question intonation in Bulgarian Erli (GRIGOROVA 1998:52, cf. LEHISTE/IVIĆ 1980). According to several scholars, however, the intonational patterns of speakers of Sinti sound just like those of German (Yaron Matras, Norbert Boretzky, Birgit Igla, P.C.). It is worth noting also, however, that in terms of language attitudes Sinti-speakers are much more endonormative than Arli speakers in Macedonia, i.e. there is a traditional value against outsiders speaking or learning Sinti whereas a non-Romani speaker of Romani is considered unusual but acceptable in the multilingual context of the Balkans. To this we can add the fact that in regions of east-central Europe where the main contact languages have fixed initial stress (Czech, Hungarian, Slovak), local Romani dialects adopt this stress pattern. This may have to do with other types of boundary marking (either linguistic or social) among those groups

3. Morphology
        In the area of morphology, the best known boundary marker is the distinction between what HANCOCK (1995:54) calls thematic and athematic in the declensional system, i.e. Romani substantives of Indic origin and those borrowed into the language up to the time of the initial contacts with Greek generally have a stem vowel /e/ before oblique formants, while later borrowings, i.e. those that took place after the presumed dispersal of Roms throughout Europe, do not. This can be seen in the examples cited earlier and re-cited here, e.g. *džépo* 'pocket' (Turkish *ceb*), DAT *džepóske* vs *dženó* 'person', DAT *dženéske*; *sfíri* 'hammer' (Greek *sfyrí*), DAT *sfiríske* vs *vogí* 'soul, belly, etc.' DAT *vogéske*.[10] Although the pattern itself may be borrowed, nonetheless, it is significant that it appears to have been adopted precisely before the diaspora (BAKKER 1997, cf. also CORTIADE 1991)
        The adaptation of verbs into Balkan Romani dialects is usually carried out by means of a derivational affix (cf. BORETZKY 1993a:66) or compounding with verbs such as *ker-* 'do', e.g. Skopje Arli *mislinel* (Macedonian *misli* + Greek present *-in-*), *kerel sabri* 'endure' (Turkish *sabır* 'patience'), *kerel komentar*i 'comment on', but also *kerel buti* 'work' (using native material). These methods are paralleled in the other Balkan languages, e.g. Macedonian *kalajisa* (Turkish *kalay* 'tin' + Greek aorist *-is-*), *deflorisa* 'deflower', *stori aber* 'inform' (Macedonian *stori* 'do' + Turkish *haber* 'news'). In the case of the analytic adaptation pattern using 'do', similar patterns are found throughout the area in contact with Turkish (FRIEDMAN 1996:107) but may in fact be an inherited South Asian feature (cf. MASICA 1976:141-58). A

---

[9]This type of boundary marking is attested in the United States. Certain intonational patterns are characteristic of African-American Vernacular English (AAVE) such that even in the Southeast, whose dialects are the basis for AAVE, it is usually possible for a native speaker of US English to tell from the beginning of the telephone conversation the race of the interlocutor. It is important to note, however, that while such patterns are associated with ethnic dialects in the US, many African-Americans are bi-dialectal while others, especially those who are from old northern families, do not speak AAVE. On the other hand, LABOV (1996:88-93) has shown that teenage whites whose main associations are with speakers of AAVE will adopt the same intonational patterns, although certain less salient phonological features (e.g. the change of velar nasal sonorant to dental in final position) may be lacking.

[10]Some dialects distinguish proper names ending in unstressed /i/ from borrowed common nouns in unstressed /i/ such that the later are assimilated to the native pattern, e.g. Ajia Varvara *askéri* 'soldier' (Turkish *asker*), dative *askeréske* but *Jáni* dative *Janíske* (IGLA 1996:34-35, cf. also BORETZKY 1993a:33), but Sepečides *dérti* 'pain', (Turkish *dert*) DAT *dertíske* (CECH/HEINSCHINK 1999:21).

specific feature of the dialect of Ajia Varvara as well as some of the dialects of East Bulgaria is the conjugation of verbs of Turkish origin using person markers of Turkish origin, e.g. *beklerim, beklerdum, beklerimas, beklerdumas* 'wait 1SG - PR, AOR, IMP, PLU vs., e.g., native *kerav, kerdem, keravas, kerdemas* 'do' (same categories). This is a relatively isolated phenomenon that seems to be an arrested development of language shift (cf. MESSING 1987:27-28; IGLA 1996:3, 61-65), but it is worth noting as a morphologically instantiated boundary marker in the morphology of the verbal system. Dialects in contact with Slavic can incorporate elements of Slavic verbal prefixation by borrowing prefixes that can carry lexico-aspectual meaning, e.g. *kinel/pokinel* 'buy/pay for'.[11] The distinction is a lexical adaptation of the Slavic imperfective/perfective grammatical distinction. In Romani, the opposition is not part of the grammar, although the lexical effect is difficult to translate: Here, the form with *po*-focuses somehow more on the completion of the act, on its telos, as in the following example:

