

Univerzita Karlova

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav obecné lingvistiky

Filologie – Obecná lingvistika

Eastern Uzh varieties of North Central Romani

Východoužské variety severocentrální romštiny

Mgr. Michael Beníšek

DISERTAČNÍ PRÁCE

školitel: Mgr. Viktor Elšík, Ph.D.

2017

Prohlášení:

Prohlašuji, že jsem disertační práci napsal samostatně s využitím pouze uvedených a řádně citovaných pramenů a literatury a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze, dne 12. 4. 2017

.....
Jméno a příjmení

Abstract

The dissertation provides a grammatical description of a cluster of Romani varieties, called 'Eastern Uzh Romani', which are spoken in Transcarpathian Ukraine in an area adjacent to the Slovak border. These varieties are associated with five traditional locations, two of which are situated in the city of Uzhhorod, representing an eastern margin of a North Central Romani dialect continuum. The focus is not only on describing the common characteristics of the entire Eastern Uzh dialect, but also on highlighting its variation with respect to specific features of the individual varieties. The description is based on first-hand data collected during numerous fieldwork trips of the author between 2007 and 2016.

The dissertation is organised into thirteen chapters. Alongside the proper grammatical description, it provides a detailed overview of the speakers' historical, ethnocultural and sociolinguistic background. The main attention is given to describing inflectional, derivational as well as functional patterns of word classes. In addition, it discusses issues of phonology, including historical phonology within the North Central Romani context, and also covers various syntactic structures.

Keywords: Romani, North Central Romani, dialectology, language description, Transcarpathian Ukraine

Abstrakt

Disertační práce je gramatickým popisem skupiny romských variet nazvaných „východoužská romština“, jimiž se mluví na Zakarpatské Ukrajině v oblasti přiléhající k hranici se Slovenskem. Tyto variety jsou spjaty s pěti tradičními lokalitami, z nichž dvě se nacházejí ve městě Užhorod, a představují východní okraj nářečního kontinua severocentrální romštiny. Důraz je kladen nejen na popis společných charakteristik celého východoužského nářečí, ale také na jeho interní variaci se zřetelem ke specifikům jednotlivých variet. Popis je založen na datech shromážděných v průběhu opakovaného terénního výzkumu autora mezi lety 2007 až 2016.

Disertace se skládá ze třinácti kapitol a vedle vlastního gramatického popisu podává podrobný přehled o historickém, etnokulturním a sociolingvistickém kontextu mluvčích. Hlavní pozornost je věnována flektivním, slovtvorným stejně jako funkčním vzorcům slovních druhů. Práce však diskutuje i fonologické problémy, včetně historické fonologie v kontextu severocentrální romštiny, a pokrývá i různé syntaktické struktury.

Klíčová slova: romština, severocentrální romština, dialektologie, popis jazyka, Zakarpatská Ukrajina

Table of Contents

Abbreviations.....	xvii
Acknowledgement	xix
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Key concepts and preliminary remarks	1
1.2 Eastern Uzh Romani dialect region	5
1.2.1 Geographical, demographical and ethnolinguistic context	5
1.2.2 Eastern Uzh Romani locations	7
1.2.2.1 Uzhhorod	7
1.2.2.1.1 Shakhta.....	9
1.2.2.1.2 Radvanka.....	10
1.2.2.2 Perechyn	11
1.2.2.3 Khudlovo	12
1.2.2.4 Serednie	13
1.2.3 Ethnonymy	14
1.2.4 Sociolinguistic situation	17
1.2.4.1 Vitality of Romani	17
1.2.4.2 Second and contact languages	17
1.3 Methodology and sources of data.....	19
1.3.1 Fieldwork	19
1.3.2 Language data	21
1.3.3 Theoretical framework and the structure of description	24
1.3.4 Previous studies.....	28
1.3.5 Notes on transcription and transliteration	29
2 PHONOLOGY AND ORTHOGRAPHY	31
2.1 Consonants.....	31
2.1.1 Voice	32
2.1.2 Aspiration	33
2.1.3 Palatalisation	35
2.1.4 Sonorants	36
2.1.5 Sibilants.....	36
2.1.6 Non-sibilant fricatives	38
2.1.7 Consonant clusters and geminates.....	39

2.2	Vowels	40
2.2.1	Short vowels	41
2.2.2	Long vowels and diphthongs.....	42
2.2.2.1	Long open vowel /ā/	43
2.2.2.2	Long (diphthong-like) segments of close vowels.....	46
2.2.2.3	Long (diphthong-like) segments of mid vowels.....	47
2.2.2.4	Long (diphthong-like) segments of front rounded vowels	49
2.2.2.5	Lengthened mid monophthongs	50
2.2.2.6	Summary and historical explanation	50
2.2.3	Vowel elisions	52
2.3	Stress.....	52
2.4	Historical phonology	55
2.4.1	Common North Central Romani innovations.....	55
2.4.2	Eastern North Central Romani innovations	56
2.4.3	Uzh Romani innovations.....	57
2.4.4	Uzh Romani conservations.....	59
2.4.5	Phonolexical variation within Eastern Uzh Romani	60
2.4.5.1	Vowel changes.....	60
2.4.5.2	Consonant changes	60
2.4.5.3	Changes in consonant clusters and metatheses.....	61
2.4.5.4	Protheses and aphaereses.....	62
3	VERBS	64
3.1	TAM categories	64
3.1.1	Aspect.....	64
3.1.2	Tense	65
3.1.3	Mood	67
3.2	Verb inflection.....	70
3.2.1	Non-perfective inflection	71
3.2.1.1	Person/number marking (present inflection)	71
3.2.1.1.1	Active consonantal verbs	71
3.2.1.1.2	Active vocalic verbs.....	72
3.2.1.1.3	Middle <i>uv</i> -verbs	72
3.2.1.2	Future inflection	74

3.2.1.3	Imperfect and potential (remote non-perfective) inflection.....	74
3.2.1.4	Imperative inflection.....	76
3.2.2	Perfective inflection	77
3.2.2.1	Perfective stem marking	78
3.2.2.1.1	Perfective stem of consonantal verbs.....	78
3.2.2.1.1.1	Monoconsonantal verbs.....	78
3.2.2.1.1.2	Bases ending in /l/ or /r/.....	78
3.2.2.1.1.3	Bases ending in /n/.....	79
3.2.2.1.1.4	Bases ending in velar, palatal, affricate or sibilant consonants.....	79
3.2.2.1.1.5	Bases ending in /v/.....	80
3.2.2.1.1.6	Bases ending in /d/ barring /nd/.....	80
3.2.2.1.1.7	Bases ending in /nd/.....	81
3.2.2.1.1.8	Bases ending in /m/, /p/ or /j/.....	82
3.2.2.1.2	Perfective stem of vocalic verbs	82
3.2.2.1.3	Perfective stem of middle verbs.....	84
3.2.2.1.4	Perfective suffixes: summary.....	84
3.2.2.2	Person/number marking (aorist inflection).....	85
3.2.2.3	Irrealis (remote perfective) inflection.....	86
3.2.3	Loan-verb integration	89
3.3	Copula.....	90
3.3.1	Present and past indicative copula in <i>s-</i> and <i>h-</i>	91
3.3.2	Non-indicative and future copula in <i>av-</i> and <i>ej-</i>	96
3.3.3	Perfective copula in <i>uv-</i>	98
3.4	Non-finite forms	99
3.4.1	Adjectival participles.....	100
3.4.1.1	Oikoclitic participles.....	102
3.4.1.2	Xenoclitic participles	103
3.4.2	Adverbial participle (gerund)	104
3.4.3	Infinitive	105
3.5	Verb derivation	106
3.5.1	Deverbal derivation	106
3.5.1.1	Lexicalised causatives in <i>-av-</i>	107
3.5.1.2	Causatives in <i>-ar-</i> and <i>-lar-</i>	107

3.5.1.3	Anticausatives.....	108
3.5.1.4	Iteratives	113
3.5.1.5	Prefixal verb modifications	117
3.5.1.5.1	The prefix <i>do-</i>	118
3.5.1.5.2	The prefix <i>ob-</i>	119
3.5.1.5.3	The prefix <i>od-</i>	119
3.5.1.5.4	The prefix <i>po-</i>	120
3.5.1.5.5	The prefix <i>pod-</i>	120
3.5.1.5.6	The prefix <i>pre-</i>	121
3.5.1.5.7	The prefix <i>roz-</i>	123
3.5.1.5.8	The prefix <i>(i)z-</i>	123
3.5.1.5.9	The prefix <i>za-</i>	124
3.5.2	Deadjectival and denominal verbs	124
3.5.2.1	Factitives.....	125
3.5.2.2	Inchoatives.....	126
3.5.2.3	Marginal denominal derivations.....	128
4	NOUNS.....	130
4.1	Noun inflection	130
4.1.1	Layer I.....	131
4.1.1.1	Oikoclitic masculine nouns	132
4.1.1.1.1	Oikoclitic zero masculines.....	133
4.1.1.1.1.1	Basic zero masculines.....	133
4.1.1.1.1.2	Abstract nouns in <i>-(i)be(n)</i> and <i>-(i)pe(n)</i>	134
4.1.1.1.1.3	Zero masculines ending in [aj]	135
4.1.1.1.2	Oikoclitic <i>o-</i> and <i>i-</i> masculines	136
4.1.1.1.3	Inflection of <i>čha</i> ‘son, Romani boy’	137
4.1.1.2	Oikoclitic feminine nouns	137
4.1.1.2.1	Oikoclitic zero feminines.....	138
4.1.1.2.2	Oikoclitic <i>i-</i> feminines	140
4.1.1.2.3	Inflection of <i>āsv-/āsm-</i> ‘teardrop’ and <i>prajt-/prajt’-</i> ‘leaf’	141
4.1.1.3	Xenoclitic masculine nouns.....	142
4.1.1.3.1	Xenoclitic <i>o-</i> and <i>a-</i> masculines.....	143
4.1.1.3.2	Xenoclitic <i>i-</i> and <i>u-</i> masculines.....	144

4.1.1.3.3	Xenoclitic zero masculines	144
4.1.1.3.4	Non-integrated masculine loanwords.....	146
4.1.1.4	Xenoclitic feminine nouns.....	147
4.1.2	Vocative	148
4.1.2.1	Vocative of oikoclitic nouns.....	149
4.1.2.2	Vocative of xenoclitic nouns	152
4.1.3	Layer II case suffixes	154
4.2	Noun derivation	156
4.2.1	Diminutive nouns	157
4.2.1.1	Oikoclitic diminutives in <i>-ōr-</i>	158
4.2.1.2	Xenoclitic diminutives in <i>-(i)c-</i>	159
4.2.2	Nominalisation	160
4.2.2.1	Conversion of adjectives	160
4.2.2.2	Abstract nouns	162
4.2.2.2.1	Abstract nouns in <i>-(i)be(n)</i>	164
4.2.2.2.2	Abstract nouns in <i>-ipe(n)</i>	164
4.2.2.2.3	Abstract nouns in <i>-(V)šāg-</i>	166
4.2.2.2.4	Summary of abstract nominalisers.....	167
4.2.2.3	De-infinitival noun <i>texan</i> ‘food’	167
4.2.3	Agentive and feminine derivation	168
4.2.3.1	Agentive nouns	168
4.2.3.2	Feminine derivation.....	168
4.2.4	Names of fruit trees in <i>-in</i> and <i>-uñ</i>	170
5	ADJECTIVES	171
5.1	Adjective inflection	171
5.1.1	Oikoclitic adjective compartment	171
5.1.1.1	Vocalic adjectives.....	171
5.1.1.2	Zero adjectives.....	172
5.1.2	Xenoclitic adjective compartment.....	173
5.1.2.1	Integration of borrowed adjectives	173
5.1.2.2	Xenoclitic adjective inflection.....	173
5.2	Adjective derivation	175
5.2.1	Deadjectival derivation	176

5.2.1.1	Diminutive adjectives	176
5.2.1.2	Attenuative adjectives.....	176
5.2.1.3	Iterative adjective	177
5.2.1.4	Privative and negative adjectives	177
5.2.2	Denominal, deverbal, and deadverbial oikoclitic derivation.....	177
5.2.2.1	Qualitative adjectives in <i>-al-</i> (<i>-āl-</i>).....	177
5.2.2.2	Qualitative adjectives in <i>-val-</i>	178
5.2.2.3	Qualitative, spatial, and other adjectives in <i>-un-</i>	179
5.2.2.4	Relational adjectives in <i>-an-</i> and <i>-ikan-</i>	180
5.2.2.5	Temporal and other adjectives in <i>-utn-</i>	181
5.2.2.6	Deverbal psych adjectives in <i>-kutn-</i> and <i>-gutn-</i>	182
5.2.2.7	Historical compounds with <i>nang-</i>	182
5.2.3	Denominal xenoclitic derivation	182
5.2.3.1	Relational adjectives in <i>-ik-</i>	183
5.2.3.2	Qualitative adjectives in <i>-Všn-</i>	183
5.2.4	Summary of adjective derivation.....	185
6	PRONOMINAL FORMS.....	187
6.1	Personal, reflexive and reciprocal pronouns.....	187
6.1.1	Personal pronouns	187
6.1.1.1	Non-possessive personal pronouns.....	188
6.1.1.2	Possessive personal pronouns.....	189
6.1.2	Reflexive pronouns	191
6.1.3	Reciprocal pronouns.....	195
6.2	Interrogative pronouns.....	198
6.2.1	Substantival and adjectival interrogatives.....	199
6.2.1.1	Person and thing interrogatives <i>ko</i> and <i>so</i>	199
6.2.1.2	Interrogative <i>savo</i>	200
6.2.1.3	Interrogative <i>soza</i>	201
6.2.2	Adverbial interrogatives	203
6.2.3	Interrogative-based indefinite periphrases	206
6.3	Indefinite pronouns.....	208
6.3.1	Specific indefinites	208
6.3.1.1	Substantival and adjectival specific indefinites.....	209

6.3.1.2	Adverbial specific indefinites	211
6.3.2	Negative indefinites	212
6.3.2.1	Substantival and adjectival negative pronouns	213
6.3.2.2	Adverbial negative pronouns	215
6.3.3	Free-choice indefinites	216
6.3.3.1	Free-choice pronouns in <i>xot'</i> - and its variants	216
6.3.3.2	Free-choice pronouns in <i>akār</i> -	218
6.3.3.3	Free-choice identity/selection adjective <i>lubo</i>	219
6.3.3.4	Free-choice quality expressions	219
6.3.3.5	Slavic free-choice periphrases	220
6.4	Universal pronouns	220
6.4.1	Universal pronouns <i>savoro</i> and <i>sa</i>	221
6.4.2	Borrowed universal adjectives	223
6.4.3	Adverbial universal pronouns	226
6.5	Differential pronouns	228
6.5.1	Differential adjective <i>āver</i>	229
6.5.2	Adverbial differential pronouns	230
7	ARTICLES, DEMONSTRATIVES AND DEICTICS	234
7.1	Definite and indefinite articles	234
7.1.1	Inflection of the definite article	234
7.1.2	Indefinite article	235
7.2	Demonstratives	235
7.2.1	Adnominal and pronominal demonstratives	236
7.2.1.1	Inflection of demonstratives	236
7.2.1.2	Proximal demonstratives	238
7.2.1.3	Non-proximal demonstratives	239
7.2.1.4	Contrastive demonstratives <i>akā/okā</i>	241
7.2.2	Adverbial demonstratives	243
7.2.2.1	Stative – directive demonstratives	244
7.2.2.2	Separative – perlative demonstratives	246
7.2.2.3	Proximity and specificity in adverbial demonstratives	247
7.2.2.4	Special directive <i>a(r)de</i>	248
7.2.2.5	Spatial indicators <i>āke</i> and <i>ovke</i>	249

7.2.2.6	Contrastive demonstratives <i>akārik</i> and <i>okārik</i>	250
7.3	Temporal deictics	251
7.3.1	Deictic adverbs of days	251
7.3.2	Other temporal deictics	252
7.4	Comparative deictics	255
7.4.1	Quantity deictic <i>ajci</i>	256
7.4.2	Quality deictics <i>ajso(v)</i> and <i>kajso(v)</i>	256
7.4.3	Manner deictics <i>avka</i> and <i>kāke</i>	258
8	NUMERAL AND QUANTIFIERS	260
8.1	Numerals	260
8.1.1	Cardinal and fractional numerals	260
8.1.2	Ordinal and multiplicative numerals	263
8.1.3	Collective and distributive numerals	265
8.2	Non-numerical quantifiers	266
8.2.1	Interrogative and indefinite quantifiers	267
8.2.2	Multal quantifiers and intensifiers	268
8.2.3	Paucal quantifiers	270
8.2.4	Other quantifiers	273
9	ADVERBS AND PARTICLES	276
9.1	Deadjectival adverbs	276
9.1.1	Adverbs in <i>(-on)-es</i>	276
9.1.2	Adverbs in <i>-ān</i>	278
9.1.3	Language adverbs in <i>-ik-a</i>	278
9.2	Adverbs of manner	279
9.3	Adverbs of place	282
9.3.1	Basic spatial adverbs	282
9.3.2	Denominal adverbs of place	286
9.3.3	Borrowed adverbs of place	286
9.4	Temporal adverbs	288
9.4.1	Parts of the day, seasons and days of the week	288
9.4.2	Other temporal adverbs	290
9.5	Phasal adverbs	292
9.6	Particles	294

