

Linguistic Form and Content in the Romani-language Press  
of the Republic of Macedonia  
Victor A. Friedman  
University of Chicago  
*The Typology and Dialectology of Romani*, ed. by Y. Matras, P. Bakker & H.  
Kyuchukov. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 1997. 181-196.

0. Introduction

The Republic of Macedonia has one of the most significant Romani populations in Europe. According to the 1994 census 43,732 people or 2.3% of the total population declared themselves to be of Romani nationality [Nova Makedonija 15.IX.94:1]. (The figures were 52,103 and 2.7% in the 1991 census.) Romani nationality thus constitutes the fourth largest in the Republic after Macedonian, Albanian, and Turkish. The figures for the relationship of declared nationality to first or other language are not yet available, but given discrepancies in the categorization of nationality and language (e.g. Muslim constitutes a nationality category but not a linguistic one), it is not unreasonable to assume that -- despite the fact that some individuals declaring Romani nationality will have a non-Romani first language -- the total number of Romani speakers is higher than available figures indicate. The fact remains that Romani is both statistically and legally a significant language in Macedonia. It was one of the six languages used in the 1994 census and is the language of television and radio broadcasts coming out of Skopje, Tetovo, and Kumanovo. Like other languages of Europe that have emerged as vehicles of public life during the past two centuries, Romani in the Republic of Macedonia (as in other countries) has been the subject of efforts at literary standardization. Unlike the case with some other languages, however, the standardization of Romani is taking place in both a national and a transnational context. On the one hand, there have been efforts such as Jusuf and Kepeski's Romani gramatika (1980, henceforth, RG), which, while having in mind that transnational context, was nonetheless directed primarily at the Romani audience in Macedonia, as evidenced not only by the choice of dialects but also by the fact that it was published bilingually in Romani and Macedonian. Similarly, the standardization conference of November 1992 sponsored by the Board of Education of the Republic of Macedonia and the University of Skopje, while explicitly aware of the efforts at creating an international Romani literary language as specifically mentioned in the resulting document, nevertheless had as its goal a standardization of Romani as a language of study in schools in the Republic of Macedonia (see Friedman 1995).

On 17 November 1993 the first issue of a Romani monthly newspaper, Romani Sumnal/Romski

Svet 'Romani World' (hereafter RS), was published in Skopje under the editorial leadership of Oskar Mamut, who is also employed in the Romani-language division of Radio-Television Skopje.<sup>1</sup> The newspaper is bilingual, with all material in both Romani and Macedonian. The issue of the codification of a Romani standard language is explicitly addressed on the first page of the first number, where the editorial board states that one of the tasks they have set themselves is contributing to the development and use of literary Romani. As such, the paper can be taken as a measure of the progress and ongoing concerns of the standardization of Romani in the Republic of Macedonia. The role of the mass media is potentially of great importance in language standardization. Taking as its background RG (cf. Friedman 1985), the Skopje Standardization conference of 1992 (cf. Friedman 1995), and international efforts such as the standardization conferences of 1971 and 1990 (cf. Kenrick 1981, Cortiade et al. 1991), this paper will examine issues of RS's orthography, phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicon as they relate to on-going problems and discussions in the standardization of Literary Romani in the context of the Romani dialectal situation of Macedonia Republic of Macedonia and elsewhere.<sup>2</sup>

## 1. ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONOLOGY

### 1.01 Orthography (cf. Friedman 1985, §1.0)

Choice of orthography is often connected with ethnic and political symbolism. The choice among the Arabic, Greek, and Latin alphabets was a key issue in the quest for Albanian unity at the beginning of this century (cf. Skendi 1967:366-90). In Croatia, Franjo Tudjman's decree that bialphabetical Latin-Cyrillic signs be replaced by monoalphabetical Latin ones helped alienate the Serbian population of Croatia on the road to subsequent war (Glenny 1992:14). In Macedonia, the specification of the Macedonian language and its Cyrillic alphabet as official at the federal level in article 7 of the constitution has led to conflicts over public signs, particularly with the Albanian minority (Nova Makedonija 94.07.28, Rilindja 94.08.03, Flaka e vëllazërimit 94.08.13). In the case of Romani, there are at present a variety of competing trends. The international orthography approved at the Fourth World Romani Congress held in Warsaw in 1990 (Cortiade et al. 1991), which uses the IPA yogh (ɟ) for the voiced dental affricate and the acute for the strident palatals, is currently in use in publications funded by organizations such as the Commission of European Communities (e.g., Hill 1994, and the newsletter Interface) as well as in Romania (e.g. Sarău 1991, 1992) and elsewhere. In a modified form, this orthography is also in use in other European publications, e.g. the magazine Patrin. In the Czech Republic, a Czech-based orthography, similar to that proposed at the First