(1) *Avdive alo   nesavo barvalo džambazi ko Muto   thaj*
      today come-3SG.AOR some   rich   Džambaz to M.   and
      vakergja   kaj ka   avel   tajsa   te   kinel   tut
      say-3SG.AOR that FUT come-3SG.PR tomorrow SUB buy-3SG.PR you
      te   dadestar! Ka   pokinel   tut   frojenca!
      your father-ABL FUT pay.for-3SG.PR you-ACC   gold.coins-INS
      Today some rich Džambaz came to Muto's and said that he will come
      tomorrow to buy you from your father. He will pay for you with gold (florins)!
      (JUSUF 1974)

In any case, it is arguable that Romani does not differ significantly from its contact languages in the realm of adapting verbs to its lexicon insofar as it uses the same types of borrowed affixes and analytic constructions for purposes of adaptation. At the same time, phenomena such as the Turkish conjugation of Ajia Varvara or the borrowing of Slavic prefixes do not seem to be so much a mater of boundary maintenance as a matter of potential sources for shift -- to Turkish in the former case and to the development of grammaticalized aktionsart in the latter (cf. also the concept of *fusion* discussed in Matras in this volume) -- which is unlike the situation in the noun, where Romani has developed a marker of differentiation specific to its grammatical system.

3. Morphosyntax - contact
      When we move to the realm of morphosyntax -- the part of grammar that is most important in defining the Balkan linguistic league -- we find that the adjectival system and modal categories of the verb are sites of contact-induced change while categories pertaining to the substantival, pronominal, and tense-aspect systems are more resistant.
      The synthetic comparison of adjectives, e.g. the suffix *-eder*, is lost or highly restricted in Balkan Romani and replaced by analytic comparative and superlative markers borrowed from Balkan Romance (*maj*), Balkan Slavic (*po, naj*), Turkish (*da[h]a, en*), etc., e.g. *baro* 'big' *pobaro, majbaro, da[h]a baro* 'bigger', *najbaro, embaro, majbaro* 'biggest' This loss of synthetic inflection and replacement with borrowed analytic morphology is a salient post-Byzantine Balkanism, i.e. one that developed after the first wave of Romani speakers left the Balkans for northern Europe. Those dialects that did not remain in the Balkans either maintain

---

[11]The prefix *po*- is one of the most common for marking perfectivity throughout the Slavic languages. Cf. in this respect also *lel* 'take' *dolel* 'get' using the Macedonian preverb *do*-.

the old synthetic comparative in -*eder* with greater consistency, or devise other means to express comparison.

Borrowing even penetrates adjectival gender/number agreement in Macedonian Arli. Thus, for example, Macedonian adjectives are usually borrowed into Romani as invariants using their unmarked (neuter) form in -*o*, which corresponds to the Romani masculine, e.g. *socijalno buti* 'social work', *socijalno arka* 'social support' (Romano Sumnal, Vol. 1, No 3, 94.04.01). Both *buti* and *arka* are feminine (the former native, the latter borrowed), and so should take agreeing adjectives in -*i* or -*e* depending on syntactic position.[12] Consider, however, the following examples -- both colloquial and written -- that display interference: *buti normalni* 'a normal job' (radio talk show, July 1994), *kvalitetna evidentija* 'qualified documentation', *privatikani karane* 'private reasons' (instructions to census takers, June 1994). The first example shows a Romani feminine singular ending, the second a Macedonian feminine ending (the phrase is feminine in Macedonian), while in the third example the ending looks on the surface as if it is a Romani feminine singular, but in fact it is a Macedonian plural, influenced by the ending of the language from which the document was translated.

Aside from the adjective, the modal component of the verbal system -- *sensu largo* -- is particularly open to Balkan or Macedonian influence. I am basing my definition of modality on KUYRŁOWICZ (1956:26), which takes 'ontological irrealis' as the meaning of the non-indicative. By this definition, both the future and the infinitive are types of modals, since the actions they describe are ontologically potential rather than real (cf. also Matras in this volume).

