

YARON MATRAS (Manchester)

## Tense, aspect and modality categories in Romani

### Abstract

Romani dialects have preserved the Early Romani aspectual opposition “perfective:non-perfective” and the tense opposition “remote:non-remote”, which continue to form the backbone of the present-day TAM system. Internal renewal (drawing on inherited resources) is common in the arrangement of categories that operate on the borderline between tense, aspect, and modality – namely the domain Present-Subjunctive-Future. Contact-induced developments (I distinguish “calquing” or “metatypy”, from “borrowing” or “fusion”) are confined largely to aktionsart and to conditional and quotative modality. Some implications are drawn relating to the stability of categories, particularly in areal contact situations.

### 1. Introduction

Like other domains of Romani grammar, the language’s tense-aspect-modality (TAM) system offers an opportunity to gain insights into mechanisms of change and contact-related change. Romani is unique in being the only “Europeanised” New Indo-Aryan language. Alongside Domari (see MATRAS 1999), it is the only NIA language with basic VO rather than OV word order, with prepositions rather than postpositions; and it is unique in showing preposed definite articles and a formal distinction between factual and non-factual complementation. The typological restructuring that has taken place in Romani offers an opportunity to check the stability of TAM categories against overall typological disruption. Present-day Romani must be regarded as a group of closely-related but only partly contiguous idioms. The innovations which they share may be due to geographical developments, to shared contact-related changes, or to similar trends that are not at all linked. The adoption in Romani of patterns that are modelled on those of contiguous languages raises the issue of the cognitive motivation behind contact-induced change.

No attempt has so far been made to present an integrative account of the TAM systems of Romani varieties. My agenda for this essay is to introduce the TAM categories of Romani and to discuss their historical development. In the area of inflection, I will offer a new interpretation of the historical emergence of the past-tense concord markers, as well as an account of the rules governing the re-assignment of past-tense verbs to inflectional classes. The principal focus however is on the classification of TAM categories in Romani as a whole, and on the comparative survey of dialect-specific developments that followed the Early Romani period. The outlook will take into consideration the general significance of retention and renewal of categories in Romani.

All Ro  
primarily  
expressio  
fixes. Lo  
verb clas  
ited Rom  
product  
Early Ro  
quently  
Romani

Transi  
tation ma  
roots wit  
-ker-. In s  
derived f  
to -(j)o-  
fective fo  
marker fo  
tive from  
derivatio

The ve  
verb stem  
the verb s  
continent  
perfect o  
Perfective  
non-perfe  
show a pe  
final slot  
in Roman  
asi-ahi/-c  
tive (or P  
in some d  
Future or

Analyt  
groups. T  
take’) or  
iliaries s-  
rowed con  
it is most  
tative/inte

The lay  
(1)-(4):

## 2. The basic blueprint for finite verb formation in Romani

All Romani finite verb forms inflect for TAM and show subject concord. Romani being primarily a suffixing language, the lexical root is usually the first component in the verbal expression. The only exceptions to this rule are borrowed aktionsart and Slavic aspect prefixes. Loanword adaptation is marked by a set of Greek-derived affixes, originating in Greek verb class morphemes. They are often combined with Greek aorist markers and with inherited Romani transitive affixes: *-i-*, *-o-*, *-is-*, *-iz-*, *-os-*, *-in-*, *-isar-*, *-isa-*. These affixes are the product of a significant change in morphological productivity that took place during the Early Romani (or Byzantine) period, by which Greek morphology was adopted and subsequently used to mark out the class of European loan words. This is often referred to in Romani linguistics as “athematic” grammar (cf. HANCOCK 1995a, BAKKER 1997, ELŠÍK 2000).

Transitive and intransitive derivation follows the root (or, with loans, it follows the adaptation marker). Romani possesses a series of transitivity affixes which, when applied to roots with a transitive primary meaning, may have a causative or iterative reading: *-ar-*, *-av-*, *-ker-*. In some dialects they are in principle combinable. There is also a de-transitivity affix, derived from an auxiliary *\*jov-* (from the existential verb OIA *bhuv-*), and often contracted to *-(j)o-*. It attaches either to the root (or adapted loan root), or more commonly to the perfective form of the stem, with jotation effects on the preceding segment. The de-transitive marker forms the synthetic passive and the de-adjectival inchoative, as well as an intransitive from roots whose primary meaning is transitive. All these markers can be considered derivational.

The verb root with its derivational extensions may be referred to as the verb “stem”. The verb stem is followed by an expression of **aspect**. The perfective marker attaches directly to the verb stem. It is used to form the simple Past (or what MASICA 1991 calls, referring to sub-continental NIA as a whole, the “unspecified perfective”) as well as the remote past (Pluperfect or Counterfactual). Its origin is in the OIA participial affix *-ta* (see discussion below). Perfective markers are followed by subject concord markers. Non-perfective verb forms (the non-perfective Present, Future, Subjunctive, and non-perfective past or Imperfect) do not show a perfective marker, but allow concord markers to attach directly to the verb stem. The final slot in the verb layout is reserved for tense and modality. The actual expression of **tense** in Romani is the remoteness marker, usually expressed by an agglutinated affix *-as/-ys/-s/-asi/-ahi/-ah/-aj*. It forms the remote non-perfective (or Imperfect) and the remote perfective (or Pluperfect/Counterfactual). The principal **modality** marker in this slot is *-a*, which in some dialects marks the indicative as opposed to the zero-Subjunctive, in others the Future or Declarative as opposed to the zero-Present.

Analytic expressions of tense and modality are restricted to individual dialects or dialect groups. They include a future particle *ka/kam/ma* and the future auxiliaries *l-* (from ‘to take’) or *(j)av-* (from ‘to come’), which precede the (subjunctive) verb, and the perfect auxiliaries *s-* (from ‘to be’) and *ther-* (from ‘to have’), which precede the past participle. A borrowed conditional marker *by/bi* of Slavic origin is often a clitic with variable position, though it is most commonly found after the finite verb. Some Balkan dialects have adopted a quotative/interrogative marker *li*, of southern Slavic origin.

The layout for finite verbs in Romani is summarised in Fig. 1 and illustrated by examples (1)-(4):

{(aktionsart/Slavic aspect) SLASP + lexical root + (loan adaptation) LOAN + (transitive/de-transitive) TRANS/DETRANS} verb stem + (perfective marker) PFV + subject concord + tense/modality [remote REM, future FUT, declarative DECL, subjunctive SUBJ, conditional COND, quotative QUOT]

Figure 1: Layout of the Romani finite verb, with glossing symbols

- (1) Northeastern, Northern Central  
*ker-d'-om-as*  
 do-PFV-1SG-REM  
 'I had done.'
- (2) Vlax  
*dičh-o-l-a*  
 see-DETRANS-3SG-FUT  
 'It will be seen.'
- (3) Vlax, Balkan  
*žen-isa-jl-am-as*                      *bi*  
 marry-LOAN-PFV-1PL-REM      COND  
 'We would have been married.'
- (4) Northeastern  
*pod-šun-en-ys*  
 SLASP-hear-3PL-REM  
 'They were eavesdropping.'

### 3. The basic TAM categories

In the previous section a tentative classification of the basic TAM categories of Romani was already suggested, which I shall now take up in somewhat more detail. In the course of the discussion I will be using the term "Proto-Romani" to refer to various stages of structural developments that characterise the emergence of Romani as an independent NIA language. Proto-Romani structures are not directly attested and must be reconstructed on the basis of a comparison of Romani with related languages of India (and other NIA diaspora languages, such as Domari). The term "Early Romani" is used to refer to the latest stage of unity and relative uniformity prior to the dispersion of the dialects across Europe and Asia Minor. Early Romani structures are attested at least in some of the present-day dialects, and can usually be inferred from the distribution of structures among present-day dialects of the language.