World Romani Congress (Kenrick 1981), is in use (e.g. Hübschmannová 1991), while in Bulgaria there are several orthographies: one based on Cyrillic (e.g. Malikov 1992, Marushiakova and Popov 1994), one using English spelling conventions (e.g. Kjučukov 1993), and one similar to Kenrick (1981; e.g. Marushiakova and Popov 1994). As has been noted elsewhere, the problem with the transnational decision is that in other East European orthographies (notably Polish and the Former Serbo-Croatian), the acute is used to indicate mellow palatals (cf. de Gila/Kochanowski 1994:81, who has proposed an orthography based on the standard Latinization of Devanagari but without diacritics, in which the palatals are represented by sh, zh, c, j). RS follows standard East European practice of using the wedge (haček, čiriklo) to indicate the strident palatals (š, ž, č, dž). In this it continues the standard Latinization practice for Macedonian and other Slavic languages

#### 1.02 Schwa (cf. Friedman 1985, §1.1)

Schwa (used here as a cover term for central vowels ranging in realization from the low *ă* to high *î*) is a marginal phoneme in many Romani dialects and is generally restricted to words of foreign origin. It is excluded from the transnational orthography as well as the document produced at the 1992 Skopje conference (Friedman 1995), although RG proposed <ä> (Kjučukov 1993 uses <w>). In RS, schwa is indicated in the same manner as in Macedonian orthography -- where it is also marginal -- by means of an apostrophe: *g'ndinaja* 'we think', *s'kldiba* 'care, concern', *c'knide* 'nettles', *sak'zi* 'chewing gum'. In the case of schwa plus sonorant (or vocalic sonorants), there is hesitation between zero and the apostrophe: *s'kldiba*, *frdingje* 'directed, sent, led', *prčo* 'goat', but *v'rda* 'wagons', also *gndinela* as well as *g'ndinela*. These can to some extent be treated as loan-vowels in the same manner as <ü> and <ö> in those dialects that have borrowed unadapted lexical items from languages such as Albanian, Turkish, and Hungarian.

#### 1.03 The fronting of velars/dentals before /j/ and front vowels(cf. Friedman 1985, §1.4)

These phenomena continue to be problematic. In the transnational orthography, the problem is obviated in case endings (treated there as postpositional clitics), which are represented by the morphophonemic symbols "q" and "θ", although the same phenomena occur elsewhere. Thus for example, the same variation found in phonetic realizations of the dative suffix '-ke' occurs in roots such as *ker-* 'do' (cf. Friedman 1995). In RS, there is considerably less inconsistency in the representation of velars and dentals before front vowels and jot than in RG. Thus, although the principle of phonetic versus phonemic versus morphophonemic spelling is not consistently applied throughout RS, there is a tendency for certain lexical items and endings to follow

one or another principle. For example, the verb vaker- 'say' is consistently spelled with <kj>, while the root ker- is generally spelled <kj> but also <k>. (kerel and kjerel 'does'. Aspirated <kh> is never combined with <j>: either aspiration is not indicated or <j> is not written, e.g. khere 'at home', khelela 'plays' but mukjen 'they leave' vs mukhel pes 'he is left', dikhlo 'seen', dikhljam 'we saw', dikhena 'they see[long form]' but dikjen 'they see [short form]'. The voiced variant of the dative suffix shows variation, e.g. amenge ~ amengje, but the voiceless variant and all other case affixes as well as roots only rarely indicate fronting in spelling: lengere, gelo, etc., but muzikakjere 'musical/of music' ~ anglunipaskere 'progressive/of progress'. The root kin 'buy' is consistently spelled 'kjin-', but the root gil '-sing/song' occurs as both gil- and gjil-, similarly mangela 'wants' but mangjindor 'while wanting'. Elsewhere fronting before /i/ is not indicated, e.g. lakiri, ki Republika Makedonija, etc. The morphophonemic fronting of dentals before jotation is consistently spelled out: buti -bukja 'work sg/pl', rat - rakja 'night sg/pl', kjerdi - kjergja 'done - did'. Elsewhere, there is no graphic indication of fronted dentals. Thus the orthographic treatment of these phenomena, while gradually standardizing, remain problematic.