The development of an analytic future using an invariant particle derived from the verb meaning 'want' is one of the earliest identified shared morphosyntactic features of the Balkan languages, and the Romani dialects of the Balkans are included in this development. In the Romani dialects of the Balkans this future marker is usually the particle *ka*, which is derived from the root *kam-* (3SG *kamel*) 'want', e.g. *ka kerav* 'I will do'.[13] This type of future formation occurs in both Vlax and non-Vlax dialects, but was lost or never developed in some non-Balkan dialects. It is interesting to note that in some dialects the opposition between long and short presents, e.g. *kerav/kerava* 'do 1SG' is reinterpreted as a present/future opposition (HANCOCK 1995:99, VENTCEL'/ČERENKOV 1976:315). The dialects in which this reinterpretation occurs have been in contact with North Slavic, where the perfective present has evolved into a future, i.e. where there are two morphological presents, one of which has the value 'future'. Thus, in both Balkan and post-Balkan Romani, calques on futures in contact languages appears to have occurred.[14]

The use of a possessive construction to express necessity and negated futurity is a Balkanism that has been calqued into both Balkan Romani and Balkan Turkish, despite the absence of a lexical verb meaning 'have' in many dialects of the former and all of the latter. Thus, for example, Romani *si man te avav* 'I have to come' calques exactly the Macedonian *imam da odam*, Albanian *kam të vij* (Geg Albanian *kam me ardhë* functions as the unmarked future). Similarly, a non-agreeing construction that is used for both negated existence and

---

[12]Romani does have non-inflecting native adjectives, but these end in consonants, e.g. *šukar* 'good, beautiful'.

[13]In some dialects, the particle occurs as *kam*, and in some the lexical verb itself preserves an old 1SG ending -- *kamam* vs regular *kamav* -- but none of these facts change the basic parallel with the classic Balkan languages (Cf. also BORETZKY 1998, 1999)

[14]In Balkan Romani, the long present in -*a* generally does not occur after modal subordinators such as *ka* 'future' and *te* 'subjunctive', but these are tendencies rather than absolute rules, especially in conditional clauses or when a progressive meaning is implied (see FRIEDMAN 1997b). Moreover, the long form is normal with the conditional marker *bi*.

negated possession is used for negated futurity in, e.g. *nae man te avav* 'I shall not come' cf. Macedonian *nema da odam*, (Balkan Turkish *yoktur gideym*, FRIEDMAN 1982), etc.

   All of Romani shows the elimination of earlier infinitival constructions and replacement with a particle (modal subordinator) plus finite verb form. This is a classic Balkanism, e.g. *mangav te sovav* 'I want to sleep' parallels exactly the same construction in the other Balkan languages. At the same time, the development of new infinitive-like constructions in dialects spoken outside the Balkans and in contact with languages that have infinitives (cf. BORTEZKY 1996a) is a further example of the permeability of Romani with regard to modal verbal constructions (*sensu largo*). A related Balkan calque is the use of te plus finite verbs to mark optatives and the protasis of conditional clauses:

(2a) *O* *beng* *te* *hal* *tumaro* *šoro!*
   the devil SUB he-3SG.PR your head
  'May the devil eat your head' (JUSUF 1974)

(2b) *Te* *si* *tut* *nieci* *bori* *mangibaske,* *mang.*
   if is you-ACC intent bride taking-DAT take-IMV
   'If you have the intention of seeking a bride, seek! (JUSUF 1974)

   Conditional expressions involve combinations of calqued or borrowed markers in the protasis (calqued use of the subjunctive marker *te* or the adverb *kana* 'when', Macedonian *ako* 'if', Turkish *eger* 'if' with or without *te*) with calqued constructions or borrowed markers in the apodosis (borrowed Macedonian conditional marker *bi*, calqued use of the future marker *ka* with various tenses including present, imperfect, and pluperfect). Owing to its multiplicity of markers and calques, Macedonian Arli reflects the quadripartite conditional division of Macedonian (see KRAMER 1986): hypothetical (i.e. potential) vs expectative (i.e. future) and within each of these fulfillable vs unfulfillable (similar to realis/irrealis), although there appears to be some variation in the use of *bi* for hypothetical conditionals (see also BORETZKY 1993b:88-89).[15]

EXPECTATIVE FULFILLABLE
(3a) *Eger* *o* *manuš* *te* *na* *džanglja...*
   if   the person SUB not know-3SG.AOR
   esapi *ka* *kerel* *pe...*
   account FUT make-3SG self
   'If the peron does not know' ... one counts...' (1994 census instructions)

(3b) *Ako e* *manušeske isi* = *Eger tejsi* *e* *manušeske...*
   if the person-DAT is = if SUB+is the person-DAT
   'If the person has...'.(1994 census instructions)