The basic or "common" Romani system of TAM categories inherited from Early Romani consists of three dimensions: an aspectual dimension specifies the verb features for the category "perfective:non-perfective", a temporal dimension distinguishes the categories "remote:non-remote", and a modal dimension consists of the category of "intentionality" (Fig. 2):

marker de  
 'do-PFV-  
 event. In  
 points out  
 less, past  
 pated con  
 1PL = unt  
 added to t  
 descriptio  
 IGLA 1996  
 uses "perf  
 tual one. M  
 same aspe  
 a resultin  
 tive. JOHAN  
 with aspec  
 term "perf  
 languages.  
 tural resou

It is impo  
 has been  
 (REICHENB  
 speaking t  
 ing functio  
 perspective  
 perspective  
 with no ref  
 discussed a

The abs  
 SON 1971,  
 HOLZINGER  
 event can b  
 of "perfect  
 gressive" (I  
 that add th  
 sive, past-p  
 Imperfect i  
 of "perfect  
 is no point  
 Actual te

	<b>Non-perfective:</b>	<b>Perfective:</b>	<b>Intentional:</b>
<b>Non-remote:</b>	Present/Future	Past (Preterite, Aorist)	Subjunctive
<b>Remote:</b>	Imperfect	Pluperfect/Counterfactual	

Figure 2: Functional arrangement of TAM categories in Early Romani

**Aspect** is expressed as an extension to the verb stem. The extended stem, to which a marker deriving from the OIA participle in *-ta* is added, functions as a **perfective**: *ker-d-om* 'do-PFV-1SG = I did'. The function of the perfective is to denote a completed action or event. In actual distribution it usually refers to events in past time; as MASICA (1991: 272) points out, perfective can be linked to past time even without tense specifications. Nonetheless, past time is not inherent to the perfective, which may also be used to indicate anticipated completion with future time reference (*ži kaj ker-d-am* 'until where do-PFV-1PL = until we complete', lit. 'until we did'). I refer to the marker of participial origin that is added to the verb root in order to form the perfective aspect as a **perfective marker**. Most descriptions of Romani refer to the perfective as "Preterite" (SAMPSON 1926, BORETZKY 1993, IGLA 1996, HALWACHS 1998) or "Aorist" (HANCOCK 1995a). Only HOLZINGER (1993, 1996) uses "perfective" and classifies the dimension that is expressed by the marker as an aspectual one. My earlier use of "resultative" (MATRAS 1994, Ch. 4) was intended to capture the same aspectual dimension. The term "resultative" however is often interpreted as implying a resulting state that is observable, a meaning that is not contained in the Romani perfective. JOHANSON (1994: 260) indirectly even takes issue with the use of this label in connection with aspect. Furthermore, for the sake of consistency it appears beneficial to employ the term "perfective" as used by MASICA (1991: 262–279) in connection with aspect in other NIA languages, where it serves similar functions and draws historically on the same OIA structural resources, namely the participle affix in OIA *-ta*.

It is important to note that the event encoded by the Romani perfective is viewed as one that has been completed prior to or at the contextual point of reference that is provided (REICHENBACH's (1947) "R"), but that "R" remains unspecified in relation to the Origo of speaking time ("O"; cf. BÜHLER 1934). The Romani perfective thus lacks the deictic anchoring function that characterises tenses. What is encoded by the perfective is rather a subjective perspective on the event as completed, in JOHANSON's (1971, 1994) terms a "post-terminal" perspective. The fact that the event portrayed by the perfective is presented as a single whole, with no reference to its internal phases, seems to satisfy the criteria for perfective aspect as discussed and defined by COMRIE (1976), DAHL (1985), THIEROFF (1994, 1995) and others.

The absence of perfectivity renders an ongoing or "intra-terminal" perspective (JOHANSON 1971, 1994) on events, which is characteristic of the Present and Imperfect. While HOLZINGER's (1993, 1996) functional interpretation of "imperfective" as a non-completed event can be upheld, it seems more useful to simply regard "imperfectivity" as the absence of "perfectivity" (cf. discussion in THIEROFF 1995). Here I must revise my earlier label "progressive" (MATRAS 1994), on the grounds that the term is normally reserved for categories that add the feature of ongoing involved-ness into the various tenses (e.g. present-progressive, past-progressive, future-progressive). In Romani the only aspectual sibling of the Imperfect is the Present. The affinity between the two is sufficiently captured by the absence of "perfectivity" in both. Since there is no non-perfective form that lacks progressivity, there is no point in introducing "progressivity" as an additional category.

Actual **tense** in Romani is expressed by the agglutinative **remoteness** marker, through which

an event is contextualised relative to "O". More precisely, remoteness places the event outside the reach of "O" by excluding overlap between "R" and "O". Recall that the perfective does not contextualise the event and includes no statement about the possible overlap or non-overlap between "R" (the point of reference at which an event is regarded as completed, or as post-terminal) and "O". Conversely, remoteness makes no statement about the terminality of the event as far as its internal structure is concerned; in other words, it is aspectually neutral. But remoteness does not by necessity locate an event in time at a point of reference prior to "O", either. Consider on the one hand the habitual-past reading of the Imperfect in *dža-v-as sako džes* 'go-1SG-REM every day = I used to go every day', the imperfective-past reading of the Imperfect in *džanel-as* 'know-3SG-REM = s/he knew', the anterior-past reading of the Pluperfect in *phen-d-as-aba* 'say-PFV-3SG-REM already = s/he had already said' (i.e. prior to a specified point of reference, which is located in the past); but on the other hand the non-factual but realis reading of the conditional Imperfect in *te džan-av-as* 'COMP know-1SG-REM = if I knew', and the requestative reading of the Pluperfect in *mang-l-em-as* 'ask-PFV-1SG-REM = I should like to ask'. In the latter, remoteness only has indirect temporal significance – perhaps a future-oriented one – relative to "O". Its principal meaning of distance relates to the interactional context rather than to time. Distance here has the effect of neutralising the potentially manipulative significance of the request within the speech context. This effect is exploited for the purpose of politeness of expression. Contextual distance to real-world events is similarly achieved through the use of the conditional-Imperfect in the preceding example, 'if I knew'. The combination of perfectivity and remoteness in the conditional renders the counterfactual or irrealis meaning in *te ker-d-om-as* 'COMP do-PFV-1SG-REM = if I had done'.

While some of these meanings of the remote category – in particular the polite-requestative meaning – are pragmatically derived, they share features that are semantically inherent to the category of remoteness. What remoteness generally achieves amounts to blocking the accessibility or contextual presence of an event, which satisfies the feature of "distance" (THIEROFF 1995; cf. also JOHANSON'S (1971) "tunc-idea"). The factual or non-conditional Imperfect in *džavas* 'I used to go' can be regarded as a non-perfective aspectual perspective on an event that is contextually inaccessible because its point of reference is located prior to "O". The conditional Imperfect in *te džanavas* 'if I knew' remains unspecified with regard to "O", but the event it portrays is likewise contextually inaccessible as it is purposefully detached from real-world factuality. The Pluperfect *phendasas* 'he had said' is a perfective perspective on an event whose outcome or result was relevant at a point "R" prior to "O", while the structurally related counterfactual (irrealis conditional or polite form) is a perfective whose validity is intentionally cancelled for reasons of factual non-achievability (irrealis conditional *te kerdomas* 'if I had done'), or as part of a discourse strategy (polite-requestative *manglemas* 'I should like to ask'). All these usages have in common the contextual neutralisation of the event – whether completed (perfective) or non-completed (non-perfective). It is the contextual cancellation of factual validity, and so contextual "distance", that is the inherent meaning of the category "remoteness". To sum: though not necessarily related to time, remoteness is a temporal rather than aspectual category since the statement it makes pertains not to the internal structure of the event, but to the placement of an event relative to the immediate context of speech.

It does not seem justified to postulate an actual category of **modality** in Romani since there is, prototypically at least, only one form that is inherently non-indicative. (I differentiate throughout the paper between "category", which is a structurally distinguishable semantic function of the verb that is language-specific, and "domain", which is a universally

applicable class of functions within which a given category may be accommodated for the sake of cross-linguistic comparison. "Aspect", "tense", and "modality" are "domains", while the functions argued for in connection with the Romani structures are "categories"). Non-indicative uses of tense-aspect categories are achieved by placing them within the scope of a non-factual/conditional complementiser *te* (e.g. irrealis *te sikli-j-om-as* 'COMP learn-PFV-1SG-REM = if I had learned'). The only form that is inherently non-indicative is the Subjunctive (zero-marked in the Early Romani system, as opposed to the indicative Present/Future in *-a*), whose reading is that of **intentionality**. The Subjunctive typically figures in linked clauses with non-factual semantics (purpose clauses, modal and manipulative complements), as well as in optative constructions.