#### 1.04 Jotation in feminine substantives (cf. Friedman 1985, §2.1)

Romani dialects show variation in the jotation of oblique and plural forms of feminine stems, especially those with the nominative singular ending in a consonant. Moreover, oblique feminine stems in -a(j) frequently show contraction, e.g. dajake ~ dake 'mother (dat.)'. RS is consistent in the jotation or nonjotation of individual lexical items, e.g. čhib 'tongue' is regularly jotated ( čhibjakiri '[F.gen]) while jakh 'eye' is not (jakha [pl]). RS is also consistent in its use of uncontracted obliques of stems in -a(j), e.g. dajakiri čhib 'mother tongue' (f. gen.), ple čhajaja 'with his own daughter'. In these matters RS

#### 1.05 The opposition i/j (cf. Friedman 1985, §1.3)

Although RS displays more consistency than RG in distinguishing vocalic /i/ from non-vocalic /j/ fairly consistently, there is still some confusion. Thus, duj 'two' is consistently spelled but šai occurs alongside šaj. Vocalic /i/ is spelled in leindor 'while taking', deindor 'while giving', roipe 'weeping' sasoitne 'social' but leibe ~ lejbe 'taking', asajbe 'laughter/humor', hajbe 'food/nourishment'.

#### 1.06 The oppositions h/x (cf. Friedman 1985, §1.2)

The etymologically unmotivated (cf. Sampson 1926) distinction between /h/ and /x/ is not made in Arlija or Burgdudži, although it occurs in Džambaz, e.g. has 'laugh', xas- 'cough'. While RG prescribes the distinction, it is not consistently followed, e.g. both hiv and xiv 'hole'. RS reflects Arlija practice using only the letter

/h/, e.g. hajlovela pes 'it is understood/of course' (< h), hošinel 'feel, please' (< Tk. hoš), hevja 'holes' (< x), ha (< xa) 'eat'. Only the root xram-, e.g. xramovipe 'writing', xramone ~ hramone 'written' (< hram- < Gk. gram-, cf. Boretzky and Igla 1994) occurs, but this may be an editorial oversight. Macedonian influence seems to appear in some items in the loss of /h/ or its passage to /v/ intervocalically: asala 'laughs' (< hasala), hovaven (< xoxaven) 'deceive'. Note also the loss of intervocalic /v/ as in Macedonian in sikloibe alongside siklovibe 'studying'.

#### 1.07 r/r̃(rr, R, etc.) (cf. Friedman 1995)

As in most Macedonian Romani dialects, the distinction between plain /r/ and marked /r/ (long, uvular, etc.) is not present and therefore not indicated. This is the practice in as well as RG and Kenrick (1981) but not in Cortiade et al. (1991) where <rr> is used for the marked member.

#### 1.08 Clear, dark, and palatal /l/ (cf. Friedman 1985, §1.5)

In Macedonian Romani dialects, as in Macedonian, /l/ is clear before front vowels and dark elsewhere. It also contrasts with palatal /l'/. Unlike RG, where <lj> is sometimes used for clear and elsewhere for palatal /l/, in RS the sequence <lj> is reserved for palatal or jotted /l'/, e.g. lil 'letter', lel 'one takes', leljum 'I took', milje 'thousand', sikljovibe 'study', sikljiljum 'I studied'. The graphic combination <ll> for final dark /l/, e.g. dell 'gives' occurs as if in imitation of Albanian graphic conventions, however these are probably simply errata. The form moll (pl. molla) 'value/price' is apparently an Indicism.

#### 1.09 aspiration

As Boretzky (1993) observes, there is some variation in the realization of aspiration in individual lexical items, and it is generally neutralized word finally. This neutralization is generally reflected in spelling in RS: jek 'one' but jekhipa 'unity', jekhfar 'once', jak 'eye' but jakha 'eyes', etc. Some roots, however, display inconsistency, e.g. pučen - phučava 'ask' (2 pl. impv. - 1 sg), lači - bilači/bilači 'good - harmful', mukha 'we leave' ~ mukjen 'they leave' (cf. 1.3 above). There are also several Indicisms written with an unadapted voiced aspirates as in RG: bhagja 'consciousness/awareness', dhamkjeribe 'threat', labhakjeren 'use', adhinel 'depend'.