9.6.1	Focus particles	294
9.6.1.1	Additive particles	294
9.6.1.2	Scalar particles	296
9.6.1.3	Restrictive particles	297
9.6.2	Terminative particle	299
9.6.3	Affirmative and negative particles	301
9.6.4	Various borrowed particles	302
9.6.5	Verb-like imperative interjections.....	305
10	COMPARISON AND EQUATION	306
10.1	Comparative and superlative	306
10.1.1	Comparative	306
10.1.2	Superlative.....	308
10.1.3	Syntax of comparison.....	310
10.2	Equative and similitive	313
11	NOUN PHRASE AND PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE.....	315
11.1	Noun phrase	315
11.1.1	Functions of cases	323
11.1.1.1	Nominative.....	323
11.1.1.2	Accusative.....	326
11.1.1.3	Dative.....	328
11.1.1.4	Ablative.....	334
11.1.1.5	Instrumental	340
11.1.1.6	Locative.....	344
11.1.1.7	Genitive.....	346
11.2	Prepositional phrase.....	349
11.2.1	Spatial and temporal prepositions	351
11.2.1.1	Inessive prepositions <i>andre</i> and <i>andal</i>	353
11.2.1.2	Adessive prepositions <i>ke</i> and <i>khatar</i>	355
11.2.1.3	Contact preposition <i>pre</i>	358
11.2.1.4	Contact separative and posterior preposition <i>pal</i>	361
11.2.1.5	Inferior preposition <i>tel</i> (plus <i>telal</i>).....	365
11.2.1.6	Anterior preposition <i>angal</i>	366
11.2.1.7	Medial preposition <i>maškar</i> (plus <i>maškāral</i>)	367

11.2.1.8	Proximate preposition <i>paž</i> (plus <i>pašal</i>).....	368
11.2.1.9	Perlative preposition <i>prig</i>	370
11.2.1.10	Temporal preposition <i>posli</i>	371
11.2.2	Causal and benefactive prepositions	371
11.2.2.1	Preposition <i>važ</i>	372
11.2.2.2	Preposition <i>prekal, pre(n)gal, etc.</i>	375
11.2.3	Privative prepositions	377
12	ASPECTS OF VERB SYNTAX	379
12.1	Morphosyntactic alignment and subject agreement	379
12.2	Optative constructions	381
12.2.1	Optative particles <i>mi</i> and <i>te</i>	381
12.2.2	Optative copula <i>mije</i>	383
12.3	Syntactic modifications of verbs	384
12.3.1	Valency-increasing periphrases.....	384
12.3.2	Valency-decreasing periphrases	385
12.3.3	Analytic inchoatives	388
12.3.4	Other composite predicates	390
12.3.5	Adverbial modifications	392
12.4	Negation.....	396
12.5	Modal and phasal expressions	400
12.5.1	Volition.....	400
12.5.2	Possibility	401
12.5.2.1	Possibility modals <i>šaj</i> and <i>naši</i>	402
12.5.2.2	Epistemic possibility	403
12.5.2.3	Deontic possibility (permission)	404
12.5.2.4	Ability	406
12.5.3	Necessity	411
12.5.3.1	Personal necessity modals.....	411
12.5.3.2	Impersonal necessity modals	413
12.5.4	Phasal verbs	416
13	COMPLEX SYNTACTIC CONSTRUCTIONS.....	417
13.1	Serialisation	417
13.2	Complementation.....	418

13.2.1	Non-factual complementiser	419
13.2.2	Factual complementisers	420
13.2.3	Polar complementiser	423
13.2.4	Question-word complements.....	424
13.3	Adverbial subordination	424
13.3.1	Conditional clauses	424
13.3.2	Concessive conditional clauses	428
13.3.3	Concessive clauses	430
13.3.4	Temporal clauses.....	431
13.3.5	Spatial and manner clauses	436
13.3.6	Causal clauses	436
13.3.7	Consequential and extent clauses.....	440
13.3.8	Purpose and manipulation clauses.....	441
13.4	Relativisation	446
13.5	Coordination	451
13.5.1	Conjunctive coordination	452
13.5.2	Disjunctive coordination	457
13.5.3	Adversative coordination	461
13.5.4	Consecutive coordination.....	465
13.5.5	Emphatic negative coordinaton.....	466
	References	468

List of Tables

Table 1: Consonant phonemes	31
Table 2: Occurrence of /tʰ/ and its variation with /čh/ and /kh/	34
Table 3: Vowel phonemes	41
Table 4: Inflection of consonantal verbs	71
Table 5: Inflection of vocalic verbs.....	72
Table 6: Inflection of middle verbs	73
Table 7: Future inflection	74
Table 8: Imperfect/potential (remote non-perfective) inflection.....	75
Table 9: Imperative inflection	76
Table 10: Imperative classes	76
Table 11: Perfective stems of vocalic verbs	83
Table 12: Aorist inflection	86
Table 13: Irrealis mood inflection	87
Table 14: Innovative irrealis inflection in Perechyn	88
Table 15: TAM values of the copula.....	91
Table 16: Present and past indicative inflection of the copula.....	91
Table 17: Frequency of the past copula forms <i>sas</i> and <i>esas</i>	94
Table 18: Innovative past-tense inflection of the copula in Radvanka	95
Table 19: Present subjunctive, potential and future inflection of the copula.....	96
Table 20: Imperative inflection of the copula	96
Table 21: Innovative irrealis inflection of the copula in Perechyn	98
Table 22: Past subjunctive and irrealis inflection of the copula	99
Table 23: Examples of anticausative derivations	109
Table 24: Equipollent pairs of causative and anticausative verbs.....	111
Table 25: Inflection of oikoclitic masculines	133
Table 26: Inflection of oikoclitic feminines	137
Table 27: Inflection of <i>prajt-/prajt'</i> - 'leaf'	142
Table 28: Inflection of xenoclitic masculines	143
Table 29: Inflection of xenoclitic feminines	147
Table 30: Vocative forms of oikoclitic nouns	149
Table 31: Vocative forms of <i>čha</i> 'son, boy' and <i>čhaj</i> 'daughter, girl'	151
Table 32: Vocative forms of xenoclitic nouns	152
Table 33: Layer II case markers.....	154
Table 34: Derivation and inflection of xenoclitic diminutive nouns	159
Table 35: Distribution of the abstract nominalisers <i>-ibe(n)</i> , <i>-ipe(n)</i> and <i>-Všāg-</i>	167
Table 36: Inflection of oikoclitic vocalic adjectives	172
Table 37: Inflection of oikoclitic zero adjectives	172
Table 38: Inflection of <i>zdravo</i> 'healthy'	175
Table 39: Derivational suffixes of adjectives.....	186
Table 40: Personal pronouns	187
Table 41: Analogy of Perechyn third-person pronouns with masculine inflection.....	189
Table 42: Inflection of the reflexive pronoun	191

Table 43: Conservative and innovative patterns of reflexivity	194
Table 44: Alternative pattern of reflexivity in Uzhhorod.....	195
Table 45: Inflection of the reciprocal pronoun.....	195
Table 46: Interrogative pronouns	198
Table 47: Inflection of <i>ko</i> 'who' and <i>so</i> 'what'	200
Table 48: Specific indefinite pronouns	208
Table 49: Inflection of <i>varesavo/varesov</i> 'some'	209
Table 50: Negative indefinite pronouns	212
Table 51: Free-choice indefinite pronouns.....	218
Table 52: Universal pronouns	221
Table 53: Differential pronouns	229
Table 54: Inflection of <i>āver</i> 'other'	229
Table 55: Inflection of the definite article.....	234
Table 56: Proximal and non-proximal demonstratives	237
Table 57: Contrastive demonstratives	242
Table 58: Adverbial demonstratives	244
Table 59: Deictic adverbs of days	251
Table 60: Deictic adverbs of time	252
Table 61: Comparative deictics.....	255
Table 62: Basic cardinal numerals	261
Table 63: Formation of decade and digit-plus-decade numerals	262
Table 64: Interrogative and indefinite quantifiers.....	267
Table 65: Multal quantifiers	270
Table 66: Paucal quantifiers.....	273
Table 67: Spatial adverbs	283
Table 68: Names for the days of the week.....	289
Table 69: Comparison of superlative formations in East Central European languages.....	308
Table 70: Superlative prefixes.....	309
Table 71: Spatial prepositions	352
Table 72: Privative prepositions.....	378
Table 73: Inflection of the defective modal verb <i>kampe(l)</i> 'be needed'	414
Table 74: Factual complementisers.....	423

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative	IMP	imperative
ACC	accusative	IPF	imperfect
ADJ	adjective, adjectival	INCH	inchoative
ADV	adverb, adverbial	INF	infinitive
AKT	aktionsart	INST	instrumental
AOR	aorist	IRR	irrealis mood
ART	article	ITER	iterative
CNTR	contrastive	ITR	intransitive
COLL	collective particle	Khu	Khudlovo
COMPR	comparative	LOC	locative
COND	conditional (particle)	LQCR	(see Elšík 2008-2012)
COP	copula	MIA	Middle Indo-Aryan
DAT	dative	NCOMP	non-factual complementiser
DEM	demonstrative	NEG	negation
DIM	diminutive	NMLS	nominaliser, nominalisation
DISTR	distributive	NONPFV	non-perfective
EMP	emphatic	NOM	nominative
etr	elicited translation	NP	noun phrase
EXT	extension	OBL	oblique
FACT	factitive	OIA	Old Indo-Aryan
FCOMP	factual complementiser	OPT	optative
GEN	genitive	PART	particle

Per	Perechyn	SBJV	subjunctive
PFV	perfective	Ser	Serednie
PL	plural	SG	singular
POT	potential	SPEC	specific
PP	prepositional phrase	SUPL	superlative
PREP	preposition	TERM	terminative
PRIV	privative	TR	transitive
PRS	present	VOC	vocative
PST	past	Uzhh	Uzhhorod
PTCP	participle	UzhhR	Uzhhorod – Radvanka
RDŽ	(see Beníšek 2014a)	UzhhS	Uzhhorod – Shakhta
RECP	reciprocal	1	first person
REFL	reflexive	2	second person
REL	relativiser	3	third person
REM	remote marker		

Acknowledgement

First and foremost, I owe a debt of immense gratitude to my supervisor and friend Viktor Elšík, who introduced me to the enthralling field of linguistic fieldwork on Romani dialects and to their analysis. I benefited greatly from his numerous suggestions, discussions and comments on earlier versions of the chapters.

I would also like to express my sincere thanks to the following people.

To my colleague and friend Ján Bakyta, with whom I enjoyed stimulating discussions on various topics related to the dissertation and who explained me many Greek and Slovak forms and etymologies.

To Zuzana Bodnárová, my collaborator in the Linguistic Atlas of Central Romani Project, who shared her inspiring fieldwork experiences and findings with me and was always willing to help me with Hungarian forms and etymologies.

To Jan Červenka, the former chief of the Seminar of Romani Studies in Prague, who enabled me to work in a very friendly environment and was always trying hard to ensure the best possible working conditions.

To Lukáš Houdek, who accompanied me in two fieldwork trips and helped me with recording linguistic data in Uzhhorod and Khudlovo.

To Jevhenija Navroc'ka, a journalist and teacher in Uzhhorod, who provided me with materials and valuable information on the culture, demography and history of the Roma in Transcarpathia.

A substantial part of this dissertation was written during my visit at the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures of the University of Manchester in October 2015 to June 2016. I am very grateful to Yaron Matras for his kind support that allowed me to quietly work on the dissertation within the intellectual environment of this university. I also wish to thank the Anglo-Czech Educational Fund for their financial support that made my stay possible.

And finally, last but by no means least, a very special gratitude goes to all the generous and friendly consultants in the field. It goes without saying that this dissertation would have not been possible without their willingness to host me and share their language with me. *Pal'ikerav tumenge savorenge.*

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Key concepts and preliminary remarks

The focus of this dissertation is a grammatical description of a heterogeneous Romani dialect spoken in a western part of Transcarpathian Ukraine in an area adjacent to the border with Slovakia. This dialect is called ‘Eastern Uzh Romani’, a name explicated further below. It comprises language varieties of Romani communities living in several locations in the area, namely Uzhhorod, the administrative centre of Transcarpathia located right at the border with Slovakia, Perechyn, a district town north of Uzhhorod, Khudlovo, a village east of Uzhhorod, and Serednie, a semi-urban municipality further southeast (see the Map and 1.2.2). Apart from individuals who moved from these locations elsewhere, for example by marriage, there are no other traditional locations where this particular dialect would be spoken by local Roma, although closely related varieties are spoken on the Slovak side of the border (see below).



Map: The Eastern Uzh Romani dialect locations (legend: Uzhh – Uzhhorod, Per – Perechyn, Khu – Khudlovo, Ser – Serednie)

Before I put forward some more details about the dialect in question, some clarification about terms such as ‘dialect’, ‘dialect region’ and ‘language variety’ is in order. The two key terms used throughout this work are ‘variety’ and ‘dialect’. For their differentiation, I follow definitions given by Ferguson and Gumperz (1960), who describe a variety as:

‘any body of human speech patterns which is sufficiently homogenous to be analyzed by available techniques of synchronic description and which has a sufficiently large repertory of elements and their arrangements or processes with broad enough semantic scope to function in all normal contexts of communication.’ (Ferguson and Gumperz 1960: 3)

Bearing this definition in mind, an Eastern Uzh Romani variety is a lect associated with a particular community living in a particular location, meaning that every location with its Romani community has its distinct variety. For example, Perechyn Romani is a variety spoken by members of the Romani community living in the town of Perechyn. It does not mean that there is no linguistic variation within a single variety. Social variables, such as age, may constitute (and do constitute) a factor for further variation, and even idiolects of same-age individuals who are members of a single community differ from each other in some respects. However, as suggested by Ferguson and Gumperz, a variety is homogenous to such a degree that it may be described as a single linguistic entity. This work, following concepts of dialect geography, associates a variety with speech patterns documented in a single location. As for a dialect, it is defined by Ferguson and Gumperz as:

‘any set of one or more varieties of a language which share at least one feature or combination of features setting them apart from other varieties of the language, and which may appropriately be treated as a unit on linguistic or nonlinguistic grounds.’ (Ferguson and Gumperz 1960: 7)

It follows that the cluster of Eastern Uzh Romani varieties constitutes the Eastern Uzh Romani dialect. Although all Eastern Uzh Romani varieties contain certain features that set them apart from other closely related varieties, it should be conceded that such features are primarily contact-induced, i.e. triggered by language contact that has not occurred in related varieties of another dialect. On non-linguistic grounds, delimitation of Eastern Uzh Romani is areal, based upon the fact that all its varieties are spoken in a particular area of a particular country (see below for differentiation of Eastern Uzh Romani from Western Uzh Romani). Finally, the term ‘Eastern Uzh Romani dialect region’ is, in principle, synonymous with the ‘Eastern Uzh Romani dialect’, but its usage is motivated by an effort to emphasise the areal character of the dialect and the fact that it contains more than a single variety.

The territory of present-day Transcarpathia was united with the rest of Ukraine only in the mid-1940s. In the interwar period (1919–1938), the region formed the easternmost part of

Czechoslovakia, officially known as Subcarpathian Rus' (*Podkarpatská Rus* in Czech), while before it was part of the Kingdom of Hungary for almost a millennium. During Hungarian rule, all the aforementioned locations were situated in an east central part of the Uzh County (in the official Hungarian nomenclature *Ung vármegye*), whose territory is now divided between Slovakia and Ukraine. The word 'Uzh' [uʒ] in the name of this historical county, as well as in the name of its erstwhile capital Uzhhorod (Hungarian *Ungvár*), is derived from the name of the dominant local river Uzh (Ukrainian *Уж*, Slovak *Uh*, Hungarian *Ung*). The Uzh River, originating in the mountains of northwestern Transcarpathia, runs southwards parallel to the Slovak border down to Uzhhorod, and then turns west to Slovakia, where it finally flows into the Laborec River. The word 'Uzh' as an attributive adjective (Ukrainian *ужанський*, Slovak *užský*) is also used by Slavic dialectologists in labelling local Ukrainian and Slovak dialects (e.g. Gerovskij 1934; Dzendzelivs'kyj 1958-60; Tóbič 1965; Krajčovič 1988; etc.). Thus, the dialect name 'Uzh Romani' is inspired by a linguistic tradition that refers to Uzh dialects of other local languages, even though speakers themselves do not designate their language by this name.