(3c) *Te* *gelem* *ničeja,* *ka* *džana*   *kaj...*
   SUB go-1SG.AOR order-INS FUT know-1PL.PR that
   'If we go in order, we will discover that ...' (*Romano Sumnal*, Vol. 1, No 3, 94.04.01)

(3d) *kana šaj* *ov, soske našti* *me?* = *kana šaj* *ov, soske* *me*
   when be.able he why not.be.ale I = when be.able he why I
   te *našti?*
   SUB not.be.able
   'If he can, why not me/why can't I?' (*Romano Sumnal*, Vol. 1, No 3, 94.04.01)
EXPECTATIVE UNFULFILLABLE

---

[15]Bugurdži also has postposed *bi* after the imperfect (BORETZKY 1993b:90).

> *Te   avea   sine javinate,   ka   lea   sine   thud*
> SUB come-3PL.PR PA morning-LOC FUT take-3 SG.PR PA   milk
> 'If they had come in the morning, they would have gotten milk.' (JUSUF/KEPESKI 1980:116)
> *Me   ka   gilavgjum   sine*
> I   FUT   sing-1SG.AOR PA
> 'I would have sung...' (JUSUF/KEPESKI 1980:118).

HYPOTHETICAL FULFILLABLE

> (3e) *Te   čingarea   man,   me   bi   avava*
> SUB   invite-2SG.PR me   I   CON   come-1SG.PR
> 'If you were to invite me, I would come' (cf. JUSUF/KEPESKI 1980:122).

HYPOTHETICAL FULFILLABLE/UNFULFILLABLE

> (3e) *Te   čingarea   man sine, me bi   avava   sine*
> SUB   invite-2SG.PR me PA I   CON   come-1SG.PR PA
> 'If you were to invite me, I would [have] come' (cf. JUSUF/KEPESKI 1980:120-123).

The expression of expectative unfulfillable (irreal) conditionals by means of the future-marking particle plus a conjugated past tense (usually the imperfect, cf. GOŁĄB 1964) is another classic Balkanism found in Balkan Romani that also survives sporadically in the Vlax dialects, e.g. *ka sovava sine ~ ka sovavas ~ kamas sovav* 'I would have slept'. Moreover, in Macedonian Arli the South Slavic conditional marker *bi* has been borrowed. The use of the aorist in condtional constructions, however, argues in favor of Matras' (this volume) interpretation of the traditional present/aorist opposition as aspectual rather than temporal.

The formation of the Arli imperfect by means of the long present plus the invariant third person imperfect of 'be', which seems to recapitulate the original morphology of the imperfect (long present plus /s/ -- see below) also seems to calque the use of Macedonian third singular imperfect *beše* as a generalized emphatic past marker, e.g. *beše sum bil* 'I <u>was</u>'. Other examples of calquing such as the use of *pe[s]* 'self' as an invariant intransitive marker on the model of Macedonian *se* 'ibid.' also involve the verb phrase.

4. Morphosyntax - resistance

In the substantival and pronominal systems, Macedonian Arli and Romani dialects in general have been strongly resistant to change, while the tense-aspect system has shown morphological innovation that preserves semantic distinctions. In the substantive, despite the Balkan tendency toward analytic declension and merger of the genitive-dative opposition, Romani has been conservative in its maintenance of case markers and keeps a strict genitive-dative distinction.[16] While the Balkan languages use dative clitics to indicate possession, Romani uses only possessive pronouns in nominal constructions.[17] Insofar as Romani has

---

[16]This is not to say that the nominal system is impervious to interference, but I would argue that in morphosyntactic terms it is nonetheless more resistant. This is especially true in Macedonian dialects, where, e.g., the old locative in *-te* is still in everyday use (e.g. JUSUF 1974). Similarly, the survival of the complex system of Romani deictics in various forms in various dialects is a distinctively boundary marker (see MATRAS 1994 for a coherent analysis). While the grammatical marking of definiteness via an article may be a contact phenomenon, the material used for the marking is arguably native (see SAMPSON 1926/1868:152), and is in any case not postposed as in Slavic, Romance, and Albanian.

[17]Macedonian Arli is also among the conservative Romani dialects in its lack of a lexical verb meaning 'have'. While dative pronouns can occur in constructions with 'be' to indicate possession, these are in variation with accusative and locative pronouns, e.g. *si mange ~ si*

clitic pronouns, they occur only in the accusative case. Romani thus lacks the accusative-dative clitic pronominal distinction found in all the Balkan languages.