#### 1.10 The treatment of intervocalic -s- in grammatical affixes (cf. Friedman 1985, §1.3)

The treatment of original intervocalic /s/ and final /s/ in affixes is consistently modeled on Arlija, i.e. with two exceptions it is generally lost, and in intervocalic position the resulting hiatus is spelled with <j>: medially: mangaja 'we want', šunaja 'we hear', kasetaja 'with a cassette', ple čhajaja 'with his own

daughter', Ačhoven Devleja 'Good-bye', nijameja 'with justification' (the lack of /j/ in e čhavea 'with the child' could be simply a typographical erratum) finally: dikha 'we see', kjergja 'he did', ka la 'we will take', Džanena romane 'they know Romani', Me dikhava e manuše sar manuš 'I look at a person as a person', isi o le ~ ole ~ le 'he/it has'. The first of the two exceptions is isi 'is, there is' (cf. the foregoing example). Although there is an alternative form in Arlija without /s/, viz. i, only isi is used in RS. The other exception is original final /s/ in the reflexive accusative pronoun pes, which is important in the formation of various types of intransitives (on the model of Macedonian se). In RS, this final <s> is spelled with considerable inconsistency: hajlovela pes 'it is understood/of course', džanela pes 'it is known', bistrela pes 'be forgotten' but kjergje pe 'they pretended', g'ndinela pe 'it is thought of', kamela pe 'is liked, is wanted'. The three numbers of RS that appeared in 1993-94 displayed an apparent difference in editorial policy. Final <s> tended to be spelled with great frequency in the first number, omitted in the second, and spelled again in the third, although omission was not uncommon.

#### 1.11 the treatment n+s at morpheme boundaries

The affixation of the instrumental -sa[r] to the oblique plural stem in -n results in a delayed release perceived as /t/ resulting in spellings such as manušencar 'with people', lencar 'with them', etc. Elsewhere, however, the combination /ns/ is spelled, e.g. sansara 'peace'.

#### 1.12 combinations of preposition + definite article & obl. 3 sg. pronouns (Friedman 1985, §2.3)

In the transnational orthography, prepositions are connected to definite articles by means of a hyphen, as in Rumanian, e.g. k-o, k-i, tar-o, tar-i, baš-o, and p-o. In some orthographies, an apostrophe is used in place of a hyphen. The typical Arlija prothetic o- with third person oblique pronouns are written together if at all: olesqe, olape, olenqere, etc. RS follows the practice of RG: prepositions of postpositional origin as well as underlying p[e] 'on' write the article with the preposition as one word: ko Roma 'to the Roms', ki Japonija 'in Japan', taro tiknipe 'from childhood', tari dar 'from fear', dži ki kasarna 'toward the barracks', dži ko gav 'toward the village. The tendency is to write prothetic third person pronominal o- separately, especially in the genitive. Elsewhere there is some hesitation, e.g. ola ~ o la 'her, them', uzal olende 'besides them' but mashkar o lende 'among them', Kjeren o leja lafi thaj pučen ole akala pučiba 'Talk with him and ask him these questions', O čhavo valjani te ovel o le plo than 'The child should have its own place'. Although this o- is part of the pronoun

## 2. MORPHOLOGY

### 2.01 The shape of nominative third person pronouns (Friedman 1985, §2.3)

The shape of the third person nominative pronouns is consistently Arlija: ov, oj, and ola ~o la, which latter is used for both genders, e.g. in reference to masc. pl. nouns such as manuša, as opposed to masc. pl. on, which occurs only rarely.

### 2.02 The shape of the nominative plural definite article(Friedman 1985, §2.4)

The nominative plural definite article is consistently the Arlija o rather than e as found in other dialects, e.g. o Roma.