This concludes the functional classification of TAM categories in the Early Romani system, which continue as the backbone of the TAM system of most present-day dialects. A final note concerns the **iconicity** of the system. There are two points here. First, throughout the system, the presence of a category feature (category compliance) is linked to the presence of a structural marker, while the absence of this feature corresponds to the absence of a marker. Thus the perfective is marked by the perfective marker, while the non-perfective has no such marker and no alternative marker of non-perfectivity; it is structurally as well as functionally zero-marked for perfectivity. The remoteness marker has forms deriving from historical *\*-asi* (see below), while the non-remote categories have none. Only the Subjunctive is characterised structurally by the absence of indicative marking. Consistency would have required to label all other categories "indicative" and the Subjunctive "non-indicative", but this is not pursued due to considerations of terminological economy.

Second, the respective positions of the markers are iconic. The perfective marker separates the lexical root from the subject concord, symbolising the separation of the actor from the ongoing event, which comes about through the fact that the event is now completed. Non-perfective forms on the other hand have the concord marker in adjoined position to the lexical root, symbolising involvement of the actor in the ongoing event. Remoteness markers appear at the end of the verbal layout, symbolising the "contextual anchoring" of the verbal predication, that is, the establishment of a relation between the verb complex and the event it encodes, and the realm of speech interaction that is external to it.

#### 4. The historical development of TAM categories and TAM inflection

Romani rates among the most conservative NIA languages (alongside Domari) in preserving the OIA system of person concord that is the structural representation of the Present tenses. The concord markers 1SG *-ava*, 2SG *-esa*, 3SG *-ela*, 1PL *-asa* and 3PL *-ena* are direct cognates of the respective OIA/MIA markers, while the Romani 2PL is assimilated into the 3PL in *-ena*. Also reminiscent of the OIA system is the use of long forms for the indicative Present, and of syncopated forms for the Subjunctive. Although the Romani "long" extension in *-a* differs from the OIA one in *-i*, there being no obvious phonological or other explanation for the difference, the retention of a conservative trait here is more likely than a later renewal which might have copied the old format.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> BUBENÍK (1995) discusses the possibility that *-a* may represent a contracted future auxiliary, basing his remarks on Slovak Romani, where it functions as a future. It seems more likely that the original meaning of *-a* is that of a present-future, and that the exclusively future reading in Vlax and the Central dialects is a recent development (see below).

The origin of the perfective marker is in the OIA past participle affix *-ta*. Proto-Romani, though conservative in preserving the present inflection, evidently participated in the process that resulted in a complete collapse of the old past inflection. This was substituted for in Indo-Iranian as a whole through the generalisation of the past participle, beginning with intransitives and ultimately encompassing transitives as well. The participle with adjectival concord still forms the unspecified past tense in languages like Hindi. In Eastern and Northwestern NIA, as well as in Iranian, person markers attach to the participle to form a new past-tense inflection, and this is the path taken in Proto-Romani too. Already at the Proto-Romani stage the perfective marker underwent phonological differentiation. Following the voiced dentals *-r, l, n-* as well as *v* it shows voice assimilation, giving *-d-*. Following vowels, the dental stop shifts to a dental lateral, giving *-l-*. Elsewhere, one might assume continuation in Proto-Romani of *\*-t-*. Once the phonological rule on *-t-* retention/shift ceased to be productive, the language was left with three distinct morphological classes of perfective markers – in *-d-*, *-l-*, and *-t-*.

In Early Romani, however, consonant combinations resulting from the attachment of the old perfective marker *-ta* to particular consonantal verb stems evidently tended to be avoided. The more extreme cases which demanded earlier solutions were those where the clash resulting from dissimilar articulations was most extreme: the combinations *\*-mt-*, *\*-gt-*, more so than *\*-čt-* or *\*-št-* (see below). The regularity with which the change progresses in the various dialects makes it likely that the trigger for the development will have been shared. On the other hand the diversity of outcomes in individual dialects points to a recent development, one that followed after the dispersion. We can therefore place the roots of this development in the Early Romani period. The solution to the articulatory tension that the clusters create is to re-assign the relevant verb stems to a different morphological class, namely the (originally post-vocalic) class in *-l-*. The hierarchical progression of class re-assignment found across Romani dialects is depicted in (5):

- (5) The hierarchical progression of class re-assignment (*-d-* > *-l-*) in perfective markers:  
*-m-, -g- > -k-, -kh- > -č-, -čh- > š, s*

Only the most conservative dialects still show traces of the *-t-* marker with stems in *-m-* (Welsh Romani *kam-d-om* 'want-PFV-1SG = 'I wanted', with late voicing, Latvian Romani *kam-dž-om* alongside *kam-j-om* < *\*kam-lj-om*), while forms in *-t-* have a higher survival chance in positions following sibilants. Full re-assignment across all articulatory positions appears to have taken place in Vlax, the Central dialects, and the group of dialects referred to by BORETZKY (1999a) as Southern Balkan I.

A further phonological process affecting perfective markers is jotation. Once again, the presence of yod can be traced back to Proto-Romani, but its effects on the preceding segment date from Early Romani and later. The result is variation within Romani primarily among markers in *\*-dj- > -d-/d'-/dž-* and *\*-lj- > -l-/l'-/j-*, respectively. The inventory of perfective markers is enriched by the affix *-in-*, also deriving from an OIA participle, in *-ina*, and by the affix *-il-*, which is of OIA adjectival origin (*-illa*) and serves to mark the perfective of de-transitive derivations (passives and inchoative).

A point on inflection that has more direct bearing on our reconstruction of the historical-semantic development of TAM categories is the issue of the origin of personal concord markers in past-tense (perfective) categories, which are distinct from those inherited from the OIA present set of subject concord markers: 1SG *-om/-em/-im/-um*, 2SG *-al/-an*, 3SG M *-o* F *-i* for intransitives, and gender-independent *-as* for transitives (subsequently spreading to

intransit  
not just f  
for the 3  
Imperfec  
been to r  
ciple wit  
guages a  
and past

There  
fails to ac  
of the pr  
changes  
is *-om*). S  
transitiv  
ticipial c  
*ker-d-as*  
F = she c  
ical form  
mations,  
*om* along  
as well as  
Ukrainia

A new  
by BLOC  
concord  
of marke  
inspirati  
ula form  
BLOCH'S  
ending f  
*tu* basing  
accordin  
accordin  
though s  
lated the  
shifted t  
son mar  
larity of  
that the

What  
the parti  
tense an  
oblique  
possessi

<sup>2</sup> A pro  
TURN

intransitives as well), 1PL *-am*, 2PL *-an* and 3PL *-e*. Remarkably, this set is used in Romani not just for the past tenses of lexical verbs, but also for the present tense of the copula (except for the 3PL, which is identical with the 3SG). The past form of the copula is always in the Imperfect (*s-om-as* 'be-1SG-REM = I was'). The traditional view in Romani linguistics has been to regard the perfective or past-tense formation as an amalgamation of the past participle with the copula auxiliary. This is indeed the path that is followed in various NIA languages as well as in Iranian, though in the latter it often figures in the renewal of both present and past-tense concord sets.

There are however several problems with the copula-turned-past-concord theory. First, it fails to account for the origin of the copula markers themselves, which are distinct from those of the present-tense concord set of lexical verbs, and which in some cases defy regular sound changes (thus the 1SG present marker is *-ava* < OIA *-ami*, but the past/copula 1SG marker is *-om*). Second, it fails to address two related morphological splits – the person split and the transitivity split: in the past tense, the 3SG may in some dialects show plain adjectival-participial concord, with no person markers, but the formation is confined to intransitives, thus *ker-d-as* 'do-PFV-3SG = s/he did', but *avi-l-o* 'come-PFV-M = he came', *avi-l-i* 'come-PFV-F = she came'. Finally, it does not take into account other similarities between past-tense lexical formations and the present copula, which indicate that both are originally past tense formations, notably variable stem extensions with the historical participial ending *-in-* (*d-in-om* alongside *di-j-om* 'give-PFV-1SG = I gave', and *s-in-om* alongside *s-j-om/s-om* 'I am'), as well as the occasional *t*-derived marker in the copula (*s-t'-om*, *s-l'-om* 'I am', in southern Ukrainian and Southern Central dialects; cf. BORETZKY 1999b:238).