      Another area of resistant syntax is in clitic order. In the Balkan languages pronominal clitics precede finite verbs (although Bulgarian follows Wackernagel's law). In Romani, however, full form pronouns can precede the verb, but clitic pronouns must follow:

(4a)   *Ola*   *me*   *ka*   *lav*
         her   I   will   take-1SG.PR
         'She is the one I will get'

(4b)   *Me*   *ka*   *lav*   *la*
         I   will   take-1SG.PR her-ACC.CL
         'I will get her'

      One of the most striking morphosyntactic boundaries between Romani and the classic Balkan languages is in the phenomenon of object reduplication.   Although object reduplication does occur in Romani, it is weakly grammaticalized and, e.g., in Skopje does not correspond to the strong grammaticalization of the Macedonian system with which it is in intimate contact. This is clearly illustrated in examples (5a and b), which I recorded in July 1994 from a single broadcast of a Skopje Romani radio music-request program (*Gili pali gili* 'Song after song') in which the announcer switched freely back and forth between Romani (5a) and Macedonian (5b):

(5a) *O   Ajnuri thaj o   Džemo tari i   Švedska bahtaren   e*
     the Ajnur and the Džemo from the Sweden congratulate-3SG.PR the
     pranden   e Ramijeske thaj e Mirsadake   aj   e
     marriage-ACC the Rami-DAT and the Mirsada-DAT and the
     Safeteske   thaj e   Sadijake   bahtarena   o   bijav...
     Safet-DAT and the Sadija-DAT congratulate-3SG.PR   the   wedding...
     "Ajnur and Džemo from Sweden congratulate Rami and Mirsada on their
     marriage, and they congratulate Safet and Sadija on their wedding."
(5b) *Naza i Oli od   Švedska im   go chestitat   brakot*
     Naza and Oli from Sweden them it   congratulate-3SG.PR marriage-DEF
     na Rami i   Mirsada a   na Safet i   Sadija im   ja
     to Rami and Mirsada and to Safet and Sadija them it
     chestitat   svadbata...
     congratulate-3SG.PR wedding-DEF...
     "Naza and Oli from Sweden congratulate Rami and Mirsada on their marriage, and they congratulate Safet and Sadija on their wedding."

The obligatory object reduplication of Macedonian illustrated by (5b) was not reproduced in the Romani as illustrated by (5a).

      Romani object reduplication, while it resembles that found in the classic Balkan languages in certain respects, also differs from them in fundamental ways that are related to the preservation of the declensional system not only grammatically but socially. While it is true,

---

mande ~ si man 'I have' (literally 'it is to me ~ on me ~ me). In any case, these count as verbal rather than nominal possessive constructions, i.e. possession is indicated by means of a verb phrase not a noun phrase.

as observed in many sources (FRIEDMAN 1997a, IGLA 1999, and MATRAS 1997), that the Romani case system is undergoing simplification under contact conditions in many Balkan dialects, the case system retains its vitality in all of them. Similarly, while object reduplication of the type found in the classic Balkan languages occurs in Romani, it does so either in completely facultative discourse-bound dislocations (as in 6a) or in imitations that can be taken as nonce syntactic borrowings rather than part of the grammatical structure (as in 6b; cf. also IGLA 1996:161).

(6a) *O   melalo pani na   piena   le   ni   o   džungale ruva.*
the   dirty   water not drink-3SG.PR it-ACC nor the   bad   wolves
"Even wicked wolves do not drink dirty water." (JUSUF 1996:125)

(6b) *E   Rifatos   pendžarav,   e   čhaja   da pendžarav,   ama <u>man</u>*
the Rifat-ACC know-1SG.PR the daughter-ACC and know-1SG.PR but   <u>me</u>
ma   axmize <u>man</u> kidisave bucende   ridžaj kerav   tuke.
don't embroil <u>me</u>   this   work-PL.LOC request make-1SG.PR you-DAT
"I know Rifat and I know his daughter, but don't mix <u>me</u> up in this business, I beg of you." (JUSUF 1974:14)[18]

Note especially that (6b) contains the same type of pre-posed direct objects as (6a), but without reduplication.[19] Romani object reduplication is thus not the type of grammaticalized requisite characteristic of the classic Balkan languages. The one type of obligatory object reduplication involves possessive contractions of a type not found in any of the Balkan languages, as illustrated in (7):

(7) *I   daj   si   la   duj   čhave*
the   mother   is   her-ACC   two   children
'The mother has two children'.