### 2.03 The shape of the genitive marker(Friedman 1985, §2.3)

The long forms of the genitive (-koro, -kiri, -kere) are used with almost complete consistency:

baš i lakiri kariera 'about her career', baš o lakere učipa 'about her heights', baš o lakoro feniks 'about her phoenix', partijakere liderija 'party leaders', e romane poezijakoro dad 'the father of Romani poetry', duje čhavengiri daj 'mother of two children', o leskiri antropologikani, socijalakiri, thaj kulturakiri dimenzija 'its anthropological, societal and cultural dimension'

e minoritetengeri dživipaskeri praktika ko Balkani 'the reality (practicality) of life of minorities in the

Balkans'. The one short genitive in -ki also shows a different shape in the internal vowel of a long form:

E civilizacijakeri asimilacijaki balval 'the civilizing wind of assimilation'; cf. also ki belgradeskeri TV. The

form ko kher e Sakipengo 'at the house of the Sakips' is the only other short genitive.

### 2.04 The shape of possessive pronouns (Friedman 1985, §2.2)

The singular possessive pronouns of Romani show a variety of shapes, among which the most common in the Balkans are (taking the masculine first person as exemplary): miro, mlo, mro, moro, mo (for details, see Boretzky and Igla 1994:388).

Of these, the first two are markedly Arlija, the third is Burgudži, the fourth is shared by Burgudži and Džambaz (Gurbet), while the last is common throughout Macedonia.

nonetheless, RS is distinctly Arlija in its favoring forms of the type mlo and makes infrequent concessions

by occasionally using forms of the type mo, e.g. Dikhindor ma te našaven plo muj, našavgje pi bul 'Taking care to save their face, they lost their butt.'

### 2.05 Aorist person markers (Friedman 1985, §2.5)

The shape of the first person aorist marker is a diagnostic feature separating the so-called Vlax from the Non-Vlax dialects of Romani. The former are characterized by -em, the latter by a back rounded vowel,

-om or -um. All three endings occur in the Romani dialects of Macedonia, in Džambaz, Burgudži, and Arlija, respectively. RS consistently uses the Arlija -um, e.g. ačhiljum 'I remained'- bistergjum 'I forgot' - geljum 'I went' - khelgjum 'I danced'- leljum 'I took' g'ndingjum 'I thought'. There is not much dialectal variation in the markers of the other persons (aside from 2 sg -al (vs -an) in Sinti and some other dialects of former Austria-Hungary).<sup>3</sup> RS, however, has a peculiar first plural aorist marker, viz. -em rather than the expected -am, e.g. bašalgjem 'we played', gelem 'we went', giljavgjem 'we sang', kjergjem 'we did', lelem 'we took', manglelem 'we wished', vakjergjem 'we spoke' dikhlem 'we saw'. On rare occasion, the expected -am is used: ačhiljam 'we remained', dikhlijam 'we saw'. In the conjugated forms of 'be', which constitute the historical source of these affixes, RS consistently has the expected 1 sg sijum and 1 pl sijam. This may be an attempt to incorporate a Džambaz feature with an altered meaning, but at present it remains unclear.

#### 2.06 Imperfect/Pluperfect (Friedman 1985, §2.5)

RS is consistently Arlija in its formation of the imperfect adding the analytic preterit auxiliary sine (functioning as a particle) rather than by suffixing -as to the conjugated present:<sup>4</sup> Ko adava vakti kjerela sine pes vakti [sic! = lafi] baš o but love, a oj mi čhorori na džanela sine te čhorel. 'At that time it was said that it was a matter of a lot of money, but she, poor thing, did not know how to [= would not have thought of] steal.' A sako dive o la avena sine ko pobaro numero, pa akhal avilo pes dži ko adava o la te čhiven pes ki privatikane khera. 'But every day they came in greater numbers, and thus it came to this: they had to be put [up] in private houses.' Sa džala sine šukar dži na agorkjergjum o fakulteti. 'Everything went/was going fine until I finished college.'

#### 2.07 Long versus short present tense forms (Friedman 1985, §2.5)

RS almost always follows the practice articulated in RG of limiting short present forms to modal constructions sensu largo, i.e. subordination to the future marker ka and the modal (conjunctive/subjunctive/optative/conditional) marker te. The following examples are typical: na mangaja te vakera 'we don't want to talk', tergjola thaj ka tergjol 'it remains and will remain'. The following two sentences constitute exceptions to this practice:

Te perena tumare bala masirinen o la loneja a pali odova thoven o len sar sakana. 'If your hair is falling out, rub it with salt and then wash it as usual'. Ja ka achhava bashijaver Mlo dikhibe - bi cenzurakoro. 'But I will leave my uncensored view for another time'. The first of these is explicable either as a



progressive (Šaip Jusuf, pc) or as conditional versus conjunctive (Boretzky and Iгла 1994:402).