The varieties under description are closely related to the Romani varieties spoken in western parts of the former Uzh County, which are now in Slovakia; namely in the Sobrance district and in southeastern parts of the Michalovce district east of the Laborec River. This Slovak dialect of Uzh Romani, consisting of varieties of a greater number of traditional locations than the Ukrainian dialect, will be called 'Western Uzh Romani'. The delimitation between Western Uzh Romani and Eastern Uzh Romani is mainly based on non-linguistic grounds, namely on the current political border that separates the western varieties in Slovakia from the few eastern varieties in Ukraine. Although it also finds certain linguistic justification in different contact languages and in different results of the current language contact on both sides of the border, there are features that affect individual varieties of both dialects, and such features may be plotted as isoglosses linking selected parts of both dialect regions and relativising the dialect boundary established on the political border (see, for example, the phonolexical variation discussed in 2.4.5). Both dialects of Uzh Romani could also be treated as a single unit as they share numerous features (see 2.4.3 and 2.4.4). Their linguistic affinities are also consciously recognised by the speakers themselves who have often had kinship ties and share common surnames on both sides of the border.

The entire Uzh Romani dialect cluster is part of a broader continuum of Romani dialects that are classified as Central Romani, representing one of the major groups of the Romani dialect classification (see Matras 2002; Boretzky and Igla 2004). Central Romani is

traditionally regarded as consisting of two branches: North Central Romani and South Central Romani (Boretzky 1999, 2007). The North Central Romani varieties have primarily been spoken in Slovakia, plus in adjacent parts of southeastern Poland (varieties of the so-called ‘Bergitka Roma’), in the pre-war Czech lands and in the Transcarpathian and Galician regions of West Ukraine. The dialect under scrutiny represents the Transcarpathian dialect of North Central Romani, and both terms, Eastern Uzh Romani and Transcarpathian North Central Romani, point to one and the same dialect. There are other Romani varieties spoken beyond this core area that are sometimes classified as North Central, at least by certain authors, namely the North Transylvanian varieties in Romania (see Heuvel and Urech 2014), which are claimed as North Central in works of Boretzky (e.g. 2007), and varieties of the Roma Plaščuny in East Ukraine and South Russia, who were suggested to be descendants of immigrants from either Moravia or West Slovakia (Cherenkov 2005; Čerenkov 2008: 497–498). The South Central Romani branch comprises varieties spoken in southwestern Slovakia, in some parts of Hungary, in the Prekmurje region of Slovenia and in Austrian Burgenland (e.g. Elšík, Hübschmannová and Šebková 1999; Halwachs 2002; Halwachs and Wogg 2002; Bodnárová 2013, etc.).

From what has already been said it should be clear that Eastern Uzh Romani is not an isolated insular dialect, as is the case of some other Romani dialects (cf. Boretzky 1998). Albeit spoken in a multilingual environment where other languages have also been present, Eastern Uzh Romani is a territorial dialect spoken by long-settled local Roma and belonging to a larger dialect area. Still, it represents a peripheral dialect situated on an eastern margin of the continuum. In no other direction except for the west is Eastern Uzh Romani continued by any other Central Romani dialect. Further east, south and north, no Romani is spoken by the local Roma in Transcarpathian Ukraine, while some non-Central (Vlax) Romani dialects are spoken in other areas of Transcarpathia dozens of kilometres away (see 1.2.1 below). Although there are outlying pockets of another North Central dialect spoken north of Transcarpathia in the Galician region of Ukraine (Beníšek 2014b, 2017), these are separated from the Eastern Uzh locations by a vast area where no Romani dialect is currently spoken.

Although North Central Romani in Transcarpathian Ukraine has been recognised to exist by various scholars (e.g. Matras 2002: 9; Čerenkov 2008: 497), Transcarpathian North Central Romani has not been documented and discussed in Romani linguistics until recently (see 1.3.4). The aim of this dissertation is thus to fill the gap in the knowledge of Romani varieties of this linguistically interesting region and, at the same time, to present first-hand data pertaining to a particular fringe of a Romani dialect continuum. In the following sections

of this chapter, communities of speakers of Eastern Uzh Romani will be introduced. First, I will outline the context in which these communities find themselves within the broader Romani population of Transcarpathian Ukraine. Second, I will deal with the traditional locations of Eastern Uzh Romani communities in detail, followed by a description of various ethnonyms used by speakers in reference to themselves as well as to others. Then, the sociolinguistic situation of Eastern Uzh Romani will be discussed, with attention to its vitality and current and recent contact languages. Finally, the source of data and methodology will be described in the last sections of this introductory chapter.

1.2 Eastern Uzh Romani dialect region

1.2.1 Geographical, demographical and ethnolinguistic context

Transcarpathian Ukraine, in Ukrainian *Закарпаття* ‘Transcarpathia’ or *Закарпатська область* ‘Transcarpathian region’, is the smallest and westernmost administrative unit (oblast) of Ukraine, but one with the highest percentage of Romani population. According to the 2001 census, the number of Roma amounted to 47,587 in the whole of Ukraine, and to 14,004 in the Transcarpathian region (ERRC 2006: 11), but the actual number of Roma in Transcarpathia is considered to be higher, amounting up to 40 or even 50 thousand people (Jemec’ and Djačenko 1993; TZO: 80; Navroc’ka 2013: 135).

In Transcarpathia, nearly all Roma live in specifically ‘Gypsy’ settlements, which are as a rule situated on the outskirts of villages, in the suburbs of towns and in some cases even in segregated sites comparatively remote from parts inhabited by non-Roma. Such Romani settlements, which may markedly differ in their size, are locally called *tabory* (SG *tabor* or *tabir*; Eastern Uzh Romani SG *tāboris*, PL *tābora*) from the Slavic or Hungarian word for ‘camp’. Most ‘tabors’ have their main local representative from inside the community, who is called *baron* or *birov* (Eastern Uzh Romani *baronos* or *birovs*; the latter ultimately from Hungarian *bíró* ‘judge’), or *baronesa* in cases of a female representative. Their function is to act as a mediator between the local Roma and institutions.

The Romani population in Transcarpathian Ukraine is in no way homogeneous, and Romani communities in various locations differ among themselves in many aspects, including languages they speak. Only a small part of Transcarpathian Roma speak any Romani dialect. According to the 2001 census, only 20.5 percent of the local Roma have Romani as their mother tongue compared to 44.69 percent in the whole of Ukraine (Braun, Csernicskó and

Molnár 2010: 16, 24).¹ This demographical group of Romani-speaking Roma comprises both the North Central (Eastern Uzh) communities in the west and the North Vlach (mostly Cerhari and Lovari) communities in the south and east of Transcarpathia (see Kovalcsik 2000; Čerenkov 2008: 494, 497). According to Čerenkov (2008: 498), there were also several families of Austrian Sinti in Transcarpathia in the mid 20th century, but no Sinti group is known to live in present-day Transcarpathia.

Otherwise, most Roma in Transcarpathian Ukraine speak Hungarian as their first language (cf. Braun, Cserniczkó and Molnár 2010). The Hungarian-speaking Roma mainly live in the southern and southwestern lowland adjacent to the border with Hungary, which is an area of the highest concentration of Romani population in Transcarpathia. In some parts of Transcarpathia, Hungarian even plays the role of an ethnic language for local Romani communities, differing from the Slavic language of their non-Romani neighbours. This is the case of Romani communities living, for example, in the city of Mukachevo and in a village of Ruski Komarivtsi situated close to the Eastern Uzh locations of Khudlovo and Sereďnie. Another ethnolinguistic group of Roma whose mother tongue is other than Romani is represented by those who speak local Slavic (Ukrainian/Rusyn) dialects, whose settlements can be found in northern and northwestern valleys of the Carpathian mountains. The areas of both ethnolinguistic groups border the region of the Eastern Uzh Romani dialect. Hungarian-speaking Roma occur in contiguous communities living immediately to the south and southeast of the Eastern Uzh locations, while locations of the Ukrainian-speaking Roma are situated immediately to the north and northeast (cf. the Map above).

Last, there are traditionally Romanian-speaking Gypsies who have earned their livelihood by producing wood utensils and are locally called *volochy* ('Wallachian people'; SG *voloch*). They are closely related to Gypsy trough-makers of East Slovakia (see Agócs 2003) and can be linked to Boyash Gypsies of Central Europe. In contrast to other ethnolinguistic groups, the Volox settlements are scattered in various places of western and central parts of Transcarpathia and are also found within the geographical area of the Eastern Uzh Romani dialect region.²

¹ See also http://database.ukrcensus.gov.ua/MULT/Database/Census/databasetree_no_uk.asp?#m5 (link active 2015-01-30).

² More specifically, one Volox settlement exists in a village Kamianytsia in the halfway between Uzhhorod and Perechyn, and another Volox settlement is in Antalovtsi, which is a neighbouring village of Khudlovo (cf. Zan 2013: 11–12).

1.2.2 Eastern Uzh Romani locations

The Eastern Uzh Romani dialect region consists of mere five traditional varieties spoken in the municipalities of Uzhhorod (with two communities speaking two distinct varieties), Perechyn, Khudlovo and Serednie, as was already mentioned in 1.1 above (see also Map 1). These locations and their Romani communities will be discussed in the following sections.

1.2.2.1 Uzhhorod

Uzhhorod (Ukrainian *Ужгород*, Hungarian *Ungvár*, Slovak *Užhorod*) is a far-western Ukrainian city situated right at the border with Slovakia. It is the capital of the Transcarpathian region, which had 115,568 inhabitants in 2001 according to the All Ukrainian Census. Uzhhorod has always been a multiethnic and multilingual city with an ever-changing ethnic composition, which depended much on the actual political circumstances. Today, the majority of its population consists of Ukrainians (77.8% according to the 2001 census) with Russian and Hungarian minorities (9.6% and 6.9% respectively). In the interwar period, when the city was part of the Czechoslovak Republic, the biggest part of its inhabitants declared Czechoslovak ethnicity (30.1% according to the 1930 census; SLOZP: 21), followed by Rusyns (23.5%), Jews (22.1%) and Hungarians (16.9%), while at the beginning of the 20th century the absolute majority of its population were Hungarians (80.3% according to the 1910 census; *Népszámlálás*: 262–263.). The city is called *Ungvāra* in Eastern Uzh Romani, from the Hungarian name of the town, but is most commonly referred to as *fovros* ‘town’ in all varieties.

Evidence of Romani presence in Uzhhorod can be traced as far back as the 17th century at least, although Gypsies mentioned in documents from such an old period might not be the direct ancestors of the present-day Uzhhorod Roma. According to the census dated 23 June 1691, one of the ten streets of Uzhhorod, the only one on the left side of the river, was named after Gypsies. There Gypsies lived in twenty tents, had their own leader (*vajda*) and provided blacksmith products for the Uzhhorod castle (Sova 1937: 161, 234). During the Czechoslovak period, Uzhhorod became a focus of media attention owing to a ‘Gypsy school’ established in the local Romani settlement (see below). The Czechoslovak 1930 census recorded 37 ‘Gypsy houses’ with 266 inhabitants in Uzhhorod, although the same census ascribed Gypsy ethnicity to just 27 persons in Uzhhorod (SLOZP: 21).³

³ These data mainly pertain to Roma of the Shakhta neighbourhood of Uzhhorod and definitely do not include the Roma of Radvanka, which was a separate village at that time. See below for more details.

Today's Romani population in Uzhhorod amounts to a couple of thousand people. Although the official census data recorded 1,705 Roma in Uzhhorod in 2001, there is a general consensus that the actual number is higher. Braun, Csernicskó and Molnár (2010: 44) estimate that the actual number of Uzhhorod Roma at the time of the census may have been 2,150 persons, while the public health authorities give the number of 2,845 Roma living in Uzhhorod on 1 January 2012 (TZO: 80). Local political and NGO activists sometimes mention even higher numbers, such as 5,000 Roma. It should be pointed out that today's Romani population of Uzhhorod also comprises an appreciable number of Roma who have moved to the city from other locations and have been living there alongside the traditional Roma of Uzhhorod, whose ancestors have lived there for many generations.

From the emic perspective of Roma themselves and even from the historical point of view, there are two traditional communities of local Roma in Uzhhorod. Both are historically associated with different settlements (*tābora*), and their members still keep their distinct identity, even though one of the two communities no longer forms a coherent community in terms of a single physical space it occupies. Since members of both communities even speak slightly distinct varieties of the Romani language, and some – particularly lexical – differences of these varieties play a role in perception of the community boundaries, they must be distinguished in any linguistic treatment of Uzhhorod Romani.

The first community is represented by the proper Uzhhorod Roma who lived in a settlement in the northern neighbourhood of the town called Shakhta. The other community is traditionally associated with the southeastern neighbourhood and an erstwhile village Radvanka. What both communities have in common is that they have had strong affinities to Roma in East Slovakia, in particular to those of the current Michalovce district and, above all, to Roma of the Slovak village of Pavlovce nad Uhom. Uzhhorod Roma from both communities commonly intermarried with East Slovak Roma until the World War Two, and, in many families, the kinship ties are still being vitally maintained. They also often declare Slovak subidentity. The affinities with the East Slovak Roma are also reflected in shared surnames, such as (in alphabetical order) Adam, Badzho (Badžo), Balog, Beniak (Beňak), Buko, Horvat, Latsko (Lacko), Rats (Rác), Shugar (Šugár), Tantsosh (Tancoš), Tokar (Tokár), Tyrpak and many others, which occur among Uzhhorod Roma as well as among Roma in East Slovakia. More details about both locations and their respective communities are discussed in the following subsections.

According to an oral tradition of the Roma of the East Slovak village Blatné Remety, there also used to be a small Romani community in Červenica, which is now the northwestern

Uzhhorod neighbourhood Chervenycia (*Червениця*) located immediately behind the Slovak-Ukrainian border. The Roma of pre-war Červenica belonged to the Sliško family and had kinship links to the Roma living in villages of the Sobrance district in Slovakia. Immediately after the war, probably in connection with the establishment of the new political border, they all moved to the village of Blatné Remety, where their descendants still live (my fieldwork, 2010).

1.2.2.1.1 Shakhta

Shakhta (Eastern Uzh Romani *Šaxta*, Ukrainian *Шахта*) is the name of the northern outskirts of Uzhhorod, which is one of the two most important locations of Romani presence in Uzhhorod (the other one being Radvanka). In Shakhta, there is a traditional settlement of Uzhhorod Roma called *Močāra*, from the Hungarian *mocsár* ‘swamp’, since the settlement arose right on an erstwhile swamp. After this name, Roma from this settlement have traditionally been called *močārika roma*, by a name that is nowadays applied not only to those who still occupy this settlement but also to Roma whose ancestors dwelt there in the past.

Judging from old maps, the *Močāra* settlement in Shakhta was established only in the latter half of the 19th century.⁴ During the interwar period, its Romani community gained certain mass media fame in the whole of Czechoslovakia and even abroad owing to a primary school that was launched in the school year 1926/27 in the settlement with the aim of educating Romani children (Anonymous 1934; Steiner 1939). The school, which is still in operation, is generally alleged to be the first dedicated Gypsy school in Europe. In 1938, inhabitants of the settlement became an objective of academic research in the field of physical anthropology conducted by Marie Nováková, who also provided a brief ethnographic sketch of the local Romani community (Nováková 1949). According to her findings, which were published only after the war, the Romani settlement had 200 inhabitants living in approximately 30 houses in the time of her research (Nováková 1949: 47).

After the war, the neighbourhood of Shakhta was enlarged by building new residence areas further north so that *Močāra* no longer formed the northern margin of the town. However, it was only at the beginning of the 1970s that a large-scale abandonment of the *Močāra* settlement was initiated. In 1971 to 1972, due partly to the construction a new hospital in the vicinity of the settlement, most of its inhabitants were moved elsewhere. Some Roma built their own houses in the new streets of the Shakhta neighbourhood, some families

⁴ In the first cadastral map of Unghvár (Uzhhorod), dated 1864 (cf. Timár and Biszak 2010), the place of the Romani settlement in Shakhta is still represented by a swamp.

were given abodes in the centre of Uzhhorod, and others moved to live in erstwhile military quarters in the streets of Telmana (*Тельмана*) and Pyrohova (*Пирогова*), where new Romani settlements have arisen since then. Thus, the former single community of *močārika roma* split, though Roma have been living in concentrations even in their new locations and have never been dispersed among the non-Romani population. At the same time, the *Močāra* settlement in Shahkta has not been abandoned entirely and there are still some Roma who dwell there as of this writing; according to the local baronesa Daryna Virag (p.c., September 2014), 57 adult Roma plus their children lived in *Močāra* in September 2014.