In general, the Romani nominal system has been more resistant to change than the verbal, if we start from the fusion of Middle Indic postpositions. As Matras (this volume) has shown, Romani is conservative in its synthetic verbal morphology and tense-aspect system. The modal system, however, is the site of contact induced change. In Arli, the loss of the synthetic imperfect and pluperfect (probably connected with the loss of final /s/ which led to homonymy between the long present and the imperfect) resulted in a new form of the type present + *sine* 'be-3SG.AOR', which appears to have exactly recapitulated the original process of using an agglutinated copula as a marker of pastness (or remoteness in Matras' terms). It is also worth noting here that the agglutination of Middle Indic postpositions in Romani has resulted in a case system whose semantics recapitulate those of Old Indic (FRIEDMAN 1991).[20]

---

[18] The speaker here is using Macedonian Burgudži pronunciation, but the construction also occurs in Arli.
[19] Neither example involves potential confusion between subject and object, since the subject marking on the verb is unambiguous in both instances.
[20] These recapitulations are reminiscent of the situation in the Korča-Kostur dialects of Macedonian l in the extreme southwestern periphery, where the loss of the inherited resultative participle in *-l-* and t expansion of a new perfect using 'have' plus an invariant neuter verbal adjective -- on an Aromanian (GOŁĄB 1984:135) -- has resulted in a restructuring of the verbal system the result of which, in terms of

It should also be noted, however, that unlike the marker *-as* of most of Romani, the position of *sine* is still in progress not entirely fixed, as can be seen from examples (8a) and (8b) as well as (3e):[21]

(8a) *So   bi   vakerela pes   sine kaj   to   dad   thaj me sijam*
     what CON   say-3SG self-ACC PA   that your father and I   are-1SG.PL
     dembelija
     lazy
     'That would be to say that your father and I were lazy' (JUSUF 1996:148)

(8b) *Emen   so   rakilo   sine, a   o   vakti kerela   sine*
     at.once what become.night.PR PA   and the   time do-3SG.PR PA
     pes   te   rumungjol.
     self-ACC   SUB   be.spoiled-3SG.PR
     'As soon as it got dark, the weather looked like it was going to get bad' (JUSUF 1996:150)

5. Conclusion

From a typological point of view, the various system-internal boundaries in Romani between areas of the grammar amenable to contact-induced change and areas of resistance to such change suggest that the use of grammar for boundary maintenance in contact situations favors different parts of the system at different times and in different geopolitical and social situations. Moreover, it would appear that in situations of unidirectional multilingualism set in an historically bi-directional multilingual environment the social situation plays a significant role. Thus, for example, at the phonological level the preservation of distinctive aspirates is found throughout Romani, whereas conservatism is stress and distinctiveness in intonational patterns appears to be more likely precisely in those dialects whose speakers are culturally closer to and better integrated with the contact environment, as is the case for Roms in the southern Balkans as opposed to central Europe. The relative openness of palatal and the vocalic system to shift or modification suggests a lesser degree of salience in the correspondence of language to identity maintenance.

It is in the realm of morphosyntax -- which is the locus of the classic Balkanisms that define the *Sprachbund* -- that Balkan Romani as represented by Skopje Arli suggests that *Sprachbund* phenomena are subjected to grammatical filtering in languages that experience unidirectional multilingualism. Thus, there is a clear opposition between the relatively open systems of adjectival comparison and modality on the one hand to the conservative nominal, pronominal, and tense-aspect systems on the other. Both object reduplication and clitic ordering are distinctive, while voice marking is also more open to contact influence. Matras (this volume) makes the point that the current tense-aspect system may well have evolved as a contact phenomenon on Iranian territory. However, this was a period both of mass migration (as opposed to the sedentarism and local peripatetic practices that came with the European diaspora) and of contact with more closely related languages. It is even possible that there was bi-directional multilingualism. Thus, in terms of the typology of contact-induced change, Balkan Romani suggests that, like social practices, specific areas of grammar serve as sites of either adaptation or boundary maintenance with considerable stability over time.

---

verbal categories, is closer to Common Slavic than it is to neighboring Macedonian dialects (FRIEDMAN 1988).

[21]Cf. also BORETZKY (1996b:23).

Abbreviations

ABL   ablative
ACC   accusative
AOR   aorist
CL   clitic
CON   conditional
DAT   dative
DEF   definite
FUT   future
GEN   genitive
IMP   imperfect
IMV   imperative
INS   Instrumental
LOC   locative
PA   3SG/PL preterit of 'be' used as an invariant past (remoteness) marker
PL   plural
PLU   pluperfect
PR   present
SG   singular
SUB   subjunctive

References

BAKKER, PETER (1997): Athematic Morphology in Romani: The Borrowing of a Borrowing Pattern. in: MATRAS, YARON/BAKKER, PETER/KYUCHUKOV, HRISTO (eds.), *The Typology and Dialectology of Romani.* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 156.). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1-21.