### 2.08 adjective comparison and agreement (Friedman 1985, §2.2)

This is an area of grammar in which RS reflects dialectal compromise. The comparative is formed using the Arlija/Burgudži prefix po- (from Macedonian) while the superlative is formed using the Džambaz prefix maj- (from Romanian, as opposed to Arlija naj- [< Macedonian] or em- [<Turkish]), e.g. baro, pobaro, majbaro 'big, bigger, biggest'. The one remnant of the old synthetic comparative in -eder is the item pobuter 'more' (< but 'very'), which is used more frequently than pobut. RS shows ordinary adjective agreement, except for borrowings from Macedonian, which are taken over in the Macedonian neuter, which looks like the Romani masculine (-o) but are then treated as indeclinables in RS, e.g. socijalno buti 'welfare' (literally 'social work', in which buti is feminine. If the adjective were made to agree, it would be socijalni [which would be identical to the Macedonian plural].)

### 2.09 Derivation of abstract nouns (Friedman 1985, §2.1)

RS uses both -be and -pe for the derivation of abstract nouns from verbs and adjectives. It appears that -be is restricted to deverbal nouns, while -pe is used for both deverbal and deadjectival nouns: akharipe 'invitation', bipakjavipe 'distrust', čačipe 'truth', reality', manušipe 'humanity', nanipe 'destitution', šajdipe 'possibility', dikhipe 'view', fiksiripe 'establishment', khelipe 'playing', pučipe 'question', s'kldiba 'cares', prandiba 'weddings', mariba 'wars', hardžhiba 'expenses'. In at least one instance, the affixes are used to distinguish meaning in a single stem, viz. mang- which has such diverse but related meanings as 'want, wish, love, seek, beg, need, demand, etc.' whence mangipa 'needs' but mangibe 'desire'; cf. also namangibe 'hatred'.

## 3.0 SYNTAX AND LEXICON

### 3.01 modal constructions

RS consistently uses the Arlija modal construction of te + aorist to express fulfillable hypothetical conditions: Te gelem ničeja, ka džana kaj sa o džijanija, uzal e religiengere anava isi len specifikane anava 'If we go in order, we will discover that all peoples, alongside religious names, have [their] particular names'; Te phirgjem hari ki historija ka dikha o darhija e komplekseskere tari hari moll, 'If we go a little into history, we will see the roots of the inferiority complex,; Te g'ndingja pes hari pohor, pakjava kaj ka vakjeren: Amen sijam... 'If one thinks a little deeper, I believe that they will say: We are...'

On rare occasion, te plus long present is used: Te perena tumare bala masirinen o la loneja a pali odova

thoven o len sar sakana. 'If your hair is falling out, rub it with salt and then wash it as usual'.

Otherwise te + present or kana express fulfillable expectative conditions: kana šaj ov, soske našti me?/kana šaj ov, soske me te našti?/Kana šaj ov, thaj me ka kjerav adava/kana saj o la, soske na amen 'if he can, why not can't I/if he can can't it be me/If he can, then I will do this/if they can, then why not us?'

The borrowed Slavic conditional marker bi also occurs for fulfillable conditions, but only rarely: Salde na bi mangaja te ovel kaj sijam majbare Romane Don Kihotija. 'Only we would not like it to be the case that we become the greatest Romani Don Quixote.'

Macedonian ako is extremely rare (thaj ako 'although').

### 3.02 'be' and 'have'

Unlike many other problematic areas of dialectal variation, where RS shows some hesitation, albeit not as much as in RG, in matters of the copula RS shows great editorial consistency despite the great dialectal variation (cf. Boretzky and Iгла 1994:403-406. The paradigm of the present is strictly Arlija, of the Barutči type:

	sg.	pl.
1	sijum	sijam
2	sijan	sijen
3	isi	isi

The 3 sg./pl. past tense is sine, which also functions as marker for all other past forms (see 2.06 above).

The possessive/existential is always formed with isi, and the negative possessive/existential is consistently the general Non-Vlax nane, e.g. Sakoja dujto diz isi la pli "Roma Union" numa, o la nane len nisave vjavaharija. 'Every second town has its "Romani Union", but they have no connection with one another'.