A new direction in the historical reconstruction of the copula concord set was proposed by BLOCH (1932a). BLOCH derived the person markers from a combination of original verbal concord markers and pronominal elements.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, he suggested that this mixed set of markers was attached not to the present stem of the copula, but to its past participle. His inspiration came from POTT's (1846) and MACALISTER's (1914) discussion of the Domari copula form in *ašt-*, where the participle affix is more clearly visible than in the Romani forms. BLOCH's reconstruction goes as follows: for the 1SG he allows both an historical inflection ending from MIA *-ahmi* or a pronominal form in *me*. For the 2SG he suggests pronominal *tu* basing his reconstruction on Domari *-ur*, the cognate form having been lost in Romani according to him. For the 1PL BLOCH proposes the concord marker in MIA *-mha*. The 2PL according to BLOCH was the original present 2PL concord marker in *-tha* > *-l* (Domari *-s*, though such a development is questionable). The idea is that in Romani this form assimilated the 2SG, giving the *-l* that is still preserved in central European dialects. The 2PL later shifted to *-an*, by analogy to the 3PL present concord marker of lexical verbs. The 3rd person markers are continuations of the plain participial markers. BLOCH interprets the regularity of SG *-o-* versus PL *-e-* in the Domari concord markers as support for his argument that the pronominal/person endings were attached to the participle.

What BLOCH appears to have disregarded is the motivation for the attachment of clitics to the participle, a necessary clue to their original identity. In Domari, the set of singular past-tense and copula concord markers 1SG *-om*, 2SG *-or*, 3SG *-os* is identical with the set of oblique pronominal clitics that serve both as pronominal direct objects (with verbs) and as possessives (with nouns). This strengthens the argument in favour of their pronominal ori-

<sup>2</sup> A pronominal origin of the Domari 1SG copula concord marker had already been suggested by TURNER (1926).



gin; in fact, it ought to trigger the search for their origin in oblique rather than nominative pronouns. The past tense concord markers in both Romani and Domari are likely to have emerged as possessives, which followed the past participle in the construction *\*kerd-o-me* 'done-by-me' leading to *kerdjom* 'I did'. Marking the agent through the possessive construction, following the generalisation of the past/passive participle in the past tense, led the way toward the re-analysis of the passive participle as an active personal construction, and to the emergence of ergativity in NIA; there is some evidence that Proto-Romani participated in this development (see BUBENÍK 2000).

BLOCH's ambivalent etymology for the 1SG marker can therefore be revised in favour of the oblique pronominal *me*, while the 2SG marker is better derived from oblique *te* rather than nominative *tu*, rendering Romani *-l* (*kerdal* 'you did', preserved in Central dialects, Sinte, and Finnish Romani), and its cognate Domari *-r* (*kardor* 'you did').<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the 3SG marker of both languages can be accounted for in this manner as deriving from the MIA 3SG oblique pronoun *se*. In the first stage this 3SG pronoun will only have appeared as an agentive marker when the predication included explicit mentioning of a direct object (X's doing of Y). This is the stage still attested in Domari (cf. MATRAS 1999): *karda* 'he did', *kardi* 'she did', but *kardos-is* 's/he did it'. In Proto-Romani, the agentive 3SG marker was generalised to all usages of transitive verbs (*kerdas* 's/he did'), while the 3SG of the intransitive verb remained a plain participle (*gelo* 'he went', *geli* 'she went'). It was assimilated into the transitive inflection only from the late Early Romani period onwards. The process is still ongoing in Vlax, Southern Central, and Balkan dialects, which preserve the active participle with some verbs.

The internal consistency in the appearance of the 3SG person marker suggests that we are not dealing at all with the attachment to the past participle of the copula, but of oblique clitic pronouns. This leads me to conclude that the present copula concord set, and the past lexical concord set, emerged together, as part of the same development by which the past participle was generalised and supplemented by endings of pronominal origin. The origin of both lexical past tense verbs and the present copula in original participles explains the insertions in *-in* which the two classes share. The Romani present copula is in fact a past copula, later turned present. It has lost its original past-tense function, which was compensated for at a later stage through the attachment of the remoteness marker *-as* to form an imperfective past. A similar development is currently in progress in Domari, where the perfect forms of the existential verb *hromi* 'I have become' < OIA *bhuv-* (as opposed to *štom* 'I am', < OIA *as-*, where the process occurred earlier) are gradually taking the place of the present-tense enclitic copula *homi* 'I am' (cf. MATRAS 1999). But even in Romani there are still traces of the original function of the set in some dialects, namely in Southern Central and southern Ukrainian varieties, where forms in *šjom/sl'om* may take either past-tense or present-tense meaning (cf. BORETZKY 1999b: 238; BARANNIKOV 1934: 99).

We may thus postulate the following scenario: the initial point of departure is the loss of the OIA past-tense paradigm and the generalisation in its place of past participles. These are later linked to agentive expressions, the agent being represented by oblique pronominal clitics. This pattern is well-attested in the past-tense concord set of Kashmiri, where at least 1SG *-m*, 2SG *-th*, and 2PL *-wi* clearly originate in the respective late MIA oblique clitics *me*, *te*, and *bhe*. The similarities with the Kashmiri pattern (and that of other Dardic languages; cf. GRIERSON 1906: 60) provide yet another feature that Proto-Romani (and Domari) shares

<sup>3</sup> For a description of late MIA pronouns and clitic pronouns see BUBENÍK 1996: 86–96.

with the Dardic languages.<sup>4</sup> In Romani and Domari, we can account for all singular forms by deriving them from oblique pronominal clitics: 1SG *-om*, 2SG *-al* (Domari *-or*), 3SG *-as* (Domari *-os*), from MIA *-me*, *-te* and *-se* respectively. The 3PL in both languages is a continuation of the adjectival past participle. In the Romani copula, the 3PL assimilates into the 3SG form. The picture in the 1PL and 2PL remains somewhat more obscure. At least the Domari 1PL form *-ēn* can easily be traced back to the late MIA 1PL oblique pronominal clitic *ne*. It is possible that *\*-an* may have been the original Romani form too, which then underwent a change to *-am* under the influence of the 1PL pronoun *amen*. Such influence can be seen in the present concord form 1PL *-asa-m* (from *-asa*) in Northeastern varieties of Romani. The original 1PL form *\*-an* could have infiltrated the 2PL, giving rise to what we now find as 2PL *-an*, which later also spread to the 2SG in many present-day dialects (possibly even an Early Romani development).

There are two further issues that demand clarification, namely the roots of the vowel that precedes the consonantal concord marker, and the origin of jotation. I suggest that both issues are linked, though here too there is no avoiding some speculation. BLOCH had pointed out the pattern of number agreement represented by the vowels in the Domari concord set.<sup>5</sup> Since his only source on Domari was MACALISTER's rather fragmented discussion, he was unable to detect that the same set of oblique person clitics is also case-sensitive. Thus we find, in their use as possessives, *kury-os* 'his house', but *kury-is-ma* 'in his house' (see MATRAS 1999). This case-sensitivity is independent of the case inflection of the noun itself (nominative *kuri*, oblique *kurya-*, locative *kurya-ma*), and so it must derive from a nominal or pronominal entity that mediated between the noun and the possessive person marker. My suggestion is that the oblique pronominal clitics which gave rise to the set of past-tense concord markers (including the copula) in Romani and Domari, and to the possessives in Domari, where originally linked as agentives and possessives to the past participle and the noun, respectively, via a set of mediating relativisers, a kind of izafe particle, which inflected for number and case: *\*karda-(j)o-me* lit. 'done-which.NOM.SG-by.me' > *kerdjom* 'I did'; Domari *kuri-o-me* lit. 'house-which.NOM.SG-of.me' > *kuryom* 'my house'. The fact that the concord markers of transitive perfective verbs show number agreement with the subject rather than the object indicates re-structuring of the paradigm in the post-ergative phase, and the integration of the transitive and intransitive paradigms: the original agentive clitics are re-interpreted as plain subject markers and are now also assigned to intransitive verbs, while the transitive plain past participles now agree with the subject rather than the object, just like intransitives, allowing to use plain participles (i.e. lacking person markers) for the transitive 3PL (*kerde* 'they did', rather than *\*they were done*) and, at least in Domari, also for the transitive 3SG (*karda* 'he did', not *\*he was done*). The structure of the 3SG intransitive is still subject to variation and continuing re-structuring in Romani (see below). It is most likely that during this phase the mediating particles also "switched" alignment to agree with the subject, hence the distribution of number markers attested in the present-day forms.