BETHEL, JOHN P. (gen. ed.)(1949): *Webster's Geographical dictionary.* Springfield, MA: Merriam Webster.

BORETZKY, NORBERT (1991): Contact-Induced Sound Change, in: *Diachronica* 6. 8.1, 1-15.

BORETZKY, NORBERT (1993a): *Bugurdži: Deskriptiver und historischer Abriss eines Romani-Dialekts.* (Osteuropa-Institut der Freien Universität Berlin Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen 24) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

BORETZKY, NORBERT (1993b): Conditional sentences in Romani, in: *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 46, 83-99.

BORETZKY, NORBERT (1996a): The New Infinitive in Romani, in: *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society (Fifth Series)* 6. 1, 1-51.

BORETZKY, NORBERT (1996b): Arli: Materialien zu Einem südbalkanischen Romani-Dialekt in: *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 46, 1-30.

BORETZKY, NORBERT (1998): Interference in Romani: Functional Change and Inherited Grammatical Categories, in: *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society (Fifth Series)* 8. 1, 19-46.

BORETZKY, NORBERT (1999): Grammatical Interference in Romani: Loan Formations for Foreign Categories, in: *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 43. 3-4, 169-200.

BORETZKY, NORBERT/IGLA, BIRGIT (1994): *Wörterbuch Romani-Deutsch-Englisch: Mit einer Grammatik der Dialektvarianten.* Wiesbaden: Harrossowitz.

CECH, PETRA/HEINSCHINK, MOZES F. (1999): *Sepečides-Romani: Grammatik, Texte un Glossar eines türkischen Romani-Dialekts.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

CORTIADE, MARCEL (1988): Les latérales en romani, in: *Lingua posnaniensis* 31, 47-80.

CORTIADE, MARCEL (1991): Romani versus Pararomani, in: CORTIADE, MARCEL (ed.), *In the Margin of Romani* (Studies in Language Contact 1). Amsterdam: Insatitute of General Linguistics, University of Amestersam, 1-13.

FRIEDMAN, VICTOR A. (1982): Balkanology and Turcology: West Rumelian Turkish in Yugoslavia as Reflected in Prescriptive Grammar in: *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 2, 1-77.

FRIEDMAN, VICTOR A. (1988): Morphological Innovation and Semantic Shift in Macedonian, in: *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, 24. 1, 34-41.

FRIEDMAN, VICTOR A. (1991): Case in Romani: Old Grammar in New Affixes, in: *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society (Fifth Series)* 1. 2, 85-102.

FRIEDMAN, VICTOR A. (1995a): Persistence and Change in Ottoman Patterns of Codeswitching in the Republic of Macedonia: Nostalgia, Duress and Language Shift in Contemporary Southeastern Europe. in: GORTER, DURK/et al. (eds.), *Summer School: Code-switching and Language Contact*. Ljouwert/Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy, 58-67.

FRIEDMAN, VICTOR A. (1995b): Romani Standardization and Status in the Republic of Macedonia, in: MATRAS, YARON (ed.), *Romani in Contact: The History, Structure, and Sociology of a Language*. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 126). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 203-217.

FRIEDMAN, VICTOR A. (1996): Typological and Areal Features Linking and Separating the Balkans and the Caucasus, in: PRESS, J. IAN/KNOWLES, F. E. (eds.), *Papers in Slavonic Linguistics (Occasional Series). III*. London: University of London, 99-111.

FRIEDMAN, VICTOR A. (1997a): Cyganskij jazyk i vopros balkanskogo jazykovogo sojuza, in: RUSAKOV, A. JU. /ELOEVA F. A. (eds.), *Materialy XXVI mežvuzovskoj naučno-metodičeskoj konferencii prepodavatelej i aspirantov, Vyp. 3: Balkanskie čtenija*. St. Petersburg: University of St. Petersburg, 53-60.

FRIEDMAN, VICTOR A. (1997b): Linguistic Form and Content in the Romani-language Press, in: MATRAS, YARON/BAKKER, PETER/KYUCHUKOV, HRISTO (eds.), *The Typology and Dialectology of Romani*. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 156.). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 181-196.

FRIEDMAN, VICTOR A./DANKOFF, ROBERT (1991): The Earliest Text in Balkan (Rumelian) Romani: A Passage from Evliya Çelebi's *Seyāhat-nāme,* in: *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society (Fifth Series)* 1. 1, 1-20.