1.2.2.1.2 Radvanka

Radvanka (Eastern Uzh Romani *Radvanka*, Ukrainian *Радванка*, Hungarian *Radvánc*, Slovak *Radvánka*) used to be a separate village situated right to the southeast of Uzhhorod on the left side of the river Uzh. Only in the mid-1940s, when the territory of today's Transcarpathia became part of the Soviet Union, Radvanka was administratively incorporated into Uzhhorod as one of its urban neighbourhoods (Filip 1996: 6). Like Uzhhorod itself, Radvanka was a significantly multiethnic village in pre-war times with a strong Jewish community.

According to Filip (1996: 13–14), it is reasonable to assume that a permanent Romani settlement on the margins of Radvanka may have been established in the period from the end of the 18th century to the beginning of the 19th century, probably as a result of the politics of Enlightenment of the Austrian Empire. Helbig (2005: 128) refers to even earlier times, mentioning that Roma were allowed to live on the land of the Hungarian poet István Gyöngyössi (1629 – 1704), to whom Radvanka once belonged. The Czechoslovak census carried out in 1921 took note of only 13 Gypsies in Radvanka (SLOPR: 28), which was almost certainly an underestimate at that time.

Radvanka these days represents a neighbourhood with the most significant Romani presence in Uzhhorod and, at the same time, a neighbourhood with the highest proportion of Roma as up to one half of the overall Radvanka population is represented by Roma (Helbig (2005: 128). Most Roma live in the northern and northeastern parts of Radvanka along the left (southern) bank of the river. This area comprises the oldest part of the Radvanka Romani settlement between Malouzhanska (*Мадоужанська*) and Uzhanska (*Ужанська*) Streets under a railway track and newer residence areas in eastern parts of Uzhanska Street, its adjacent side streets, and the eastern parts of Hranitna (*Гранітна*) Street. The less populated area of the easternmost part of Uzhanska Street where houses of Roma are hidden in a depression between the road and the river is called *xār* 'pit' by the local Roma.

The subethnic composition of the current Romani population of Radvanka is quite diverse. It consists of the traditional Roma of Radvanka (*radvankakere roma*) who still keep their distinct identity as the original Romani inhabitants of Radvanka. It is their Romani variety that is considered in this dissertation as Radvanka Romani or the Radvanka subvariety of Uzhhorod Romani (abbreviated as UzhhR). In addition, today's population of Radvanka includes some Roma from the Shakhta neighbourhood of Uzhhorod and their descendants (see above), as well as Roma who have moved there from various locations of western Transcarpathia, including a number of Hungarian-speaking Roma. As indicated above, Radvanka has also been a place where many Roma born in East Slovakia could be found because intermarriages of Radvanka Roma with the East Slovak Roma, especially with those of Pavlovce nad Uhom, were almost a rule.

1.2.2.2 Perechyn

Perechyn (Eastern Uzh Romani *Perečina*, Ukrainian *Перечин*, Slovak *Perečín* or *Perečany*, Hungarian *Perecseny*) is a small district town situated some 20 kilometres north of Uzhhorod in the valley of the Uzh River in a hilly region of western Transcarpathia. The ethnic composition of its population (7,020 inhabitants according to the 2001 census) now contains virtually only Ukrainians, whereas in the past Perechyn also had a significant Slovak minority.

The origins of the current Romani settlement in Perechyn can be traced back to the interwar Czechoslovak period, although Roma had probably lived in the town before this time as well (cf. Hanyč, Kul and Šejko 1999: 256).⁵ The settlement is located to the northeast of the town centre in Tsehelná (*Цегельна*) Street in the place of a former lime factory. It is surrounded by thick bush areas in almost all directions except for the south and southwest where it is immediately connected to the residence area of the non-Roma. The settlement has two parts: a lower one (*teluno taboris*) along the lower southern parts of the street and an upper one (*opruno taboris*) stretching north up the hillside. Outside of this settlement, no Roma currently live in Perechyn.

According to the local baron Ignats Tyrpak (p.c., February 2015), the Romani settlement had 380 inhabitants in the winter of 2015, which represents a steep increase compared to the data of older published sources. Braun, Csernicskó and Molnár (2010: 46)

⁵ Unfortunately, neither SLOPR nor SLOZP, which publish local results of the censuses carried out in 1921 and 1930, give any number of Gypsies in Perechyn, although some of them may be included in the unspecified category of 'others'.

estimate the number of Roma in Perechyn in 2001 at 220, while Hanyč, Kul and Šejko (1999: 256) give a number of 146 people living in 26 houses in the latter half of the 1990s. The 2001 census data available on the official government website only shows the percentage of native speakers of various languages. The census figure for those who stated Romani as their mother tongue in Perechyn is 0.61%, i.e. 43 people, which is definitely an underestimate of the total number of Roma in Perechyn as well as of local Romani native speakers.

As the local tradition of the Roma themselves has it, Perechyn Roma comprise two formerly unrelated families. Most Roma belong to the Adam family, which also encompasses holders of the surnames Tyrpak and Churei. They are said to have been the primary inhabitants of the Romani settlement who once had marital linkages to the Roma in the Sobrance district of East Slovakia. Members of the other family, those with the surname of Surmai, are referred to as *Govdiskere* after their ancestor nicknamed *Govdis*, who is said to have come to Perechyn from an unidentified Transcarpathian village during the Soviet period. Today, both families have already intermarried, and their members speak the same Romani dialect. In addition, there are Roma from various locations of Transcarpathia who have married into Perechyn. They commonly come from villages of the Perechyn and Uzhhorod districts, but also from the towns of Uzhhorod and Velykyi Bereznyi, and as far as from Mizhhirya in the Maramuresh region. Conversely, some Roma of Perechyn have recently moved to Uzhhorod.

1.2.2.3 Khudlovo

Khudlovo (Eastern Uzh Romani *Xudl'ovs*, Ukrainian *Худльово*, Hungarian *Horlyó*) is a village located some 15 kilometres to the east of Uzhhorod. The absolute majority of its population (1451 inhabitants according to the 2001 census) is formed by Ukrainians.

Khudlovo is home for a community of long-settled Roma who have been documented to live there since the pre-World War Two period: in 1930, 57 Gypsies lived in Khudlovo according to a Czechoslovak census (SLOZP: 22). Presently, all Roma live outside of the village proper in a segregated settlement. The settlement is situated next to the main road, which bypass the village on its western side, heading north to the neighbouring village of Antalovtsi. While the settlement may have had a couple of hundred inhabitants during the late Soviet times, only a small part of Khudlovo Roma have stayed to live there for the last twenty years. During the 1990s, the local Romani community was seriously affected by disputes with local villagers over the land held by the Roma. These disputes culminated at the turn of April and May 1996 in a violent mob attack on the settlement, when houses of Roma were looted

and smashed and some even burned to the ground (see ERRC 1997: 36–37). After the pogrom, most Roma left the village either for Uzhhorod or for other locations, such as Serednie and Ruski Komarivtsi.

Today, the Romani settlement in Khudlovo has less than one hundred permanent inhabitants, while most Roma originally from Khudlovo live elsewhere (e.g. in the settlement of Telmana Street in Uzhhorod), including various Ukrainian cities outside of Transcarpathia. Numerous Khudlovo Roma also regularly travel around to Kyiv and other big cities in Ukraine to gain their livelihood by begging, occasional labour and other activities.⁶ Braun, Csernicskó and Molnár (2010: 47) estimate the number of Roma in Khudlovo at the beginning of the 21st century at 50 people, which almost coincides with the data from the Ukrainian 2001 census, according to which 3.79% (i.e. 55 persons) stated Romani as their mother tongue in Khudlovo.

Before World War Two, Khudlovo Roma had marital linkage to Roma in East Slovakia. My eldest consultant (*1947) remembered her mother, who was said to have been married to Khudlovo from a Slovak village of Trakany, i.e. from either Veľké Trakany or Malé Trakany, which are now in southeastern Slovakia. After the war, relations with the East Slovak Roma were severed, but new relations to Roma from some other subethnic groups living in the Soviet Union were established. Thus, Khudlovo has also been a village where some individual native speakers of non-Central Romani dialects could be found. Two examples documented during my fieldwork include the husband of the aforementioned eldest consultant who was a Vlax Romani-speaking man from Korolevo in Transcarpathia, and an Ursari Romani woman (*1981) from Moldova who has not had any contacts with members of her native community since her late childhood. Still, all Roma living now in Khudlovo, holders of the surnames Kosoru, Nadozhdia and Olah, are considered part of a single family.

1.2.2.4 Serednie

Serednie (Eastern Uzh Romani *Seredňa*, Ukrainian *Середнє*, Hungarian *Szerednye*, Slovak *Seredné*) is a little townlet (*селище міського типу* ‘urban-type settlement’) located some 20 kilometres to the east of Uzhhorod, halfway between Uzhhorod and Mukachevo, and approximately seven kilometres to the southeast of Khudlovo. It had 3,505 inhabitants in 2001, most of whom were Ukrainians. Historically, Serednie was a multiethnic village with

⁶ According to the information given by the village council to activists of the Uzhhorod-based NGO *Романі черхень* (‘Romani star’) in March 2013, out of the 223 registered residents of the Romani settlement in Khudlovo, only 79 permanently lived in the village (Horvat, p.c., March 2013).

significant Rusyn, Jewish, Slovak and Hungarian communities, out of which no ethnic community held the majority (cf. SLOPR: 28; SLOZP: 23; *Népszámlálása*: 258–259). It is the easternmost traditional locality of the Eastern Uzh Romani dialect region, where a North Central Romani dialect continuum ends.

Serednie is home for long-settled Roma who no longer recollect when their ancestors came to the location. According to the 1931 census, 37 Gypsies lived in Serednie in the time of the census, although the data about abodes mentions six Gypsy houses with 43 inhabitants (SLOZP: 23). The census carried out in 1921 does not record any people of Gypsy ethnicity in Serednie but mentions three Gypsy huts with 24 inhabitants (SLOPR: 28). From the beginning of the 1920s, there also exists some photo documentation of Roma in Serednie (Babka, Opleštilová and Mušinka 2015).

Serednie Roma currently live in a large segregated settlement, which is officially recognised as the Ivanivka neighbourhood (*мікрорайон Іванівка*). It is situated on the main road linking Serednie with another village, Lintsi, to the northeast. In fact, the settlement is closer to Lintsi than to Serednie proper, from which it is two kilometres, and separated by a forest. The number of inhabitants of the Romani settlement may currently be up to one thousand people. Braun, Cserniczkó and Molnár (2010: 48) estimate the number of local Roma in 2001 at 700 people, which was 20% of Serednie's population, whereas the proportion of people who stated Romani as their mother tongue in Serednie in the 2001 census was 13.55%, i.e. 475 persons.

The Romani population of Serednie consists of the local Roma, whose forefathers lived in the location for generations, plus Roma married into the community from various villages of western Transcarpathia. Particularly common have been intermarriages with Roma from the neighbouring villages of Khudlovo (see above) and Ruski Komarivtsi (southwest of Serednie). Before World War Two, marital relations to Roma in East Slovakia existed as in the other Eastern Uzh localities, but memories of such relations are rather vague among the present-day Roma of Serednie. Recorded surnames of the Roma of Serednie are Adam, Badzho, Horvat, Lakatosh, Surmai, Varodi. The baron of the local Roma is Leonid Brezhinskyi.

1.2.3 Ethnonymy

The Roma who speak Eastern Uzh Romani varieties normally refer to themselves simply as *roma* 'Roma, Gypsies' (SG.M *rom*, SG.F *romňi*) with no further attributes. In the singular, substantivised adjectives M *romano*, F *romaňi* (in all varieties) or M *romaduno*, F *romaduňi*

(optionally in Radvanka) are used as well (see 4.2.2.1). There is no single unifying appellation that would set them apart from all other Roma.

An attributive appellation may occur, but it is only used in specific contexts. In Uzhhorod and sometimes in Perechyn, one may often hear from the local Roma that they are *slovākika* or *slovāt'ika roma* ‘Slovak Roma’, which is also the most common way they are referred to by scholars (e.g. Kovalcsik 2000: 71–72, Čerenkov 2008: 497). Such an ethnonym is often used by speakers in contexts when they underline their kinship links to East Slovak Roma. Another attributive self-appellation, *ungrika roma* or *vengerska roma* ‘Hungarian Roma’, is sometimes used in contact with foreign Romani groups in other parts of the former Soviet Union as a marker of Transcarpathian identity, since Transcarpathia is often associated with Hungarian-speaking Roma who form the majority of Romani population in Transcarpathia.

Speakers of Eastern Uzh Romani commonly identify themselves with particular locations where they live or were born. Thus, the most common self-identifying means is by referring to a particular location with the help of an attributive genitive, such as *ungvārakere roma* ‘Roma of Uzhhorod’, *radvankakere roma* ‘Roma of Radvanka’, *perečinakere roma* ‘Roma of Perechyn’, *xudl'ovskere roma* ‘Roma of Khudlovo’, *seredňakere roma* ‘Roma of Serednie’. As mentioned in 1.2.2.1.1 above, Roma from the traditional Uzhhorod Romani settlement in Shakhta are commonly referred to as *močārika roma* after the name of the settlement *Močāra*, irrespective of whether they are still living there, while the term *šaxtakere roma* ‘Roma of Shakhta’ is normally used in the meaning of the Roma who currently live in Shakhta. Within Uzhhorod, where several Romani settlements exist nowadays, Roma may be identified after the names of these particular settlements, e.g. *tel'manakere roma* ‘Roma of Telmana Street’, *xārakere roma*, literally ‘Roma of the Pit’, referring to Roma living in a settlement called *xār* ‘pit’ (see 1.2.2.1.2 above), etc.

One particularly common emic distinction that manifests itself in appellations is that between *fovroskere roma* ‘urban Roma’, which is in principle synonymous to *ungvārakere roma* ‘Roma of Uzhhorod’,⁷ and *gāvutune roma* ‘rural Roma’, which refers to communities living outside of Uzhhorod. Instead of the attributive genitive *fovroskere*, non-genitive adjectival derivations *fovrikane* (in Uzhhorod) and *fovrot'ikane* (in Khudlovo and Serednie) are very common as well. Such attributes are based upon the dichotomy between *fovros*

⁷ However, in Uzhhorod itself the term *fovroskere* or *fovrikane roma* is sometimes used in a narrower meaning as an appellation synonymous to *močārika roma*, i.e. excluding the Roma of Radvanka.

‘town’, which in the local context of western Transcarpathia refers only to Uzhhorod, and *gav* ‘village’ (PL *gāva*), which refers to all other locations of western Transcarpathia, including small towns such as Perechyn, which are also considered as *gāva* in the emic perspective. Throughout this work, I will occasionally make use of the term *gāvutune* (in italics) when I refer to Romani varieties spoken in Perechyn, Khudlovo and Serednie without their differentiation.

Foreign groups of Roma who speak other Romani dialects are often labelled by a rather vague ethnonym *vlaxika roma*, originally ‘Vlax Roma’, or just *vlaxi* (SG.M *vlaxos*, SG.F *vlaxiña*). Other Roma of Transcarpathia who do not speak Romani may be referred to by the language they speak. Thus, *ungrika roma* usually refers to Roma who natively speak Hungarian (cf. also above), while Roma speaking local Slavic (Ukrainian/Rusyn) dialects are often described as *huculika roma*, a name given after a Ukrainian subethnic group of Hutsuls, even though the proper Hutsuls live in the east of Transcarpathia, i.e. elsewhere than Roma referred to by this term. In addition, Ukrainian-speaking Roma are also called *ukrajincika roma* ‘Ukrainian Roma’ or else *rusika roma*, which can be translated as ‘East Slavic Roma’ since the relational adjective *rusiko* ‘Russian’ is also used in a broader meaning in reference to East Slavic nations and their cultures. The distinct Romanian-speaking group of producers of wooden utensils (see 1.2.1 above) is denoted by a local Ukrainian loanword (*roma*) *voloxi* ‘Valakhs’ (SG.M *voloxos*, SG.F *vološka*). Last, the term *šātorika* or *šātrika roma* is sometimes used when speaking about foreign itinerant or semi-itinerant Romani groups (cf. Hungarian *sátor* ‘tent’).