Mujal akija klasichno socijalno arka isi panda jek taro 1992-to bersh pendzhardi sar programa bash e dzhivdipaskoro standardeskoro arakhibe. 'Beside this classic welfare, there has been (lit. 'is') a program since May 1992 for the protection of the standard of living.' The third person present copulative functions of 'be', including passive participle constructions, are consistently rendered by tano/tani/tane: o gendo e manušengoro so pherena o usulija baši socijalakoro arakhibe tano sa majbaro 'the number of people fulfilling the conditions for social welfare is greater than ever', xramone tane bigjende rigore 'numberless pages have been written'

### 3.03 negation

Expressions of negation is an area where RS shows dialectal compromise. The negative existential nane and the distinction between the modal negator ma and the indicative negator ma are all consistent with Non-

Vlax (Arlija, Burgudži) usage. The negative pronouns, however, khanšik 'nothing', khonik 'no one', as well as negative adverbs such as nikana 'never' reflect Vlax usage, as opposed to Arlija ništo, niko etc. RS also uses čipota 'nothing', which appears to be a Džambaz treatment of a Hellenism (Greek tipota 'nothing').

### 3.04 Vocabulary

The vocabulary of RS displays many of the trends in current efforts to establish literary Romani in Macedonia: the use of neologisms, Indicisms such as raštra 'state', sansara 'peace' (cf. also 1.9), "internationalisms", calques on Macedonian, etc. In terms of vocabulary choice within the everyday lexicon of the various Romani dialects of Macedonia, as in grammar, RS tends to favor Arlija but makes occasional compromises by selecting from the other dialects. Thus, for example, the following consistently uses Arlija oja 'yes' (vs. Džambaz and Burgudži va), Arlija javer 'other' (vs. aver), Arlija tajsa 'tomorrow' (vs. tehara or javine), Non-Vlax lafī 'word' (vs. Vlax vorba) but also non-Arlija thaj 'and' (vs. Arlija [h]em) and Vlax lungo 'long'. In some cases synonymous items from different dialects are used, e.g. Arlija agjaar, akhal and Džambaz agaja 'thus', Arlija bizo 'without' but also the more widespread bi, Non-Vlax salde 'only' but also Vlax numa. Motivations for individual choices varies, thus for example thaj is apparently preferred to [h]em because the former is Indic whereas the latter is from Turkish, but bizo is influenced by Slavic whereas bi is not. Both salde and numa are borrowed (from Turkish and Romanian, respectively), but the same situation holds for lafī and vorba.

The name of the newspaper itself is peculiar. Sumnal in the Vlax dialects of Romani means, among other things, 'holy'. The Macedonian word for 'holy' is svet, which is homonymous with the word for 'world'.<sup>5</sup> In the meaning 'world' Macedonian svet is derived from an original meaning of 'light'. The semantic equation of 'light' and 'world' was calqued from South Slavic into Romanian, where the word for 'world' is lume (definite lumea). The Romanian word was borrowed into the Vlax Romani dialects, whereas Non-Vlax dialects in the Balkans use other borrowings such as the Turkism dunya. The use of sumnal to mean 'world' is based thus on a complex of misunderstandings.

### 4. Conclusion

In its basic principles, RS represents a development in the direction described by the decisions reached at the 1992 Skopje conference and indicated in RG, namely an Arlija base with elements from other dialects using an Latin orthography of the type in wide use in Eastern Europe, including RG, and recommended at the 1971 standardization conference (cf. Also Hancock 1993, 1995). Nonetheless, specifics of the solutions

reached by RS differ from those seen elsewhere. Taken as a whole, RS clearly represents a step forward in the standardization of Romani in the Republic of Macedonia. The editors are aware of standardization issues and are attempting to make concrete contributions towards a consistent and usable norm.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Although the newspaper was intended as a monthly, it has so far appeared only thrice: 17 November 1993, 10 December 1993, and 1 April 1994.