GOŁĄB, ZBIGNIEW (1964): *Conditionalis typu bałkańskiego w językach południowosłowiańskich*. Cracow: Polska Akademia Nauk.

GOŁĄB, ZBIGNIEW (1984): *The Arumanian dialect of Kruševo*. Skopje: MANU.

GRIGOROVA, EVELINA (1998): Interrogative Intonation of Two Bulgarian Romani Dialects: Sofia Erli and Kalderaš, in: *Grazer Linguistische Studien 50 (Romani II)*, 45-63.

HANCOCK, IAN (1995): *A Handbook of Vlax Romani*. Columbus: Slavica.

IGLA, BIRGIT (1996): *Das Romani von Ajia Varvara: Deskriptive und historisch-vergleichende Darstellung eines Zigeunerdialekts*. (Osteuropa-Institut der Freien Universität Berlin Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen, 29.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

IGLA, BIRGIT (1999): Disturbances and Innovations in the Case System in Bulgarian Romani Dialects, in: *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 46. 3-4, 201-214.

ISMAJLI, REXHEP (1988): Mbi statusin e shqipes standarde në RSF të Jugosllavisë, in: *Gjuha shqipe* 7. 2, 1-22.

JUSUF, ŠAIP (1974): *Duj Kale Mare: Drama pi romani čhib* . Ms. Skopje.

JUSUF, ŠAIP (1996): *Sikljova romani čhib* . Skopje: Prosvetno delo.

JUSUF, ŠAIP/KEPESKI, KRUME (1980): *Romani gramatika - Romska gramatika*. Skopje: Naša Kniga.

KRAMER, CHRISTINA. (1986) *Analytic Modality in Macedonian.* (Slavistische Beiträge, 198). Munich: Otto Sagner.

KURYŁOWICZ, JERZY (1956) *L'Apophonie en indo-européen* . Wrocław: Polska Akademia Nauk.

LABOV, WILLIAM (1996): When Intuitions Fail, in: MCNAIR, LISA/SINGER, KORA/DOBRIN, LISE M. /AUCOIN, MICHELLE M. (eds.), *CLS [Chicago Linguistic Society] 32: Papers from the Parasession on Theory and Data in Linguistics.* Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 77-105.

LEHISTE, ILSE/IVIĆ, PAVLE (1980): The Intonation of Yes-Or-No Questions--A New Balkansim? in: *Balkanistica* 6, 44-53.

MASICA, COLIN P. (1976): *Defining a Linguistic Area.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

MATRAS, YARON (1994): *Untersuchung zu Grammatik und Diskurs des Romanes: Dialekt der Kelderaša/Lovara.* (Osteuropa-Institut der Freien Universität Berlin Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen 26.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

MATRAS, YARON (1997): The typology of case relations and case layer distribution in Romani, in: MATRAS, YARON/BAKKER, PETER/KYUCHUKOV, HRISTO (eds.), *The Typology and Dialectology of Romani* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 156.) Amsterdam: Benjamins, 61-93.

MATRAS, YARON (1998): Para-Romani Revisted, in: MATRAS, YARON (ed.), *The Romani Element in Non-Standard Speech.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1-27.

MESSING, GORDON M. (1987): *A Glossary of Greek Romany: As Spoken in Agia Varvara (Athens).* Columbus: Slavica.

PETROVSKI, TRAJKO/VELIČKOVSKI, BONE (1998): *Makedonsko-romski i Romsko makedonsi rečnik/Makedonsko-romano thaj Romano-makedonsko alavari.* Skopje: Vorldbook.

PROTHERO, G. W. (gen. ed.) (1920): *Caucasia.* London: Foreign Office.

SAMPSON, JOHN (1926 [l 969]): *The Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales.* Oxford: Oxford University.

VENTCEL', TAT'JANA V. /ČERENKOV, L. N. (1976): Dialekty ciganskogo jazyka, in: KONRAD, N. I. (ed.), *Jazyki Azii i Afriki I.* Moscow: Nauka, 283-332.

ZAVOD ZA STATISTIKA NA REPUBLIKA MAKEDONIJA (1997): *Popis na naselenieto, domaḱinstva, stanovite i zemjodelskite stopanstva vo Republika Makedonija 1994 godina, Kniga XIII: Vkupno naselenie, domaḱinstva, stanovite i zemjodelskite stopanstva spored administrativno-teritorijalnata podelba od 1996 godina.* Skopje: Zavod za statistika na Rapublika Makedonija.