Non-Roma are referred to as *gādže* (SG.M *gādžo*, SG.F *gādži*), i.e. by a name common in many other Romani-speaking communities. In addition, there are special cryptic terms used in reference to non-Roma in case of their close presence. In both Uzhhorod communities and in Khudlovo, such a term is *gome* (SG.M *gomo*, SG.F *gomi*), which is obviously related to an Armenian loanword *gomež* and its variant *gomi* (as a masculine form) documented in other Romani dialects (see Boretzky 1995a: 142). In Serednie, and optionally also in Radvanka, the cryptic term for non-Roma is *govre* (SG.M *govro*, SG.F *govri*), which is an inherited word of Indo-Aryan origin common in North Central varieties in Slovakia. In Perechyn, there is currently no cryptic term for the non-Roma or is not attested.

1.2.4 Sociolinguistic situation

1.2.4.1 Vitality of Romani

In all traditional locations of Eastern Uzh Romani, Romani is a vital means of communication in all generations, still transmitted to children. Yet, no Eastern Uzh Romani community is monolingual. Romani children are exposed to other languages from early childhood and some degree of codeswitching is a common practice: more common in certain families, less common in other families. Moreover, the Romani language does not have any official recognition in the region; it has no institutional support, is not used in school learning, and there are no media broadcasting in Romani locally. Therefore, Eastern Uzh Romani is not safe, although it is not in danger of imminent extinction.

With respect to particular localities, the least safe varieties seem to be those of Radvanka and Perechyn. In Radvanka, trilingual Romani-Hungarian-Ukrainian codeswitching is quite common, and in some families Romani represents the less dominant code of communication. Children from some families in Radvanka pick up Romani from their peers in streets rather than in the family. In Perechyn, there live quite a few Roma who come from locations where no Romani is spoken. Although these Roma usually learn some Romani in Perechyn, their preferred code is the local Ukrainian dialect, which consequently becomes one of the common languages of the local Romani community.

1.2.4.2 Second and contact languages

Like elsewhere, all adult speakers of Romani are multilingual and they speak other languages in addition to Romani. Eastern Uzh Romani speakers are at least trilingual and often even quadrilingual, which reflects the complex multilingual reality in Transcarpathian Ukraine. Moreover, the second languages have been subject to replacement by other languages during the last one hundred years. This was due to the political history when the region was part of several different countries with ever-changing official languages and sometimes even with changing languages of instruction in schools. Thus, for example, the original language of instruction in the aforementioned Gypsy school in the Shakhta neighbourhood of Uzhhorod, Slovak, was replaced by Hungarian during the war and finally by Ukrainian (plus Russian) in the Soviet period. As a result, members of the same families who belong to different generations were sometimes instructed in different languages during their childhood, even though they attended the same school.

Today, the main second language of Eastern Uzh Romani speakers is represented by local varieties of the East Slavic dialects of Transcarpathia. Such dialects have most

commonly been classified as belonging to Southwestern Ukrainian dialects (e.g. AUM; Danylenko and Vakulenko 1995, etc.). Alternatively, they have been described as South Carpathian Ukrainian dialects (Pan'kevyč 1938) or as part of the Rusyn language (e.g. Magocsi 1979; Pugh 2009). I refer to them as local Ukrainian throughout this work and occasionally use the term Rusyn in brackets.⁸ Through mass media and school, speakers of Eastern Uzh Romani are also in contact with Standard Ukrainian, but active competence in it is rather poor among many Roma and an exclusive and straightforward influence of Standard Ukrainian (and not of the local Ukrainian) on Eastern Uzh Romani is not supported by the data (see, for example, the discussion of the forms of verb aktionsart prefixes in 3.5.1.5).

Another important contact language of Eastern Uzh Romani is Russian, which has served as one of the second languages since Transcarpathia became part of the Soviet Union in the 1940s. Russian was (and still is) a lingua franca of the former Soviet Union, propagated through mass media and school and particularly through its invincible position as the language of interethnic communication. Moreover, Roma from Transcarpathia often travelled for work to other parts of the Soviet Union, as far as to Central Asia, and, vice versa, many Russian-speaking people from other parts of the Soviet Union moved to Transcarpathia and especially to Uzhhorod to live there either temporarily or permanently. Under these circumstances, Russian was used by Roma on a daily basis in communication with various people. Although its importance in independent Ukraine slightly declined, Russian is still frequently used and many Russian terms and expressions encroach onto communication in other languages, including Eastern Uzh Romani (see the discussion on various Slavic-origin particles in 9.6.4).

Hungarian is another contact language of Eastern Uzh Romani and a second language for some (but not all) members of Eastern Uzh Romani communities. In Transcarpathia in general, Hungarian is the most common mother tongue of the Romani population and the first language for Roma living immediately south and southeast of the Eastern Uzh Romani dialect region (see 1.2.1 above). In Uzhhorod, Khudlovo and Serednie, there are frequent social contacts and even marital affinities with these Hungarian-speaking Roma, and during these contacts Hungarian is often used in communication. In Radvanka, Hungarian even puts Romani in danger of being shifted in some families. The only Eastern Uzh locality where

⁸ The question whether the East Slavic dialects of Transcarpathia belong to the Ukrainian language or form an independent language called Rusyn is a political issue which has little to do with linguistic criteria. I would like to emphasise that in no way do I want to present any political stances in this thesis, so that I do not insist on either decision.

Hungarian currently plays no role in Perechyn, even though the Roma of the eldest generation have some knowledge of it there as well and there are many Hungarian loanwords used by the eldest speakers in Perechyn that do not occur in the speech of middle-aged and young speakers (e.g. *hatāris* ‘border’ from Hungarian *határ* instead of the more common *hraňica* of local Slavic origin). In any case, the degree of knowledge of Hungarian is uneven among various Eastern Uzh Romani speakers and may be outlined as a continuum from knowledge of several isolated words to a decent active command, even within a single location.

Finally, Slovak, more specifically an East Slovak dialect, used to be a second language of Eastern Uzh Romani communities until the first half of the twentieth century, when Slovaks were an integral part of the local ethnic milieu and contacts and marital relations with East Slovak Roma were common. In both Uzhhorod communities, Slovak was the main second language alongside Hungarian, also used as the language of instruction in the famous Gypsy school in Uzhhorod in the pre-war period (Steiner 1939), but its knowledge has been declining rapidly in generations born after the World War Two. Today, some degree of Slovak competence normally occurs only among those Roma who have maintained their contacts with Slovakia, in particular in Radvanka. Still, unambiguous East Slovak loanwords are common in all Eastern Uzh Romani varieties, including the easternmost varieties of Khudlovo and Sereďnie. Many Slovak-origin basic vocabulary items, such as the adjective *zdravo* ‘healthy’, the kinship terms *ujcus* ‘uncle’ and *cetka* ‘aunt’, and even function words, such as the pronoun *nič* ‘nothing’, are not only shared by Eastern Uzh varieties, but also with the Uzh and Zemplín Romani varieties in East Slovakia.

1.3 Methodology and sources of data

1.3.1 Fieldwork

The present grammatical description is based on data acquired during my fieldwork research conducted between 2007 and 2016 in the traditional locations of the dialect. The fieldwork was carried out in 16 recurrent trips to the area. The length of individual trips ranged from three days at the minimum to one month at the maximum, and the total time spent in the field researching this dialect was half a year.

The first trip was conducted in July 2007 when I, then a graduate student of Romani and Indian Studies, set off to Uzhhorod with another student, Lukáš Houdek; our primary task was to obtain recordings of the local Romani dialect for the linguistic archive of the Seminar of Romani Studies in Prague. During our one week stay, we acquired several hours of recordings of various Shakhta and Radvanka speakers (see 1.3.2 below). In a more systematic

way, the fieldwork was initiated in August 2010 by research in Uzhhorod (only Shakhta), Perechyn and Serednie. The aim of this trip was two-fold: to obtain structured elicited data for the intended dialectological atlas of Central Romani and to gather preliminary data for my PhD research. A similar fieldwork research was carried out on the Khudlovo variety in July 2011.

In 2011, I made a closer and godparental relationship with members of one Romani family who were living in Shakhta. Since then, I have been returning to visit this family and have stayed in their household several times every year. The head of this family, a man born in 1976, also became my main language consultant from whom I elicited detailed lexical and grammatical data; I was also allowed to record him any time. Since I was living at this family's residence during my stays in Uzhhorod, I assumed the role of a participant observer and could observe the language in natural discourse throughout the day. My research was, however, not limited to collecting data from this particular family, and I have been visiting other Romani households in Uzhhorod since 2011, both related and unrelated to my main consultant, and there, I was able to acquire further language data, mainly through recording natural speech. At the same time, my acquaintanceship with the family of my godchild enabled me to make new contacts in the Perechyn Romani community since the wife of my main consultant is of Perechyn descent, and I could record her relatives who still live in Perechyn during many of my visits.

The major language of my fieldwork research was Romani. I was already able to speak in Eastern North Central Romani (in a levelled East Slovak Romani variety) when I commenced my fieldwork in 2007. Apart from elicitation sessions, all of my communication with consultants during the fieldwork was exclusively done in Romani. I gradually accommodated my Romani to the Eastern Uzh Romani, more specifically to the Shakhta variety, to the degree that I can claim that I am an active speaker of the dialect.

As for funding of my fieldwork, the trips in 2007 and 2010 were funded by the linguistic research aim *Jazyk jako lidská činnost, její produkt a faktor* ('Language as a human activity, its product and factor'), realised at the Faculty of Arts in 2005 to 2011 and owing to the Czech Ministry of Education. In the summer of 2011, one trip was funded by the Czech Grant Agency within the research project *Linguistic Atlas of Central Romani* (2011–2013, P406/11/0818), managed by Viktor Elšík. The subsequent fieldwork was one of numerous private journeys, some of which were supported by single-purpose scholarships granted by the Faculty of Arts.

1.3.2 Language data

The major source of language data are audio-recordings of both elicited and natural speech collected in all varieties of Eastern Uzh Romani. The process of recording was carried out in the speakers' home environments or in the homes of relatives and friends of the recorded speakers. The elicitation was primarily the oral reverse translation elicitation (see Samarin 1967), mostly with the help of the Ukrainian mutation of the *Linguistic Questionnaire for the Documentation of Central European Romani* (hence LQCR; Elšík 2008–2012). LQCR has been developed in several versions; the versions used for documenting most Eastern Uzh varieties were LQCR-3 (for the Shakhta, Perechyn and Serednie varieties) and LQCR-4 (for the Khudlovo variety). Both versions consist of 1,500 sentences designed to cover all essential grammatical structures and a large section of the lexicon. In addition, I made use of a shorter version LQCR-E for documentation of the Radvanka variety; the LQCR-E consists of 800 sentence items and was formerly developed for documenting the dialectal variation of North Central Romani in East Slovakia. LQCR in general partly derives from the *Romani Dialectological Questionnaire* (Elšík and Matras 2001), which has been used to document numerous Romani dialects from all over Europe for the *Romani Morpho-Syntax Database* project (see Elšík and Matras 2006: 58–67; Matras, White and Elšík 2009).

The language consultants for the LQCR elicitation were selected so that their idiolects were accurate representatives of the local variety. With the only exception (see below), all the consultants were born in the given locality, grew up there and spent either the whole lives or a significant part of their lives there; in addition, at least one of their parents was also local.⁹ On the basis of LQCR, the entire eastern Uzh region has been documented by 9,170 transcribed sentences, all of which are grammatically and lexically tagged and stored in a searchable database (Elšík 2008–) alongside the data of other Romani dialects from various regions of East Central Europe. The audio-recordings of the LQCR elicitation are stored in the archive of recordings of the Seminar of Romani Studies at Charles University.

In addition to the recordings of elicited translations, I also collected numerous natural speech recordings of various genres, such as narratives, conversations and interviews on various topics. Such recordings were partly acquired during or after the sessions of the LQCR elicitation with the same speakers, but a considerable portion of language data was acquired independently of LQCR between 2007 and 2016 during my numerous journeys to the area

⁹ For the Shakhta variety, the appropriate location is considered the entire town of Uzhhorod, not only the Shakhta neighbourhood (see 1.2.2.1.1 for details about the history and distribution of the traditional Roma of Shakhta).

(see also 1.3.1 above). The following paragraphs provide a more detailed overview of linguistic sources of data in particular varieties.

In Radvanka, the LQCR data were acquired in February and April of 2013 through questionnaire elicitation in two different families (LQCR-E: 1,326 items). In one family, the main consultant was a female speaker who was born in 1977; she contributed 493 items. This consultant's son, born in 1997, contributed 31 items. In the other family, two siblings were consulted: a female speaker born in the 1980s who contributed by 589 items, and her brother, born in 1997, who contributed by 213 items. Furthermore, recordings collected in Radvanka in June 2007 and in June 2016 of four more people who were born between the 1950s and 1980s have been included for analysis. In addition, I consulted a short recording of 10 minutes acquired by Milena Hübschmannová in Uzhhorod in 1995, which is stored in the archive of the Seminar of Romani Studies in Prague. The recording is of a Radvanka speaker who was born in 1947. The total number of consultants of the Radvanka variety is nine, and the total length of analysed recordings (including those of the LQCR) is 7 hours and 50 minutes.

The language data for the Shakhta variety come from long-term research conducted in Uzhhorod during various fieldwork trips (see 1.3.1 above). The LQCR data were acquired in August 2010 through questionnaire elicitation with two female speakers from two different families (LQCR-3: 2,987 items). The first speaker, who contributed 1,493 items, was born in 1963 and grew up in the traditional settlement of *Močāra* before her family left for Telmana Street in the early 1970s. The other consultant, who was consulted in Shakhta, was born in 1970; she contributed 1,494 items. In addition, the Shakhta variety has been documented by more than 120 hours of recordings of both elicited and natural speech of more than 20 other speakers. However, because of capacity limitations, only a small part of these recordings has been transcribed and was usable for the analysis. Alongside the recordings of the two speakers consulted for the LQCR, a significant part of the analysed data comes from my main male consultant, who was born in 1976 (see 1.3.1 above). I have also analysed at least parts of recordings with seven other speakers of varying ages, from a female speaker born in 1929 (a half-hour narrative about the war and personal history) to a young male speaker born in 1998. All of them were consulted and recorded in various parts of Uzhhorod, but they share the fact that they either personally come from the traditional Uzhhorod Romani settlement of *Močāra* or their ancestors came from there; thus, they all belong to the community of the *Močārika Roma* (see 1.2.2.1.1). In this association, I should concede certain bias towards the Shakhta variety in the description. For example, the number of the glossed sentences that represent the Shakha variety considerably outnumber those of the other varieties, and some discussions,

such as those of nominalisation and adjective derivation, are significantly based on the data of the Shakhta variety.

In Perechyn, the LQCR data were acquired in August 2010 through questionnaire elicitation with two female speakers who were from a single family (LQCR-3: 1,554 items). The main consultant, who contributed 1,422 items, was born in 1993. The other consultant was the main consultant's grandmother, born in 1946, who contributed 132 items. Spontaneous utterances of both speakers were also recorded in addition to the elicitation. During the same fieldwork in August 2010, I also recorded a half-hour interview with the local Romani pastor, who was born in 1975. Other recordings of narratives and conversations of Perechyn speakers were collected during several trips between 2011 and 2016; these record five other speakers of various ages (born between 1945 and 1986). The total number of consultants of the Perechyn variety is eight, and the total length of recordings (including those of the LQCR) is 12 hours and 44 minutes.

In Khudlovo, the LQCR data were acquired in July 2011 through questionnaire elicitation with two female and one male speakers from a single family (LQCR-4: 1,806 items). The main female consultant, who contributed 1,196 items, was born in 1964, while the male consultant, who contributed 116 items, was the main consultant's son and was born in 1981. The other female consultant was the son's wife, the daughter-in-law of the main consultant, and was born in 1981 in Chişinău, Moldova. She was a native speaker of Ursari Romani and learned the local Romani variety after she came to Khudlovo at the age of 14. For this reason, two thirds of the 494 LQCR items elicited with this speaker were elicited again with her mother-in-law for cross-checking; this double elicitation revealed that the Eastern Uzh idiolect of the woman of Ursari origin does not differ in any significant way from the idiolects of the local native speakers. With all the speakers consulted for the LQCR, plus three other members of the same family (born in 1947, in the late 1970s and in 1997), recordings of spontaneous speech were acquired and analysed as well. I returned to Khudlovo in August 2015 and recorded another male speaker who was born in 1980. The total sum of all speakers whose language data have been analysed is seven with eight hours of recordings.