<sup>2</sup>We are accepting here as a useful heuristic device the distinction between the so-called Vlax and Non-Vlax dialects of Romani. Although the Romani dialectal situation in the Republic of Macedonia is quite complex, the majority of speakers use dialects of a Non-Vlax type that are described by the self-ascriptive cover term Arlija (< Turkish yerli 'local'). Next in importance for Macedonia is Džambaz (< Turkish cambaz 'acrobat, horse-dealer', known elsewhere as Gurbet, related to Kalderaš, Lovari, Čurari, Mačvano, etc.), which is a Vlax type dialect that has undergone Non-Vlax influence. Also of significance for Macedonia is Burgudži or Bugurdži (< Turkish burgucu 'gimlet-maker', also known as Rabadži [< Turkish arabacı 'drayman']) or Kovačja (< Slavic Kovač 'blacksmith', a name which is also used for other groups including the non-Romani speaking Gjupci of southwestern Macedonia), which is also a Non-Vlax dialect

<sup>3</sup>There is considerable variation in the third person endings in all of Romani, a topic beyond the scope of this paper (see Matras 1995). For additional details see Friedman and Dankoff (1991) and Boretzky and Igla (1994:355-56).

<sup>4</sup>Although not occurring in RS, the pluperfect is formed in the same manner in each dialect as its respective imperfect, but with the aorist rather than the present as the base.

<sup>5</sup>The homonymy is a coincidence of historical development. The /e/ of svet 'holy' is from a Common Slavic front nasal, whereas the /e/ of svet 'world, light' is from a Common Slavic \*ē

#### REFERENCES

- Boretzky, Norbert and Birgit Igla. 1994. Wörterbuch Romani-Deutsch-Englisch. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Boretzky, Norbert. 1993. Bugurdži. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Boretzky, Norbert. 1995. Interdialectal interference in Romani. in Romani in Contact: The History, Structure, and Sociology of a Language, ed. by Yaron Matras, 69-94. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Cortiade, M. et al. (1991) "I alfabèta e standardone Rromane čhibaqiri, Décizia "I Rromani Alfabèta".

Informaciaqoro Lil e Rromane Uniaqoro 1-2, 7-8.

- de Gila-Kochanowski, Vania. 1994. Parlons tsigane: Histoire, culture et langue du peuple tsigane. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1985. Problems in the Codification of a Standard Romani Literary Language. Papers from the Fourth and Fifth Annual Meetings: Gypsy Lore Society, North American Chapter. 56-75. New York: Gypsy Lore Society.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1995. Romani Standardization and Status in the Republic of Macedonia. in Romani in Contact: The History, Structure, and Sociology of a Language, ed. by Yaron Matras, 177-188. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Friedman victor a. and Robert Dankoff. 1991. The Earliest Text in Balkan (Rumelian) Romani: A Passage from Evliya Çelebi's Seyāhat-nāme. Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society (Fifth Series) 1,1:1-20.
- Glenny, Misha. 1992. The Fall of Yugoslavia: The Third Balkan War. London: Penguin.
- Hancock, Ian. 1993. The Emergence of a Union Dialect of North American Vlax Romani, and its Implications for an International Standard. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 99, 91-104.
- Hancock, Ian. 1995. A Grammar of Vlax Romani. Columbus: Slavica.
- Hill, Eric. 1994. O Rukun' al and-i skòla. Paris: Rromani Baxt-C.E.E. (trans. by O. and B. Galius' et al.)
- Hübschmannová, Milena et al. 1991. Romsko-český česko-romski kapesní slovník. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Jusuf, Šaip and Krume Kepeski. 1980. Romani gramatika - Romska gramatika. Skopje: Naša Kniga.
- Kenrick, Donald. 1981. "Romano alfabeto". Loli Phabaj 1, 3-4.
- Kjučukov, Hristo. 1993. Učeben bălgarsko-romski rečnik. Sofia: UNICEF
- Malikov, Jašar. 1992. Cigansko-bălgarski rečnik. Sofia: Fondacija "Otvoreno obštestvo".
- Marushiakova, Elena and Vesselin Popov (eds.) 1994. Studii Romani. Sofia: Club '90
- Matras, Yaron. 1995. Verb evidentials and their discourse function in Vlach Romani Narratives. in Romani in Contact: The History, Structure, and Sociology of a Language, ed. by Yaron Matras, 95-123. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sampson, Sampson. 1926. The Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales. Oxford: Oxford University. (Reprinted 1968).

Sarău, Gheorghe. 1991. Limba romaní. Bucharest: Editura didactică și pedagogică.

Sarău, Gheorghe. 1992. Mic dicționar rom-român. Bucharest: Kriterion.

Skendi, Stavro. 1967. The Albanian National Awakening. Princeton: Princeton University Press.