We now turn to jotation. In the Romani perfective verb jotation is always linked to the presence of a person marker, while adjectival participles remain unaffected by it. Its origin is there-

<sup>4</sup> Domari is more conservative in retaining the clitics in their oblique function as well. Thus *ēr-os* 'it came to him', cf. Kashmiri *ā-s* (MASICA 1991 : 298).

<sup>5</sup> The full set for Domari is singular 1 *-om*, 2 *-or*, 3 *-os*, plural 1 *-in*, *-es*, *-e*. Here too there are parallels with some of the Dardic languages described by GRIERSON (1906). In Shina the singular forms have a mediating vowel in *a/o* while the plural forms have *e*. In Gawar-Bati the singular forms have *e* and plurals have *a*. Kashmiri has preserved singular forms in *u* with variable plural forms.

fore clearly connected to that of the person markers. Whether the yod component of the mediating particle can be related to the OIA relativiser in *y-* or not (in initial position the glide would have rendered *dž*), must be left open; quite possibly we are dealing with a local jotation process, of which we find several in Proto-Romani morpheme boundaries. While jotation was lost, or never emerged, in Domari, its effect in Proto-Romani may have been to alter the quality of the vowel of the Izafe-like mediating particle to *-a-* in all positions except the salient 1SG (hence Romani *kerdjom* 'I did' but *kerdjäl* 'you did', Domari *kardom* and *kardor*).

Following the structural renewal of the perfective category in Proto-Romani, an additional category emerged through external affixation of an agglutinating marker, uninflected for person or number. BLOCH (1932b:59) postulates *\*-asi* as the ancestral (Proto-Romani) form, from which present-day dialects of Romani derived both *-as/-ys/-s* and *-ahi* (in some Arli varieties even *-asi*). The form suggests itself as a copula form, < OIA *asi-* (see BLOCH 1932b). The addition of a copula as a remote tense marker is found elsewhere in Indo-Iranian, though usually the forms inflect for person and number. Romani agrees here too with Domari, which has a marker *-a* in identical function (MATRAS 1999). While there is no evidence to support HANCOCK'S (1995b:33) impression that *-as(i)* was directly borrowed from the (literary) Persian 3SG enclitic copula *-ast*, Iranian does offer a possible model for imitation. Let us first establish that the Romani remoteness marker must have emerged in Proto-Romani after the complete re-structuring of the perfective or past paradigm, since it appears in a position external to it. It is therefore quite possible that we are dealing with a development that arose in contact with Iranian, in-between the late Indian (Dardic) and European periods of Romani. A pattern that seems to match the requirements of a model for the Romani remoteness marker is found in Kurdish. Here, the perfect is formed through attachment of a uniform 3SG present copula form to the inflected (perfective) past tense: *ket-im-e* 'I have fallen', *ket-iy-e* 'you have fallen', *ket-in-e* 'we have fallen'. There is in addition a counterpart form *-a* which appears in conjunction with a subjunctive marker to form the irrealis, and which (depending on dialect) may be either internal or external to the person marker: *bi-ket-am-a* 'that I should fall' (cf. realis *bi-ket-im* 'that I fall'). The isolated function of the *-a* affix is related to semantic distance or remoteness. The Kurdish model is especially close to Domari: in addition to the remoteness marker in *-a* Domari also has a contextualising affix in *-i* that attaches to the plain (non-perfective) stem to form the present tense, and to the perfective stem to form the perfect (*kardom* 'I did', *kardomi* 'I have done').

Much discussion has been devoted to the historical development of the Romani remoteness marker *-as(i)* (for a summary see BUBENÍK 1995: 6–10). Most attempts to explain the choice of the copula examined the Pluperfect/Conditional and Imperfect separately, and failed to recognise remoteness as the semantic feature that unites the two. Neither the conditional meaning of the Pluperfect/Counterfactual nor the progressive aspectual meaning conveyed by the Imperfect are inherent to *-as(i)*. The function of the Proto-Romani copula that attached to the person-inflected finite verb was to highlight a contextual point of reference against which the event encoded by the verb appeared as remote. It is likely to have been the past copula that was chosen for this purpose. BORETZKY (quoted in HANCOCK 1995b:32) points to the case of Arli, which shows repetition of the same development as Proto-Romani by generalising a past-tense 3SG enclitic copula *sine/hine* as a marker of remoteness (in my terms). The Kurdish pattern shows that Iranian influence is not unlikely to have triggered the emergence of the remoteness marker in both Romani and Domari, though both languages differ from Kurdish in allowing the remote category to operate independently of irrealis modality.

### 5. The distribution and renewal of TAM categories in Romani dialects

Five formal TAM categories are inherited from Early Romani (see Fig. 3): Past, Imperfect, Pluperfect/Counterfactual, Present/Future, and Subjunctive.

Past (adjectival agreement for intransitives)	Present/Future
remote: Imperfect, Pluperfect/Counterfactual	-a
-as(i)	Subjunctive
	-ø

Figure 3: Early Romani TAM categories and markers

The present section is devoted to the later developments that affected the TAM system in individual dialects. Some principal, representative developments are summarised in Fig. 4:

	pfv	rem	pres	subj	fut	decl	evid	perf	cond	aktionsart	slasp
Arli	+	<i>s/h-ine</i>	-a	-ø	<i>ka</i>						
Sepečides	+	-as	-a	-ø	<i>ka</i>			<i>ther-</i>			
Bugurdži	+	-as	-a	-ø	<i>ka</i>				<i>bi</i>		
Prilep	+	-as	-a/-ø	-ø	<i>ka</i>			<i>s-</i>			
Sofia Erli	+	-as	-ø		<i>ka</i>	-a			<i>(bi)</i>		
Gurbet	+	-ah	-ø		<i>ka</i>		<i>(-o/-i)</i>				
Keld/Lovari	+	-as	-ø		-a		<i>-o/-i</i>				
Romungro	+	-ahi	-ø		-a					calq/Hungarian	
Roman	+	-ahi	-ø		-a					calq/German	
Finnish	+	-as	-ø		-a						
N. Central	+	-as	-ø		-a				<i>bi</i>		+
Polska Roma	+	-ys	-ø		-a				<i>by</i>		+
Xaladitka	+	-as	-a/-ø	-ø	<i>l-</i>				<i>by</i>		+
Latvian	+	-as	-a/-ø	-ø						Latvian	+
Welsh	+	-as	-a/-ø	-ø							
Sinte	+	-s	-a/-ø	-ø						calq/German	

Figure 4: TAM categories and markers in present-day Romani dialects

The past tenses remain on the whole conservative. The perfective is the most conservative of all categories, having undergone little significant restructuring (disregarding of course changes to inflectional forms) in any of the dialects since the Early Romani period. The only noteworthy change is the gradual retreat of the 3SG form with adjectival agreement, or "active participle", as in *gelo* 'he went' *geli* 'she went', *kerdjilo* 'it (m) was done' *kerdjili* 'it (f) was done', which appears to have been confined to intransitives already in Early Romani. It is gradually substituted through the person-inflected forms of transitive verbs: *geljas* 'he/she went', *kerdjilas* 'it (m/f) was done'. The distribution of the active participle is geographical: it has disappeared completely in the Northern and Northern Central dialects, but survives in the Balkans, and is facultative in the transition regions between the Balkans and central Europe. In Vlax and in Southern Central dialects,<sup>6</sup> active participles co-exist with person-inflected forms.