In Serednie, the LQCR data were collected in August 2010 through questionnaire elicitation with a single male speaker (LQCR-3: 1,497 items) who was born in 1983. During the same fieldwork, I also acquired recordings of three other members of the main consultant's family (born between the 1960s and 1980s). Another fieldwork trip was conducted in Serednie in August 2016 when I recorded a single female speaker born in the 1970s; the total length was more than two hours. In addition, I acquired more than five hours

of recordings of fairy tales and anecdotes narrated by a young speaker from Serednie (born in 1990) in February 2013 in Uzhhorod. However, the majority of the recorded materials with this speaker have not been transcribed yet and have not been included in the analysis. The only transcribed part was a 30-minute long narrative consisting of four fairy tales that have been published in Beníšek (2014a). In this work, the language examples of this source are indexed with the abbreviation RDŽ. The total number of consultants of the Serednie variety is six, with 9 hours and 50 minutes of recordings included in the analysis.

Unless otherwise stated, the data for the other Central Romani dialects come from the database of the LQCR-based elicited translations (Elšík 2008–).

1.3.3 Theoretical framework and the structure of description

The dissertation is a synchronic description of the Eastern Uzh Romani dialect as it is spoken in its traditional locations. Moreover, it includes a section on the historical phonology and contains some diachronic notes for clarification of current forms and functions. The dissertation also has frequent references to the reconstructed Late Proto-Romani. Note that I use the term ‘Late Proto-Romani’ for what Matras (e.g. 2002) labels ‘Early Romani’, that is, an unattested proto-language of all Romani dialects assumed to have been spoken in the Greek-speaking areas of the Late Byzantine period before the split-up of Romani dialects occurred.¹⁰ In this association, the term ‘inherited’ is used throughout the work and understood in the sense ‘inherited from Late Proto-Romani’. It means that inherited forms and categories consist of not only the indigenous Indo-Aryan forms and categories inherited from an Indian predecessor of Romani, but also of those borrowed from West Asian languages and Greek, which were present in the common forerunner of all Romani dialects. Furthermore, notes about the contact-induced phenomena that are outcomes of recent and current language contact with Slavic and Hungarian are part of the description, although an analysis of contact-induced language change is not the primary aim of this dissertation. The description is also a comparative one in that it is focused on internal variations of the dialect and distinctions found among its individual varieties. However, it does not represent a systematic comparative grammar in terms of the Eastern Uzh dialect’s relation to other Romani dialects, apart from the section on historical phonology and intermittent references on features of the most related Romani dialects of East Slovakia.

¹⁰ See Elšík and Matras (2006: 68–84) for a brief sketch of this proto-language reconstructed on the basis of the comparative dialectology.

From what has already been said, it should be clear that the approach of the description is language-driven rather than theory-driven (see Hyman 2001) because its goal is not an analysis of a language within a particular linguistic theory or a discussion of a theoretical issue. The description makes use of widely accepted universal terms and established concepts within the cumulative theoretical framework of what Dixon (2007) calls the *basic linguistic theory*. It also seeks to find inspiration in the contemporary functional-typological concepts (e.g. Payne 1997; Shopen 2007) that form the background of many of the recent grammar descriptions and, finally, is firmly embedded in concepts common in the up-to-date Romani linguistics.¹¹ In particular, I follow the concepts and discussions of Elšik and Matras (2006), for example, in using the innovative terms *oikoclititic* and *xenoclititic* for the Romani-specific morphological compartmentalisation instead of the more conservative, but less adequate, terms *thematic* and *athematic* (see 4.1 and 5.1 for more details).

The dissertation does not include any discussion of the lexical material, which was also documented during the fieldwork. Although I have been working on a dictionary of the Shakhta variety with almost 4,000 lexical entries processed so far, I have finally made a decision not to include any dictionary, because this would lead to the unacceptable length of the dissertation. In any case, the parallel work on the dictionary turned out to be very helpful in writing some parts of the grammar description, in particular those dealing with the derivation. I expect further work on the lexical aspects of the dialect as a future task, not only in terms of preparation of a more or less exhaustive dictionary, which is a long-term task, but also in terms of a discussion of the lexical variation among individual varieties, which would provide a more comprehensive picture of the entire Eastern Uzh Romani dialect. Analyses of the pragmatics and discourse-related phenomena are also left for further research.

The dissertation is organised into thirteen chapters. The actual description is designed in a bottom-up approach as it starts in a traditional way, with a chapter on phonology, and ends by discussing complex syntactic constructions, such as clause linking. Still, morphology and syntax are not sharply divided, and a discussion of both morphological and syntactic features is often interconnected or dealt with in a single chapter (see, for example, the discussion on both the morphological and syntactic properties of comparative and superlative constructions in chapter 10). The most striking division between morphology and syntax pertains to discussing the verbs; chapter 3 is mainly concerned with the verb morphology,

¹¹ See Matras (2002) and Boretzky and Igla (2004) for the most authoritative works of the recent Romani linguistics.

while the verb syntax has its own chapter 12. This approach sometimes leads to a situation where the different devices used for the same or similar verb categories are dealt with in different parts of the grammar. For example, various valency-changing devices are discussed in different chapters, depending on whether they are morphological or syntactic in nature. The obvious weaknesses of such an approach from a functional point of view are overcome by rich cross-references throughout the work that refer to functionally related forms and structures in different parts of the description.

As already indicated, the description begins with the chapter on phonology and orthography, where special attention is given to the inventory of phonemes, the issues of vowel length and diphthongs and stress placement. In this chapter, the standard transcription of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) is often provided for language examples. The final sections of the chapter on phonology also provide a brief sketch of the historical phonology of Eastern Uzh Romani within the broader context of North Central Romani dialects, plus an outline of the word-specific phonological variation found within the dialect region.

In chapters 3 to 9, the emphasis is on the discussion of various word classes and their inflectional and derivational patterns, as well as on their functions, especially as far as the less lexical and more grammatical word classes (the so-called function words) are concerned. I somewhat depart from the traditional parts of speech and adopt a slightly different classification based on a more precise understanding of the functional and semantic commonalities of various categories of words. For example, I deal with numerals in a single chapter together with non-numerical quantifiers, owing to their related semantic characteristics, and I also discuss demonstratives in association with location deictics (the words such as ‘here’ and ‘there’), temporal and comparative deictics (‘thus’, ‘such’, ‘so much’, etc.) and even the articles; at the same time, I separate demonstratives from the other pronouns discussed in another chapter. Chapter 10 is one of the few chapters conceived in an onomasiological perspective; it is devoted to describing morphological and syntactic devices used in comparative and equative constructions. Chapter 11 deals with the structure of noun and prepositional phrases and also incorporates a discussion regarding the functions of individual case markers and prepositions, with a rather semasiological perspective adopted. The final two chapters are on syntactic structures: the aforementioned chapter 12 is a discussion of important aspects of the syntax of verbs, including a relatively detailed overview of various modal expressions and their functions. Chapter 13 deals with combining phrases, clauses and sentences into larger units, such as serialisation, complementation,

subordination, relativisation and coordination. Thus, the description combines both the semasiological (form-to-function) and the onomasiological (function-to-form) approaches, with different importances attached to one or the other perspective in different chapters. On the whole, however, the semasiological perspective dominates.

The features, forms and grammatical categories discussed are amply illustrated by language examples that come from both elicited and spontaneous speech. The sentence examples in every chapter beginning with verbs (3) are consecutively numbered and contain the interlinear glosses, in addition to the more or less idiomatic English translations. The interlinear glosses are based on conventions common in the current typological literature and in grammar descriptions (the so-called Leipzig Glossing Rules).¹² Two kinds of glossing representations occur: morphemic glossing and morphosemantic glossing. The morphemic representation provides glosses for every segmented morpheme separated from other morphemes by hyphens, both in the example and in the gloss, e.g. *gej-l'-om-as* [go-PFV-1SG-REM] 'I would have gone'. This morpheme-by-morpheme glossing is used only for words and morphemes where it is required by the ongoing discussion of the given feature. Otherwise, most examples contain only the morphosemantic glosses, which provide a complex gloss for the entire word form, e.g. *gejlomas* [go.IRR.1SG]. As is evident, the morphemic and morphosemantic representations may differ in the categorial abbreviations they use, as well as in their order.

The numbered language examples are followed by bracketed abbreviations of names of the varieties where they were recorded. For example, the abbreviation (UzhhR) means that the given example is a representative of the Radvanka variety of Uzhhorod, the abbreviation (UzhhS) stands for the Shakhta variety of Uzhhorod, the abbreviation (Uzhh) stands for both and so forth. The label (common) means that the given example was recorded in all varieties. Sometimes, an upper index is also added to such bracketed varieties. The three indices that occur are ^{LQCR}, ^{RDž} and ^{etr}. The most common one is ^{LQCR}, which points to the source of the example in the elicited translations acquired with the help of the LQCR (see 1.3.2 above). The upper index of ^{RDž} only occurs in some Sereďnie examples and indicates that the sentence example has already been published in a selection of fairy tales (Beniřek 2014a). The least common index of ^{etr} points to an elicited translation acquired beyond the LQCR context. The majority of numbered examples lack any upper index, meaning they represent natural speech and have not been published elsewhere. It follows that the indices of ^{LQCR} and ^{etr} refer to

¹² See <http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php> (link active 2017-03-10).

elicited translations, while ^{RDž} and no index indicate a spontaneous utterance. Although I was trying to illustrate the discussed features by choosing spontaneous sentences as much as possible, some features and categories are attested only through elicitation, or their spontaneous occurrence was not suitable for illustration, for example, because they occurred in incomplete or defective sentences, in one-word answers and the like. Moreover, it is more convenient to present elicited speech in some cases, such as for illustration of clear paradigms in broader sentence contexts and also for the sake of dialectological comparison since translations elicited in different varieties can demonstrate either differences and variation of structures within the dialect region or, the other way around, uniformity.¹³ In any case, the majority of the glossed sentence examples represent natural speech, while the elicited data have mostly been utilised in inflectional paradigms, in discussions on derivations and in phonological analyses.

1.3.4 Previous studies

Despite the fact that existence of North Central Romani in Transcarpathian Ukraine has been recognised (see 1.1), the Eastern Uzh dialect has not drawn any scholarly attention until recently. Miklosich (1872: 62–63) published a list of 203 words and short sentences that were given to him by Mr. Piurko; these were *in der Gegend von Unghvár aufgezeichnet*, i.e. recorded in the vicinity of Uzhhorod. The word list clearly represents an Uzh dialect with some archaic features, and a number of its words, such as *oblaka* ‘window’, *vad’os* ‘bed’ and numerous Slovak loanwords (*stromos* ‘tree’, etc.) indicate the origin of the word list in a northern variety of Western Uzh Romani in what is now the Sobrance district of East Slovakia. Otherwise, the first analysis of an Eastern Uzh variety was my article of selected features of the Serednie variety (Beníšek 2013b). I also published three fairy tales told by a speaker from Serednie (Beníšek 2014a), which are included in the analysis of this description (see 1.3.2 and 1.3.3 above), and discussed some of the features of the dialect at several linguistic conferences (Beníšek 2013c, 2014c, 2014d, 2016).¹⁴ Some other North Central Romani dialects have been described for decades, and research of some of them can even be traced back to almost the beginnings of scholarly interest in Romani. Only a selection of the

¹³ See Chelliah (2001) for a discussion of the different purposes of elicited and natural texts.

¹⁴ A note here should be made about the Ukrainian–Romani conversation booklet published in Uzhhorod by local activists (Adam and Navroc’ka 2002). The Romani language presented in this booklet is based on a Vlax-type dialect and does not represent the local dialect of Uzhhorod. This also holds true for Romani texts published in the memoirs of Adam, Zejkan and Navroc’ka (2006), which have been strongly edited and contain a mixture of Eastern Uzh features with Vlax ones.

most fundamental works on North Central Romani are summarised in the following paragraphs.

The first description of a North Central Romani variety, and even one of the earliest grammatical and lexical descriptions of Romani at all, is Puchmayer (1821): a sketch of the now extinct Bohemian Romani that was spoken at that time by itinerant Roma of West Bohemia. Another authoritative work from the 19th century is Sowa's description of a Romani variety spoken in the vicinity of the West Slovak town of Trenčín (Sowa 1887), which remains the most in-depth treatise of a western variety of North Central Romani so far. The same author also wrote an article sketch of a Moravian Romani variety of Boskovice, which was based on two folktales (Sowa 1893). Nevertheless, the first scholarly work on Slovak Romani dialects was that of Ihnátko (1877).

In the first half of the 20th century, a significant effort was made in documentation of Polish North Central Romani by the publication of texts (Kopernicki 1930) and by a dictionary of a variety of the city of Zakopane (Rozwadowski 1936). After World War Two, several linguists in Czechoslovakia commenced a systematic study of the Romani varieties spoken in East Slovakia. Lípa (1963) described a Zemplín Romani variety spoken north of the town of Humenné, while the dictionary of Hübschmannová, Šebková and Žigová (1991) is a compilation of the lexical material from various localities of East Slovakia and beyond. So far, the dictionary, which also includes a short grammatical outline, has remained the standard reference work of what is called 'East Slovak Romani'. A study of Romani dialects spoken in the northwestern parts of Slovakia (Červenka 2006) should also be mentioned.

1.3.5 Notes on transcription and transliteration

Transcription of the Romani language examples follows the mainstream scholarly conventions. The features typical of such conventions are the Czech-origin graphemes making use of carons for the postalveolar affricates and fricatives, such as ⟨č⟩, ⟨dž⟩, ⟨š⟩ and ⟨ž⟩, and digraphs for aspirated consonants, such as ⟨kh⟩. The palatal stops are indicated in the Czech-Slovak way, that is, ⟨dʲ⟩, ⟨tʲ⟩, ⟨ň⟩ and ⟨lʲ⟩. The long vowel is marked by a macron, ⟨ā⟩, while diphthongs are indicated as sequences of a vowel plus a consonant, e.g. ⟨ej⟩ and ⟨ov⟩. See the second chapter on phonology and orthography for more information.

The geographic names in Ukraine are given in the official romanisation according to the Ukrainian National transliteration, while surnames and bibliographical references of Ukrainian and Russian sources follow the scientific transliteration system similar to that used

in Romani transcription. Otherwise, language examples of the East Slavic languages are kept in the Cyrillic script.

2 PHONOLOGY AND ORTHOGRAPHY

2.1 Consonants

There are 31 to 35 consonant phonemes in Eastern Uzh Romani. The exact number depends on whether the aspirated palatal stop /tʰ/ exists in the given variety or an idiolect or not and whether we include the highly marginal palatalised sibilants, which only occur in few loanwords, into the phonemic system. See the following chart (Table 1), in which all phonemes are indicated by their IPA representations, as well as by graphemes used for their representation in this work (in chevrons).

Table 1: Consonant phonemes

		labial	(denti-) alveolar	post-alveolar	palatal	velar	uvular	glottal
nasals		m ⟨m⟩	n ⟨n⟩		ɲ ⟨ň⟩			
stops	<i>voiceless</i>	p ⟨p⟩	t ⟨t⟩		c ⟨tʰ⟩	k ⟨k⟩		
	<i>aspirated</i>	p ^h ⟨ph⟩	t ^h ⟨th⟩		c ^h ⟨tʰh⟩	k ^h ⟨kh⟩		
	<i>voiced</i>	b ⟨b⟩	d ⟨d⟩		ɟ ⟨dʰ⟩	g ⟨g⟩		
affricate	<i>voiceless</i>		ts̄ ⟨c⟩	tʃ̄ ⟨č⟩				
	<i>palatalised</i>		ts̄ ^j ⟨cʰ⟩					
	<i>aspirated</i>			tʃ̄ ^h ⟨čh⟩				
	<i>voiced</i>		dz̄ ⟨dz⟩	dʒ̄ ⟨dž⟩				
fricative	<i>voiceless</i>	f ⟨f⟩	s ⟨s⟩	ʃ/ʂ ⟨š⟩			χ ⟨x⟩	h ⟨h⟩
	<i>palatalised</i>		s ^j ⟨sʰ⟩					
	<i>voiced</i>	v/ɸ ⟨v⟩	z ⟨z⟩	ʒ/ʒ̣ ⟨ž⟩				
	<i>palatalised</i>		z ^j ⟨zʰ⟩					
trill			r ⟨r⟩					
lateral approximant			l ⟨l⟩		ʎ ⟨lʲ⟩			
approximant (glide)					j ⟨j⟩			

Apart from the place and manner of articulation, the main distinctive features of Romani consonantism are voice and aspiration, which will be discussed in separate sections each, while palatalisation, based on alternation of some non-palatal phonemes with their palatal counterparts, plays an important role in the morphophonology. The stops and nasals

occur in labial (bilabial), alveolar (or denti-alveolar), palatal and velar places of articulation (the velar nasal only as an allophone and, therefore, unshown in the chart). The inventory of affricates and fricatives comprises the (denti-)alveolar and post-alveolar phonemes. There are also labial (labiodental) fricatives and two post-velar fricatives. Last, a palatal approximant and two lateral approximants are part of the phonological system. For more details on most of these phonemes, see the following sections.

2.1.1 Voice

As in other Romani dialects, the voice opposition is a distinctive feature of stops, affricates and fricatives. It may be subject to alternation. The voice alternation, which is shared with other Romani dialects and whose origin must go back to Proto-Romani, is in the nominal Layer II case suffixes. Most case suffixes have a voiceless variant, such as DAT *-ke* and ABL *-tar*, and a voiced variant, such as *-ge* and *-dar*, which are phonologically conditioned (see 4.1.3).

Furthermore, there are certain contact-induced phenomena that affect voice of consonants in contact with other sounds, both word-medially and word-finally. The main rule of such voice changes is regressive assimilation. It would be worth dealing with this topic in more detail in some phonetic research, and only a few general remarks and observations can be put forward here.

First, voiced consonants are devoiced on the morphemic boundary if the following consonant is voiceless. For example, the iterative suffix *-ker-* triggers devoicing of the preceding voiced consonant, as in *čumid-* ‘to kiss’ (3SG *čumidel*) > ITER *čumit-ker-* ‘to repeatedly kiss, to kiss multiple objects’ (3SG *čumitkerel*). Many examples may be found in aktionsart derivation of verbs, e.g. the prefix of ‘dissolution’ *roz-*, as in *roz-dža-* ‘to split up, to divorce’, takes on a form *ros-* when attached to verbs that begin in a voiceless consonant, such as *ros-ker-* ‘to take apart, to spend (money), etc.’. This regressive assimilation of voice is typical of many Slavic languages (but not of Standard Ukrainian), where it plays an important role in the grammatical systems. However, the opposite process, regressive voicing of voiceless consonant, is rare in Eastern Uzh Romani. It can be found in a historical compound *jepaž-rat* ‘midnight’, from *jepaš* ‘half’ and **rat* ‘night’ (now *rātī*). Nonetheless, this example rather represents assimilation at word boundaries discussed in the following section. In the productive inflectional and derivational processes, assimilation of voiceless consonants does not operate, e.g. *beš-* ‘to sit’, PFV *beš-l-* (as in *bešle* ‘they sat’), not **bež-l-* (**bežle*).

Regressive assimilation of voice is not limited to within a word, but applies to boundaries across words as well. In contrast to the word-medial positions, voice assimilation at the word boundaries includes voicing of the voiceless consonants as well. Voiceless consonants, including all sibilants, are voiced not only before the initial voiced consonant of a following word, as in *biš berš* [bi.ʒberʃ] ‘twenty years’, *kas dikhes* [kaz.di.k^hes] ‘whom do you see’, but also before the initial vowel, e.g. *berš oleske* [ber.ʒo.les.ke] ‘a year ago’, *deš ovri* [de.ʒou.ri] ‘ten o’clock’, *pališ ov* [pa.li.ʒou] ‘then he’, *des avka* [de.za.ka] ‘you give in such a way’, *džās ijdž* [dʒa:.zi:tʃ] ‘I was going yesterday’, etc.¹⁵ Such voice alterations triggered by contact of different words are not represented in writing.¹⁶

Voice is usually neutralised in the absolute word-final position, when no word follows, or before a prosodic break, e.g. *brišind* ‘rain’ > *brišint#* (vs. *brišindalo* ‘rainy’), *čhib* ‘tongue, language’ > *čhip#* (vs. PL *čhiba*), *dad* ‘father’ > *dat#* (vs. ACC *dades*), *mindž* ‘vagina’ > *minč#* (vs. PL *mindža*), etc. This feature is shared with most North Slavic language, even though it, once again, does not occur in Standard Ukrainian.

The process of devoicing does not apply to /v/, which preserves its voice under any circumstances mentioned above, but is frequently changed into bilabial [u] in the syllable coda, e.g. *džav* [dʒau] not *[dʒaf]. See 2.1.6 below for more details.

2.1.2 Aspiration

Presence of the distinctive aspirated consonant phonemes is typical of nearly all Indo-Aryan languages (cf. Masica 1991: 101–104), including many Romani dialects. Late Proto-Romani (‘Early Romani’) is reconstructed as having the voiceless aspirated series of stops */ph/, */th/, */kh/ and an affricate */čh/ (Matras 2002: 54; Elšík and Matras 2006: 70), and the same aspirated consonants are found in Eastern Uzh Romani, e.g. *phral* ‘brother’, *phuter-* ‘to open’, *than* ‘bed’, *thov-* ‘to put’, *dikh-* ‘to see’, *khas* ‘hay’, *ačh-* ‘to stay, to become’, *čhon* ‘moon,

¹⁵ This feature, too, is contact-induced, documented in Slavic dialects of the area (cf. Zilyns’kyj 1979: 151).

¹⁶ Take note of the form of the prepositions *paž* ‘beside, next to, by’ and *važ* ‘for, because of, etc.’ instead of *paš* and *vaš* known from other dialects. In Eastern Uzh Romani, these preposition almost always occur with the voiced sibilant as it is required by the sound environment these prepositions most commonly find themselves, and that is why their voiced variant is taken as the primary one. The only phonetic context in which *paž* and *važ* occur with the voiceless sibilant, i.e. as [paʃ] and [vaʃ], is when a word in an initial voiceless consonant follows, e.g. when the prepositions are combined with the second-person pronouns *tu(te)*, *tijro*, *tumende*, *tumāro* or with the reflexive pronouns *peste*, *peskero*, *pende*, *pengero*. The voiceless variant is also retained in etymologically related forms, such as the spatial adverb *pāšes* ‘nearby’ and the consecutive coordinator *važodā* ‘therefore’ (< *vaš* with the demonstrative *odā*).

month', etc. In addition, there is an aspirated palatal plosive /tʰ/ [cʰ], in particular in the *gāvutune* varieties and only rarely in Uzhhorod, but its lexical distribution is extremely marginal. Having developed through palatalisation of the aspirated velar /kh/, /tʰ/ occurs in few words indicated in Table 2, and varies with the aspirated affricate /čh/, in a single noun even with /kh/.

Table 2: Occurrence of /tʰ/ and its variation with /čh/ and /kh/

Proto-Romani	Uzhhorod	Perechyn	Khudlovo	Serednie	MEANING
* <i>khil</i>	<i>čhil</i>	<i>tʰil</i>	<i>tʰil</i>	<i>tʰil</i>	'butter'
* <i>khiljav</i>	<i>čhil'av</i>	<i>tʰil'av</i>	<i>khil'av</i>	<i>tʰil'av</i>	'plum'
* <i>dikhjo(ve)l</i>	<i>dičhol</i>	<i>diʰhol</i>	<i>diʰhol, dičhol</i>	<i>diʰhol</i>	'is seen'
* <i>makhi</i>	<i>māčhi</i>	<i>māʰhi</i>	<i>māʰhi</i>	<i>māʰhi</i>	'fly' ¹⁷

It appears from Table 2 that /tʰ/ never occurs in Uzhhorod. However, one speaker of the Shakhta variety who was consulted and had no record of any ties to the *gāvutune* communities provided evidence for the palatal /tʰ/ in these words, so that there are conspicuously some more conservative speakers in Uzhhorod who have /tʰ/ instead of /čh/ in these words. On the other hand, even in those varieties in which /tʰ/ remains it is sometimes pronounced with slight affrication, being closer to an alveolo-palatal affricate [tʰ̠], which stands halfway between [cʰ] and [tʃʰ]. To sum up, the sound /tʰ/ is a marginal and unstable consonant, which represents a transitional sound in the development of /kh/ to /čh/ in several words. Note that not all words with a palatal sound close to /kh/ have been affected by this development, e.g. *khiñol* 's/he rests, relaxes' in Khudlovo and Serednie.

Another, and only idiolectal, development of aspiration is its overall loss, which was recorded from several speakers in Uzhhorod. It affects aspirated consonants in all articulation positions, which merge with their unaspirated counterparts. Decomposition of aspirated phonemes into consonant clusters of their unaspirated counterpart plus /x/, such as /ph/ > /px/, called 'velarisation' by Matras (2002: 54), which is widespread in Northeastern Romani, has not developed anywhere in Eastern Uzh Romani.¹⁸

In a word-final position, aspiration is neutralised, which is represented in writing, e.g. *ačhel* 's/he stays' as against IMP.2SG *ač*, *dikhel* 's/he sees' as against IMP.2SG *dik*, for the numeral 'one' cf. NOM.SG *jek* as against OBL.SG.M *jekhe*, etc. If a word with a vowel or with a

¹⁷ In all varieties, *māčhi/māʰhi* is an obsolete word, which is giving way to the Slavic loanword *muxa*.

¹⁸ This development is common in related North Central dialects of Ukrainian Galicia.

voiced consonant follows, further voicing takes place, e.g. *dik ovke* [di.gou.ke] ‘Look over there’ (← *dikh* + *ovke*). In a word-medial position, neutralisation of aspiration never applies, even if a consonant follows (*dikh'om* ‘I saw’).

2.1.3 Palatalisation

In contrast to dialects that have been in more prolonged contact with East Slavic languages, such as Russian Romani (e.g. Wentzel 1980), there are essentially no palatalised counterparts of consonants in Eastern Uzh Romani. What we find are ‘true’ palatals rather than palatalised consonants, much like in Slovak and Hungarian, such as the stops /tʃ/ [c] and /dʃ/ [j] and the sonorants /ɲ/ [ɲ] and /ʎ/ [ʎ]. These palatal consonants developed partly from iotated dentals and velars (see 2.4.1), partly through palatalisation before /i/, as in *d'ives* ‘day’ < **dives* (cf. OIA/MIA *divasa-*), and are found in many loanwords from various languages as well.

The palatal consonants /tʃ/, /dʃ/, /ɲ/, /ʎ/ also occur in morphophonological alternation with the respective non-palatals /t/, /d/, /n/, /l/. One context for such alternation pertains before masculine and feminine suffixes in adjective inflection, e.g. *pārno* M vs. *pārñ-i* F ‘white’, *tāt-o* M vs. *tāt'-i* F ‘warm’, *phērd-o* M vs. *phērd'-i* F ‘full’, *nasval-o* M vs. *nasval'-i* F ‘ill’. When more laterals occur in a single word form, their distant regressive assimilation occur before the feminine suffix, as in *melal-o* M > *mel'al'-i* F ‘dirty’, *lovl-o* M > *lovl'-i* F ‘red’ (cf. also the deadjectival verbs *lovl'ar-* ‘to make red’ and *lovl'uv-* ‘to become red’). Another morphophonological alternation of palatals with non-palatals is in the perfective stem suffixes (see 3.2.2.1), e.g. *zasuv-t-e* ‘they fell asleep’ vs. *zasuv-t'-om* ‘I fell asleep’, *ker-d-e* ‘they did’ vs. *ker-d'-om* ‘I did’, *cir-n-e* ‘they pulled’ vs. *cir-ñ-om* ‘I pulled’, *beš-l-e* ‘they sat’ vs. *beš-l'-om* ‘I sat’. The velar stops /k/, /kh/ and /g/ may also be palatalised and become /tʃ/, /tʃh/ or /čh/ and /dʃ/ respectively in some kinds of verb derivation, e.g. transitive *pek-* ‘to bake’ > intransitive *peť-uv-*, transitive *dikh-* ‘to see’ > intransitive *diťh-uv-* or *dičh-uv-*, transitive *phag-* ‘to break’ > intransitive *phad'-uv-*.

Palatal consonants also stand for the palatalised alveolars in East Slavic loanwords, e.g. *d'ad'as* [ɟaɟas] ‘uncle’ < Russian *дядя* [dʲadʲa], *ťurma* [curma] ‘prison’ < Ukrainian *тюрма* [tʲurma],¹⁹ etc. Other palatalised consonants of the Russian or Ukrainian words occur in non-palatalised forms in the Romani loanwords, as in *bedno* ‘pitiful, poor’ (Russian *бедный*), *kopejka* ‘Копек’ (Russian *копейка*), *naprimér* ‘for example’ (Russian *например*),

¹⁹ Articulation of the palatalised consonants is not homogenous even within Ukrainian and may be closer to that of the West Slavic palatals rather than to articulation of their counterparts in Russian, in particular in some West Ukrainian dialects (cf. Zilyns'kyj 1979: 89–93).

retko ‘rare’ (Russian *редкий*), etc. The only exception are the palatalised alveolar sibilants [tʃʲ], [sʲ] and [zʲ], written as ⟨cʹ⟩, ⟨sʹ⟩ and ⟨zʹ⟩, which occur in East Slavic loanwords (and only in East Slavic loanwords); they will be discussed in 2.1.5.

2.1.4 Sonorants

The inventory of nasals comprises three phonemes: bilabial /m/ (*makh* IMP ‘Smear!’, *komāris* ‘mosquito’), alveolar /n/ (*nakh* ‘nose’, *konāris* ‘branch’) and palatal /ɲ/ [ɲ] (*ñerno* ‘sober’, *koñānki* ‘horse’s faeces’). The alveolar nasal has a velar allophone [ŋ] before velar stops, as in *cinkerav* [tʃɪŋkeraʋ] ‘I do the shopping’ versus *cinav* [tʃɪmaʋ] ‘I buy’, or in Khudlovo *čhangl'om* [tʃʰaŋgɫom] ‘I vomitted’ versus *čhandav* [tʃʰandaʋ] ‘I vomit’.

Unlike in some other Romani dialects, only a single rhotic phoneme has been documented, as in *āro* ‘flour’, *bāro* ‘big’, *berš* ‘year’, *korkōro* ‘alone’, *rom* ‘Rom, husband’ and *rov-* ‘to weep’, which may display distinct kinds of *r*-sound in other Romani dialects. The Eastern Uzh Romani /r/ is a trill, whose articulation probably differs in individual varieties like the articulation of the post-alveolar sibilants mentioned below. In general, /r/ in most positions is post-alveolar in Khudlovo and Serednie, while apparently more alveolar (and more like a tap?) in Uzhhorod and Perechyn. Only an in-depth phonetic analysis could provide more details.

Two lateral approximants are alveolar /l/, which is slightly velarised, e.g. *bālo* ‘pig’, *lovve* ‘money’, and palatal /lʲ/ [ɭ], e.g. *čul'al* ‘it flows’, *l'im* ‘muscle’, *ludos* ‘people’. Both are clear contrastive phonemes, cf. *avla* [aʋɭa] ‘s/he will come’ as against *av'l'a* [aʋɭa] ‘s/he came’. In some loanwords, /l/ is optionally vocalised in the syllable coda in the pre-consonantal position, e.g. *solgāl'in-* [sol.ga:ɭin] ~ *sovgāl'in-* [soʋ.ga:ɭin] ‘to serve’ (< Hungarian *szolgál*). This vacillation probably reflects the situation of a source language, as it was documented in some Slavic and Hungarian varieties of the area (cf. Pugh 2009: 35; Lizanyec and Horváth 1981), rather than a phonological process of Romani.

2.1.5 Sibilants

As in other Romani dialects, both sibilant affricates and sibilant fricatives occur.

Sibilant affricates are the only representatives of affricates in Eastern Uzh Romani. The post-alveolar affricates /čh/ [tʃʰ] and /dž/ [dʒ] are restricted to inherited words, such as *čha* ‘son, Romani boy’ and *dža* IMP.2SG ‘go’ (for /čh/, see also 2.1.2 above). The voiced alveolar affricate /dz/ [dʒ], in contrast, occurs in a single inherited word of unknown origin *dzār* ‘pubic hair’, including its derivation *dzaralo* ‘hairy’. However, it is common in numerous loanwords of probable East Slovak origin, e.g. *cudzo* ‘foreign’, *dzeka* ‘mood,

liking’, *dzivo* ‘wild’, *pondzelkos* ‘Monday’, *sudzin-* ‘to judge’, etc., rarely in other loanwords, such as *cipdzāris* ‘zip (fastener)’ from Hungarian *cipzár*. Both voiceless affricates, alveolar /c/ [t͡s] and post-alveolar /č/ [t͡ʃ], as in *ciral* ‘cheese’ and *čirla* ‘long ago’, are very common in inherited as well as borrowed items.