<sup>6</sup> Roman and other varieties of the Vend sub-group. The loss of participles in the northern varieties of the Southern Central dialects appears to be a recent development (cf. Elšík et al. 1999: 356).

The group of intransitive verbs that take the active participle is open to variation among dialects. Most common are verbs of motion and change of state. In some Vlax dialects, the opposition between active participle and person-inflected form has been functionalised, with the active participle denoting a kind of evidentiality (see MATRAS 1995): *avilas* 'he arrived' (unmarked person-inflected form), *avilo* 'he arrived suddenly/unexpectedly/surprisingly' (evidential active participle). The primary function of these evidentials is to indicate surprise or unexpectedness at the discourse level, rather than to mark out the actual source of information as secondary (as is the case with prototypical inferentials, e.g. in Turkish). The use of Romani evidentials may however overlap with reported speech or inference (non-eyewitness) if the speaker wishes to disclaim responsibility for the possible effect that the presentation of information may have on the hearer, such as non-acceptance or disbelief by the hearer and subsequent weakening of the speaker's discursive authority.

Structural stability is also characteristic of the remote tenses, the Imperfect and the Pluperfect/Counterfactual. Renewal of the remote tenses is found only in Arli of Kosovo and Macedonia, where the synthetic agglutinative markers are replaced by an analytic marker. This marker is *sine/hine*, the 3SG past tense of the copula, which follows the person-inflected tense form of the present for the imperfect – *kerava sine* 'I was doing' – and of the perfective for the pluperfect *kerjum sine* 'I had done'. A contact-induced innovation is the development of an analytic Perfect. In the dialect of the Sepečides, now spoken in Turkey but whose speakers immigrated from Greece, older speakers maintain a Perfect based on the possessive verb *ther-* 'to have' followed by the passive participle, copying Greek perfect formation: *therava les dikhlo* 'I have seen him' (CECH & HEINSCHINK 1999: 49). In the Prilep dialect, a similar Perfect has emerged under Macedonian influence, linking the passive participle with the auxiliary 'to be': *sinum tumenge vakerdo* 'I have told you' (BORETZKY ms). For a small number of situative verbs, comparable constructions may denote the Present: Polska Roma *me som bešto* 'I sit/am seated'. This formation appears to be marginal, but it is encountered in various dialects of the Northern and Balkan branches.

By contrast to the past-tense categories, the original setup of the Present/Future/Subjunctive complex involving a Present/Future form (i.e. no morphological marking of the future) and a syncopated Subjunctive form has apparently not been preserved fully intact in any Romani variety. In the Balkan dialects Sepeči, Arli and Bugurdži the morphological opposition between Present and Subjunctive is maintained, but here a further differentiation is introduced into the system through the emergence of an analytic future in *ka*. A transitional system is found in a number of dialects (Welsh, Latvian, Xaladitka, Prilep, some Sinte varieties). Here the syncopated Subjunctive forms infiltrate the Present indicative, leading to a gradual collapse of the subjunctive/indicative opposition. In some dialects a similar development has led to the specialisation of the original Present/Future long form in *-a* for modal/future use, while the short forms are generalised for the Present indicative. This is most obvious in a geographical cluster of central-eastern European dialects, comprising the Vlax and Central dialects as well as the adjoining Polska Roma variety. In Welsh Romani the long forms are optional in the Present, but obligatory in the Future. In Erli, the long forms appear sporadically in a confirmative-declarative function (BORETZKY 1998: 141). Likewise the long forms in Northern Vlax, which generally denote the future, may have present-tense declarative-confirmative meaning (*kamasa* 'we do indeed want!'). HANCOCK (1995a:142) has referred to this as an "oratorical present", due to its association with ceremonial speech.

The building of an analytic Future adds a further dimension to the changes in the Present/Future/Subjunctive setup. The feature is most conspicuous in the Balkans, where it is best

represented by the particle *ka/kam*, a contracted form of *kam-* 'to want', and more marginally by *ma-* from *mang-* 'to want, demand'. Both are calques on a pan-Balkan future particle derived from the verb 'to want' (Greek *tha*, Balkan Slavic *ču*, etc). In Romani this may be considered a late Balkanism, one that is not exhibited by varieties of the language that are spoken outside the Balkans, while on the other hand it is adopted by dialects that are by comparison recent arrivals in the region, notably southern Vlax Gurbet and Džambazi, northern Vlax Kalderaš as spoken in Serbia, and Ajia Varvara and Dendropotamos Vlax as spoken in Athens and Thessaloniki, respectively (and prior to that in Turkey). While in Kalderaš the northern Vlax long future in *-a* alternates with the more recently adopted Balkan-type analytic *ka*, the special case of Ajia Varvara shows the takeover of the future through *ka* but retention of *-a* in the conditional. An auxiliary-based analytical future is known from the North Russian (Xaladitka) and Ukrainian dialects, where the verb *l-* 'to take' and *av-* 'to come' act as auxiliaries followed by the subjunctive, introduced by the non-factual complementiser *te*.

The interplay between the formation of the categories Present, Subjunctive, Future and modal functions such as declarative and conditional, are a Romani expression of the universal affinity between the Future and modal categories (cf. COMRIE 1989). The future is a recent category in the language. If it is not left unexpressed altogether, it may draw on three possible resources: it can derive from a kind of "super-indicative", i.e. a specialisation of the original Present indicative for statements that demand increased confirmation since their factual basis is narrow. Closely related readings of the same structure are the declarative and prospective conditional. A second source for the future is modal intentionality, expressed by the modal verb 'to want', from which the future particle derives. The final option is a lexical-aspectual modification through the use of an auxiliary verb. The diversity in the formation of the future and the entire domain of modality might be expected on structural grounds once we assume that a Future category was missing from the Early Romani system. But it is at the same time indicative of the volatility of modal categories: where a solid factual basis for an assertion is missing, speakers are inclined to devise new strategies to reinforce their assertive authority.

While no actual form is borrowed into Romani to construct the Future, the model for its formation in the Balkan dialects is calqued on the surrounding languages, recruiting inherited material to match an external pattern. This is the kind of contact development which ROSS (1996) has referred to as "metatypy". Contact developments are exclusively responsible for formations in two further domains: for the emergence of aktionsart marking in Romani, and for the modal categories Conditional and Quotative/Interrogative. There are two types of aktionsart marking: that typical of verbs in German and Hungarian, where verb stems can be combined with so-called verbal particles, and the verb derivational system of Slavic languages, often termed "aspect" though it seems more suitable to consider it as a category in its own right, termed "Slavic aspect" following DAHL (1985; cf. also THIEROFF 1994, 1995).

The first type of aktionsart appears in Romani dialects in intensive contact with German and Hungarian, namely Sinte and Roman (German), and Romungro (Hungarian). IGLA (1992) points out that although the replication of verbal aktionsart must be viewed in the context of overall grammatical and lexical borrowing (from German into Sinte), material borrowing of verb roots and of verbal particles as well as calquing of verbal particles may all occur independently of one another. Thus entire German aktionsart-marked verbs may be replicated (*me ruferau an* 'I call', German *ich rufe an*), the particle can be replicated with

inherited verbs (*oj karas an* 'she called', German *sie rief an*), a replicated verb may be accompanied by a calqued particle (*štrajtaras tele* 'disputed', German *stritt [ $\langle$ streit-] ab*), or the entire verb may be calqued (*kerau pre* 'I open', German [*ich*] *mache auf*). In Roman, calqued or metatypised particles tend to be separable from the verb: *tel pisin-* 'to sign', German *unterschreiben*, *ar cid-* 'take off', German *ausziehen* (but *aun asav* 'to laugh at' German *anlachen*). Aktionsart modifications that are inseparable from the verb are on the other hand all replications of German material: *cadža-* 'to dissolve (intr)', German *zergehen* (*zer-*), *camper-* 'to merge', German *zusammenfallen* (dialectal *zsamma-*). Metatypy based on the Hungarian model characterises the overwhelming majority of verbal particles employed in Romungro, with only isolated occurrences of aktionsart prefixes of Hungarian origin (ELŠÍK et al. 1999: 373). In Latvian Romani, Slavic aspect is inherited from the forerunner dialect, which emerged in contact with Polish. But the system is further enriched through borrowings of Latvian aktionsart prefixes: *iedža-* 'to go in', Latvian *ieiet*, *piedža-* 'to approach', Latvian *pieiet* (MĀNUŠS 1997). In the Aja Varvara Vlach dialect spoken in Athens, there is some borrowing of Greek aktionsart prefixes into the language: *ksanadikh-* 'to see again' (IGLA 1996).

Slavic aspect in Romani is an areal phenomenon, not just in the sense that it is found in Romani dialects in contact with Slavic languages, but also since it is confined to the North-eastern and Northern Central groups of dialects, while Romani dialects in contact with Slavic in the Balkans do not show the feature. Unlike aktionsart, Slavic aspect in Romani appears to be borrowed on a wholesale basis, as a fixed derivational set, applicable in principle to all Romani verb roots, and in practice to those roots that parallel verbs which allow modification in the contact language: Xaladikta (North Russian Romani) *dava* 'I give', *dodava* 'I add', *obdava* 'I embrace', *otdava* 'I confiscate', *piridava* 'I hand over', *podava* 'I obtain', *rozdava* 'I hand out', *vydava* 'I give away', etc. The Romani dialects in question may be said to have undergone "fusion" – in the sense developed in MATRAS (1998) – with the contact languages in the domain of Slavic aspect marking: there is non-separation of the indigenous and contact languages for the grammatical category of Slavic aspect. A further case of fusion is the replication in Romani of conditional *bi/by* and partly also of the interrogative/quotative *li* particles in Romani. Formally, we are dealing here with clitic particles that are easily integrated. Functionally, both domains covered by these particles may be said to involve interaction-related operations, since they directly address the factual validity of propositions. Their replication from the contact language is therefore predictable through the general hierarchy of "fusion" (MATRAS 1998), which foresees the early borrowing of discourse particles, phasal adverbs, and coordinating conjunctions.

## 6. Conclusion

The core opposition expressed in the Romani verb stem is aspectual: perfective versus non-perfective. This is in line with other NIA languages and draws structurally and semantically on the old distinction between the plain and modified verb stem. The development of inflection and agreement alignment patterns of the perfective in Proto-Romani can be placed in an areal context, and the affinity with Dardic languages, as well as with Domari, is apparent. The interpretation pursued above allows insights into the overall historical development of Romani and reinforces the theory of a northwestern connection prior to the out-migration from India, as hypothesised by TURNER (1926) based on phonological evidence.

Tense in Romani is external in the linear plan for the verb. This is well in line with universals of tense representation, and with the linear plan for verb inflection in NIA, though the exceptional feature of Romani is the fact that the tense marker is uninflected, and is external to person inflection. But this pattern has a parallel in Iranian (Kurdish), which again fits the accepted historical scenario of an outwards migration from India via Iranian-speaking territory and possible typological re-structuring under Iranian influence. Romani and Domari share the feature of external tense formation, Domari figuring even somewhat closer to the Iranian model. As for the functional analysis of tense, I have argued that readings such as conditional, irrealis, habitual, frequentative, counterfactual, requestative and so on are derived, either syntactically (e.g. the conditional is derived through combination with a conditional subordinator), or pragmatically (e.g. the requestative). What they share is the feature of contextual distance or remoteness.

Little restructuring of the aspecto-temporal domain has taken place in present-day Romani dialects. The core aspectual distinction and the structural formation by which it is expressed remain stable. New categories (notably the Perfect) are attested, as a contact development, only in the dialects of the Sepečides and Prilep, while only Arli has re-structured its remoteness formation (though its function has not been affected). The evidentials in Vlax might be viewed as a contact-related development owing to the presence of past-tense evidentiality (formed likewise on the basis of older perfective forms) in the Balkans, though for Romani as a whole it is clear that the gradual retreat of the participle is by far the dominant development, compared with the functional differentiation of a person-inflected form versus an active participle. The renewal of the domain present-future-subjunctive is partly internal and partly a result of metatypy or calquing in an areal context. The movement across these categories testifies to the natural functional affinity among them.

An obvious contact-induced change is the emergence of aktionsart marking. Here we are dealing with the import of spatial metaphors to indicate punctuality, duration and involvement. Two distinct structural developments are involved, metatypy and fusion. It appears that the type of process is partly conditioned by the degree of structural integration of the modifying morpheme in the model language. The greater the integration, the greater the tendency to operate with the entire set of original markers from the model language (i.e. the greater the tendency toward fusion). Thus metatypy is frequent in Sinte or Romungro, while fusion allows to adapt to the Slavic model in Northeastern and Northern Central dialects. Other constraints are internal: Metatypy operates on the basis of identification of an L1 element with an L2 model element and the subsequent functional syncretisation of the two. Thus it demands internal creativity, and it is also bound by the internal resources that are available in the language. This explains why Sinte employs *pre* 'up' to match German *auf*, but borrows German *hin*, having no internal preposition or adverb with dative-directional meaning that can match the L2 model.

While formal criteria will determine the particular course that a contact-induced change will take – metatypy or fusion – it is apparent that aktionsart is in principle sensitive to areal development. This can be seen in the areal clustering of grammaticalised aktionsart in Slavic, Baltic, Hungarian, and German. Another example of the wholesale borrowing of grammaticalised aktionsart modification into a minority language is the use of Greek-derived prefixes in Aromanian (ZIUDRU 2000). What makes aktionsart attractive for imitation and syncretisation across languages? Theories of contact-induced change have noted the contact-susceptibility of cultural loans in the lexicon, of clause-combining strategies in syntax, and of interaction-monitoring strategies in discourse (discourse operators). Less attention has



been devoted to the morphosemantics that represent a speaker's comprehensive perspective of the predication, as the core of the proposition. Aktionsart borrowing of the kind that is relevant to our discussion signifies that in the middle of this perspective stands the conceptualisation of punctuality, duration, and other evaluative properties of the predication in terms of spatial metaphors. These in turn are aligned to match the grammatical expression of spatial relations in the language through prepositions and adverbs. Both dimensions – the conceptualisation in spatial terms, and the assignment of spatial metaphors to the grammatical grid of available spatial expressions – are imported from the model language. We can take this as an indication of the transferability of a "view of the world" pertaining to the conceptualisation of action – or: predication-related conceptual adaptation – which defies the structural boundaries between linguistic systems, and moreover, encourages structural adaptation and syncretisation of these systems.

### Abbreviations

CALQ	calqued formation	OIA	Old Indo-Aryan
COND	conditional	PL	plural
COMP	complementiser	PERF	perfect
DECL	declarative	PFV	perfective
DETRANS	de-transitive	PRES	present
EVID	evidential	QUOT	quotative
F	feminine	REM	remote
FUT	future	SG	singular
LOAN	loan verb adaptation affix	SLASP	Slavic aspect
M	masculine	SUBJ	subjunctive
MIA	Middle Indo-Aryan	TAM	tense-aspect-modality
NIA	New Indo-Aryan	TRANS	transitive
NOM	nominative		

### References

- BAKKER, PETER (1997): Athematic morphology in Romani: The borrowing of a borrowing pattern, in: MATRAS, YARON et al. (eds.), *The typology and dialectology of Romani*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1–21.
- BARANNIKOV, A. P. (1934): *The Ukrainian and South Russian Gypsy dialects*. Leningrad: Academy of Science.
- BLOCH, JULES (1932a): Le présent du verbe "être" en tzigane, in: *Indian Linguistics* 2, 309–316.
- BLOCH, JULES (1932b): Survivance de skr. āstī en indien moderne, in: *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique* 33.1, 55–65.
- BORETZKY, NORBERT (1993): *Bugurdži. Deskriptiver und historischer Abriß eines Romani-Dialekts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- BORETZKY, NORBERT (1994): *Romani. Grammatik des Kalderaš-Dialekts mit Texten und Glossar*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- BORETZKY, NORBERT (1996): Arli. Materialien zu einem südbalkanischen Romani-Dialekt, in: HALWACHS, DIETER (ed.), *Romani I*. (Grazer Linguistische Studien 46), 1–30.
- BORETZKY, NORBERT (1998): Eri: Eine Bestandsaufnahme nach den Texten von Gilliat-Smith, in: *Studii Romani* V-VI, 122–160.
- BORETZKY, NORBERT (1999a): *Die Verwandtschaftsbeziehungen zwischen den südbalkanischen Romani-Dialekten*. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang.
- BORETZKY, NORBERT (1999b): Die Gliederung der zentralen Dialekte und die Beziehungen zwischen südlichen zentralen Dialekten (Romungro) und südbalkanischen Romani-Dialekten. in: HAL-

- WACHS, DIETER & MENZ, FLORIAN (eds), *Die Sprache der Roma. Perspektiven der Romani-Forschung in Österreich im interdisziplinären und internationalen Kontext*. Klagenfurt: Drava, 210–276.
- BOREZKY, NORBERT (ms): Der Dialekt von Prilep. Ms.
- BUBENÍK, VÍT (1995): On typological changes and structural borrowing in the history of European Romani, in: MATRAS, YARON (ed.), *Romani in contact. The history, structure and sociology of a language*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1–23.
- BUBENÍK, VÍT (1996): *The structure and development of Middle Indo-Aryan dialects*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- BUBENÍK, VÍT (2000): Was Proto-Romani an ergative language?, in: ELŠÍK, VIKTOR & MATRAS, YARON (eds.), *Grammatical relations in Romani: The noun phrase*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 205–227.
- BÜHLER, KARL (1934 [1982]): *Sprachtheorie*. Stuttgart: Fischer.
- CECH, PETRA & HEINSCHINK, MOZES (1999): *Sepečides-Romani. Grammatik, Texte und Glossar eines türkischen Romani-Dialekts*. Osteuropa-Institut an der Freien Universität Berlin. (Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen 34). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- COMRIE, BERNARD (1976): *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- COMRIE, BERNARD (1989): On identifying future tenses, in: ABRAHAM, WERNER & JANSSEN, THEO (eds.), *Tempus-Aspekt-Modus*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 51–63.
- DAHL, ÖSTEN (1985): *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- ELŠÍK, VIKTOR (2000): Romani nominal paradigms: Their structure, diversity and development, in: ELŠÍK, VIKTOR & MATRAS, YARON (eds.), *Grammatical relations in Romani: The noun phrase*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 9–30.
- ELŠÍK, VIKTOR; HÜBSCHMANNOVÁ, MILENA & ŠEBKOVÁ, HANA (1999): The Southern Central (*ahi*-imperfect) Romani dialects of Slovakia and northern Hungary, in: HALWACHS, DIETER & MENZ, FLORIAN (eds.), *Die Sprache der Roma. Perspektiven der Romani-Forschung in Österreich im interdisziplinären und internationalen Kontext*. Klagenfurt: Drava, 277–390.
- GRIERSON, GEORGE A. (1906): *The Pišāca languages of North-Western India*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.
- HALWACHS, DIETER (1998): *Amaro vakeripe Roman hi – Unsere Sprache ist Roman: Texte, Glossar und Grammatik der burgenländischen Romani-Variante*. Klagenfurt: Drava.
- HANCOCK, IAN (1995a): *A handbook of Vlax Romani*. Columbus: Slavica.
- HANCOCK, IAN (1995b): On the migration and affiliation of the Dömba: Iranian words in Rom, Lom, and Dom Gypsy, in: MATRAS, YARON (ed.), *Romani in contact. The history, structure and sociology of a language*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 25–51.
- HOLZINGER, DANIEL (1993): *Das Rómanes. Grammatik und Diskursanalyse der Sprache der Sinte*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- HOLZINGER, DANIEL (1996): Verbal aspect and thematic organization of Sinte narrative discourse, in: HALWACHS, DIETER (ed.), *Romani I*. (Grazer Linguistische Studien 46), 111–129.
- IGLA, BIRGIT (1992): Entlehnung und Lehnübersetzung deutscher Präfixverben im Sinti, in: ERFURT, JÜRGEN et al. (eds.), *Prinzipien des Sprachwandels I. Vorbereitung*. Bochum: Brockmeyer, 38–56.
- IGLA, BIRGIT (1996): *Das Romani von Ajia Varvara. Deskriptive und historisch-vergleichende Darstellung eines Zigeunerndialekts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- JOHANSON, LARS (1971): *Aspekt im Türkischen*. Uppsala: University.
- JOHANSON, LARS (1994): Türkeitürkische Aspekttempora, in: THIEROFF, ROLF & BALLWEG, JOACHIM (eds.), *Tense systems in European languages*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 247–266.
- MĀNUŠS, LEKSA; NEILANDS, JĀNIS & RUDEVĪČS, KĀRLIS (1997): *Čigānu-latviešu-angļu etimoloģiskā vārdnīca un latviešu-čigānu vārdnīca*. Rīgā: Zvaigzne ABC.
- MACALISTER, R. A. S. (1914): *The Language of the Nawar or Zutt, the nomad smiths of Palestine*. London: Edinburgh University Press.
- MASICA, COLIN (1991): *The Indo-Aryan languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MATRAS, YARON (1994): *Untersuchungen zu Grammatik und Diskurs des Romanes. Dialekt der Kelde-raša/Lovara*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- MATRAS, YARON (1995): Verb evidentials and their discourse function in Vlax Romani narratives, in: MATRAS, YARON (ed.), *Romani in contact. The history, structure, and sociology of a language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 95–123.
- MATRAS, YARON (1998): Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing, in: *Linguistics* 36.2, 281–331.

- MATRAS, YARON (1999): The state of present-day Domari in Jerusalem, in: *Mediterranean Language Review* 11.1, 1–58.
- POTT, AUGUST (1846): Über die Sprache der Zigeuner in Syrien, in: *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft der Sprache* 1, 175–186.
- REICHENBACH, HANS (1947 [1963]): *Elements of symbolic logic*. New York: Macmillan.
- ROSS, MALCOLM (1996): Contact-induced change and the comparative method, in: DURIE, MARK & ROSS, MALCOLM (eds.), *The comparative method reviewed*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 190–217.
- SAMPSON, JOHN (1926 [1968]): *The dialect of the Gypsies of Wales*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- THIEROFF, ROLF (1994): Inherent verb categories and categorizations in European languages, in: THIEROFF, ROLF & BALLWEG, JOACHIM (eds.), *Tense systems in European languages*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 3–45.
- THIEROFF, ROLF (1995): More on inherent verb categories in European languages, in: THIEROFF, ROLF (ed.), *Tense systems in European languages II*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1–36.
- TURNER, RALPH (1926): The position of Romani in Indo-Aryan, in: *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* (Third Series) 5.4, 145–189.
- ZIUDRU, EVANTHIA (2000): *Split morphology in Aromanian verb prefixation*. University of Manchester BA Dissertation, May 2000.

MATRAS, YARON  
University of Manchester  
Department of Linguistics  
Manchester M13 9PL, UK  
y.matras@man.ac.uk

# ■ Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung

*Language Typology  
and Universals*

Focus on:

**Romani in Typological and Areal Perspective**

Editor: Birgit Igla

**Editor-in-chief:** Th. Stolz, Bremen

**Advisory Board:** W. Bisang, Mainz · N. Boretzky, Bochum · B. Comrie, Leipzig  
W. Croft, Manchester · Ö. Dahl, Stockholm · L. Decsy, Padova · W. Dressler, Wien  
M. Haspelmath, Leipzig · E. König, Berlin · G. Lüdi, Basel · H. Lüdtke, Kiel · U. Mosel, Kiel  
P. Muysken, Leiden · V. P. Nedjalkov, St. Petersburg · W. Oesterreicher, München  
P. Ramat, Pavia · W. Raible, Freiburg · H.-J. Sasse, Köln · H. Seiler, Lenzburg  
P. Sgall, Prag · M. Shibatani, Kobe · U. Stephany, Köln · S. Thompson, Santa Barbara  
T. Vennemann, Ried · Wolfgang U. Wurzel, Berlin



Akademie Verlag