The inventory of sibilant fricatives consists of the alveolars /s/ and /z/ and the post-alveolars /š/, which is phonetically either [ʃ] or [ʂ], and /ž/, which is either [ʒ] or [ʒ̣], e.g. *sovel* ‘s/he sleeps’, *zor* ‘strength’, *šuvlo* ‘swollen’, *žuvžo* ‘clean’. As already indicated, articulation of the post-alveolar sibilants differs within Eastern Uzh Romani. In Uzhhorod and Perechyn, /š/ and /ž/ seem to be the palato-alveolars [ʃ] and [ʒ], while in Khudlovo and Serechnie, they are rather ‘hard’ and more back, retroflex [ʂ] and [ʒ̣] respectively. More detailed phonetic research would be needed to determine the exact phonetic properties and articulatory variability of the post-alveolar sibilants in the entire dialect area.

In contrast to the East Slovak Romani dialect described by Lípa (1963), there is no distinct phoneme of an alveolo-palatal sibilant /ʃ/ in Eastern Uzh Romani. In Slavic loanwords such as *mušin-* ‘have to, must’, *šivo* ‘grey’, *štrihin-* ‘to cut (with scissors)’, whose post-alveolar sibilant has its parallel in East Slovak *mušec*, *štrihac*, *šivi* (cf. also Polish *musieć* [muɕɛtɛ], *siwy* [ɕivɨ]), this /š/ does not differ from /š/ in inherited words, such as *bešindos* ‘sitting’, *uši* ‘Stand up!’, *šil* ‘cold’, or *štār* ‘four’. Contact of /š/ with palatals, as in *grašni* ‘mare’, does not seem to result in the alveolo-palatal sibilant either.

However, there are very rare palatalised counterparts of the alveolar sibilants /c/ [t͡s], /s/ [sʲ] and /z/ [zʲ]. They never occur in inherited words, nor in earlier loanwords from Hungarian or Slovak. They can only be found in some East Slavic loanwords, such as *lisic'a* [lɪsʲɪtsʲa] ‘fox’ (cf. Ukrainian *лисиця*), *sus'idos* [susʲidos] M, *sus'itka* [susʲitka] F ‘neighbour’ (cf. Ukrainian *сусід*, *сусідка*) and *vz'atka* [vzʲatka] ‘bribe’ (cf. Russian *взятка*), in personal names, such as *Vas'as* ‘Vasia’, in some common non-integrated loan forms, such as *druz'ja* ‘friends’ (from the Russian plural noun *друзья*), and in adverbs, particles and pronominal forms of East Slavic origin, e.g. *fs'o* ‘that’s all’ (cf. Russian *всё*), *ós'eňu* ‘in the autumn’ (cf. Russian *осенью*), Perechyn *fs'agde* ‘everywhere’ (cf. dialectal Ukrainian (Rusyn) *всюди*), etc. Most of these loanwords compete with other loanwords with no palatalised sibilants, e.g. with the Hungarian-origin *somsijdas/somsijtka* ‘neighbour’ and *ejsone* ‘in the autumn’ (for a variety of words for ‘everywhere’, see 6.4.3). In any case, the palatalised alveolar sibilants are marginal phonemes in the Eastern Uzh Romani phonological system, restricted to a small proportion of the current loanwords.

2.1.6 Non-sibilant fricatives

Two labiodental fricatives exist in Eastern Uzh Romani: voiceless /f/ and voiced /v/. Both are distinct phonemes, cf. *feder* ‘better’, *fovros* ‘town, Uzhhorod’ as against *verdan* ‘cart’, *vojna* ‘war’, etc. However, /f/ seems to optionally replace /v/ in the position after the voiceless aspirated velar /kh/, as in the multiplicative suffix *-var* in *jekhfar* alongside *jekhvar* (versus only *duvar* ‘twice’), and perhaps also in the initial position before voiceless sibilants; cf. the temporal pronouns *fsadzik*, *fs'agde* ‘everywhere’ in Perechyn.

In other environments of the initial position, /v/ is retained, e.g. *vas* ‘hand’, *vriskinel* ‘s/he shouts’. It is also retained after most consonants, as in *nasvalo* ‘ill’, and in the intervocalic position, as in *garuvava*, *othovava* ‘I will hide’. In the syllable coda, viz. in the post-vocalic position either before consonants or word-finally, a non-syllabic bilabial allophone [ɸ] usually stands for /v/, much like in Ukrainian (see Zilyns'kyj 1979: 81; Pugh 2009: 35) and in Standard Slovak (see Sábol 1964; Hanulíková and Hamann 2010). In the word-final position, the result is a closing diphthong formed with the previous vowel, e.g. *garuvav* [garuɸav], *othovav* [ot^hovav] ‘I hide’, IMP *garuv* [garuɸ], *othov* [ot^hov] ‘Hide!’, *ov* [ov] ‘he’, etc. The semivocalic allophone of /v/ may occur after any vowel, including /u/, which may result in sequences of two nearly identical segments [uɸ], as in *phuv* [p^huɸ] ‘land, soil, ground’ (versus ABL *phuvatar* [p^hu.va.tar] ‘from the ground’). In ordinary articulation, such a sequence of two identical elements may be eliminated by reduction of the semivocalic element or by lengthened articulation of the vocalic element. Taking all the options together, *phuv* have the following attested realisations [p^huv ~ p^huɸ ~ p^hu: ~ p^hu]. Before consonants and after the open and back vowels, either the same process takes place, e.g. *avri* [avri] ‘outside’, or /v/ retains its labiodental nature with slight diphthongisation of the preceding vowel, resulting in a sequence [V^uv], e.g. *avri* [a^uvri] ‘outside’, *garuvlas* [garu^uvlas], *othovlas* [ot^ho^uvlas] ‘s/he was hiding’. After front vowels diphthongisation is infrequent, as in *dživdo* [dživdo] ‘alive’ and *kijevs* [kijevs] ‘Kyiv’, although both [dživdo] and [kijevs] occur as well. The labiodental may also be found after the vowel /a/ in the word-final position provided that a word with an initial vowel follows and both words form a single unit, e.g. IMP *av* [av] ‘Come!’, *av manca* [av.man.ŕsa] ‘Come with me!’ but *av ade* [a.va.de] ‘Come here!’, *ušav* [u.šav] but *ušav opre* [u.ša.vop.re] ‘I get up’. Furthermore, the labiodental with no diphthongisation is retained in the emphatic or careful articulation in all positions where [ɸ] is otherwise common, e.g. *avri* [avri] ‘outside’ (emphatic). This vacillation between [v] and [ɸ] is one of the reasons I do not distinguish the non-syllabic allophone of /v/ in the orthography, e.g. by the grapheme ⟨w⟩, which is common in other Romani descriptions (e.g. Tenser 2005).

Instead, I adhere to the writing practice of the speakers themselves, who represent /v/ in all its occurrences and phonetic realisations by a single letter, viz. either by the Latin grapheme ⟨v⟩ or by its Cyrillic counterpart ⟨в⟩, as in the local Slavic languages Slovak and Ukrainian.²⁰ The issues of diphthongs are also addressed in 2.2.2, where more details about the allophone [ʋ] can be found.

Two post-velar fricatives are the uvular /x/ [χ], as in *xal* [χal] ‘s/he eats’, *xār* [χa:r] ‘pit’ and *xovr* [χovr] ‘deep’, and the glottal /h/ [h], as in *hazdel* [hazdel] ‘s/he lifts’, *hā* [ha:] ‘yes’ and *hora* [hora] ‘mountain’. Both /x/ and /h/ alternate in the free-choice prefix *xot’- ~ hot’-* and *xoč- ~ hoč-* (see 6.3.3.1), but, otherwise, they are kept apart as distinct phonemes. The glottal fricative may also be voiced [ɦ].

2.1.7 Consonant clusters and geminates

Numerous combinations of consonants in clusters occur in the initial and medial positions, partly also in the final position. Many of these clusters are old, going back either to Indo-Aryan or to contact with West Asian languages and Greek, while some clusters have made their way into the language through recent loanwords (see Matras 2002: 55–56 on consonant clusters in Romani in general). Recent and current loanwords generally maintain clusters of the source language, e.g. /pt/ and /bd/ in *lopta*, Radvanka *lobda* ‘ball’ (cf. Slovak *lopta*, Hungarian *labda*) or /hl/ in *hlavno* ‘main’ (Slovak *hlavný*), which occur only in loanwords. Consonant clusters also frequently arise by attaching consonant affixes to (consonant) bases in inflection and derivation.

Still, two types of clusters that are common in other North Central dialects do not occur in Eastern Uzh Romani. First, clusters of sibilants with palatals, such as /stʰ/ and /štʰ/, have undergone progressive assimilation and simplification, leaving just /s/ and /š/ (see 2.4.3). Second, a cluster /dn/ has experienced the process of regressive assimilation and simplification towards /n/, as in *sabano* ‘allowed’ (< **sabadno*, which is regular adaptation of Hungarian *sabad*); see also 3.2.2.1.1.6.

There is also a certain restriction on the occurrence of some clusters in the final position. The old clusters /st/, /št/ and /xt/ are simplified in the final position by deletion of the alveolar stop, e.g. *trast* ‘metal’ > *tras* (vs. PL *trasta*), *vast* > *vas* ‘hand’ (vs. PL *vasta*), *kašt* > *kaš* ‘wood’ (vs. PL *kašta*), *baxt* > *bax* ‘happiness’ (vs. *baxtalo* ‘happy’), etc. This rule is represented in writing.

²⁰ Unlike in Belarusian, which has a distinct letter ⟨ѣ⟩ used to represent the bilabial [ʋ].

In contrast to clusters of unidentical consonants, clusters of identical consonants, i.e. geminates, are rather marginal. They occur in some loanwords, as in *ucca* ‘street’ (< Hungarian *utca*), *vanna* ‘bathtub’ (< Russian/Ukrainian *ванна*),²¹ and may also arise through prefixation, as in *oddel* ‘s/he hands away’ (< *od-* + *d-* ‘to give’). The geminate /nn/ may result from assimilation of */dn/ mentioned above in this section, e.g. *honno* ‘able’ (< **hodno*; cf. Slovak *hodný*). Most commonly, nasal gemination happens when the vocalic segment of the 2/3PL suffix *-en* is syncopated in remote and future inflectional forms of verbs whose base end in /n/, e.g. *čhin-* ‘to cut’: *čhin-en-as* [cut-2/3PL-REM] > *čhinnas* ‘you/they were cutting’, or *pisin-* ‘to write’: *pis-in-en-a* [write-INTEGRATION-2/3PL-FUT] > *pisinna* ‘you/they will write’. Since the verb bases in /n/ comprise the extremely frequent loan verbs marked by the productive integration marker *-in-*, the nasal geminate /nn/ is relatively common in terms of the text frequency. The same mechanism is also behind the geminate /ll/ in 3SG forms of verbs such as *khel-*: *khel-el-as* [dance-3SG-REM] > *khellas* ‘s/he was dancing’, *khel-el-a* [dance-3SG-FUT] > *khella* ‘s/he will dance’. Note that the remote forms with geminated /nn/ and /ll/, such as *čhinnas*, *pisinnas* and *khellas* are in contrast to the 1PL present forms *čhinas* ‘we cut’, *pisinas* ‘we write’ and *khelas* ‘we dance’, and therefore provide that they are phonemically distinct.

At the word boundary, potential gemination resulting from contact of two identical consonants that belong to two words is eliminated. In other words, if the final consonant of a word comes into contact with the identical consonant of the following word, only a simple consonant is usually pronounced, e.g. *mul'āris som* [mu.ʎa:.rɪ.som] ‘I am a bricklayer’, *prigal leste* [pɾi.ga.les.te] ‘for the sake of him’.

It should be highlighted that the combination of the post-vocalic /v/ plus any consonant, such as *fovros* ‘town, Uzhhorod’, *lovve* ‘money’, *tanitovva* ‘teachers’, does not represent a consonant cluster or a geminate. As discussed in 2.1.6, /v/ is in these cases vocalised [ʋ] forming a diphthong with the preceding vowel [foʋros, loʋve, tanitoʋva] (see also 2.2.2).

2.2 Vowels

Eastern Uzh Romani have inherited all vowel phonemes reconstructed for Late Proto-Romani /a, e, o, i, u/ (see Matras 2002: 58; Elšík and Matras 2006: 71). These are supplemented by the marginal front rounded vowels /ü/ and /ö/, which occur only in Hungarian loanwords and are in free variation with their unrounded counterparts /i/ and /e/ respectively. The most

²¹ But not, for example, in the temporal adverb *akor* ‘then, at that time’ from Hungarian *akkor*.

interesting and, at the same time, the most intricate topic of the Eastern Uzh Romani vowel system relates to the complex issue of long vowels and diphthongs, which will be given the main attention in the discussion.

2.2.1 Short vowels

The vowel inventory of Eastern Uzh Romani is given in Table 3 along with its graphemic representation in chevrons.

Table 3: Vowel phonemes

	Front		Central	Back
	unrounded	rounded		
Close	i/ɪ ⟨i⟩	y ⟨ü⟩		u ⟨u⟩
Mid	e ⟨e⟩	ø ⟨ö⟩		o ⟨o⟩
Open			a ⟨a⟩	

The basic inventory of short vowels consists of five phonemes: open /a/, which is phonetically central and unrounded [ä], mid front unrounded /e/ [ɛ], mid back rounded /o/ [ɔ], close front unrounded /i/ [ɪ] and close back rounded /u/ [u]. The vowel [ɪ] seems to have a more close variant [i] after palatal consonants, but the articulatory properties have not been studied to such a phonetical detail. What is clear is that both [i] and [ɪ] do not constitute separate phonemes in Eastern Uzh Romani. This constitutes a difference from Ukrainian, where /i/ ⟨i⟩ and /ɪ/ ⟨ɨ⟩ are distinguished on the phonemic level, although articulation of the latter phoneme, transcribed as ⟨y⟩ into the Latin script in Slavic linguistics, differs among dialects and may phonetically be closer to the close-mid [e] (see Zilyns'kyj 1979: 44–50). Indeed, in some loanwords from local Ukrainian dialects, the Ukrainian phoneme /ɪ/ is reflected as /e/ in Eastern Uzh Romani, most conspicuously in the form of the aktionsart verb prefix *pre-*, as in the verb *pre-denaš-* ‘to come by running’, which has its counterpart in the Ukrainian prefix *npu-* (as in *npu-ðizmu*) (see 3.5.1.5.6 for more details). For the sake of simplicity, all five phonemes will be transcribed as ⟨a, e, o, i, u⟩ throughout this work.

In addition to these five inherited vowels, there are front rounded vowels /ü/ [y] and /ö/ [ø], which occur only in Hungarian loanwords. They are attested in all varieties, in particular among speakers who frequently speak Hungarian,²² but they are in free variation

²² The front rounded vowels also exist in local Ukrainian (Rusyn) dialects in Transcarpathia, including in non-borrowed Slavic words (cf. Zilyns'kyj 1979: 64).

with their unrounded counterparts /e/ and /i/, which commonly replace them, e.g. *fürta* [fyrta] ~ *firta* [firta] ‘bunch, cluster’ (< Hungarian *fürt*), *köjčön* [køiʃøn] ~ *kejčen* [keiʃen] ‘loan’ (< Hungarian dial. *köjcsön*, standard *kölcsön*), *ünepos* [ynepos] ~ *inepos* [inepos] ‘feast’ (< Hungarian *ünnep*), etc. Exceptionally, the rounded vowel may lose its frontness and merge with the back vowel, e.g. in a morphologically non-integrated loanword *sületijšnap* ‘birthday’ (< Hungarian *születésnap*), which commonly alternates with *suletijšnap* rather than with **siletijšnap*. Still, many Hungarian words with rounded vowels occur only with the unrounded vowel in the loanwords, e.g. *figin-* or *fijgin-* ‘to hang’ (Hungarian *függ*), *l’ivin-* (Khudlovo *vil’in-*) (dialectal Hungarian *lív-*; Standard *löv-*, *lő*), etc.

Central vowels [ə] and [i], the latter usually transcribed as ⟨y⟩ in Romani descriptions, which are common in some Vlax and Northeastern Romani dialects (cf. Matras 2002: 59; Boretzky and Igla 2004: 35–38), do not occur in Eastern Uzh Romani. The Russian central vowel [ɨ] ⟨ы⟩ is normally reflected as [ɪ] in loanwords, e.g. Russian *рыбак* > *ribākos* [rɪba:kos] ‘fisherman’.

2.2.2 Long vowels and diphthongs

It is generally agreed that there was no distinctive vowel length in Late Proto-Romani and the original OIA and MIA vowel length had already been lost in a pre-European period. Absence of vowel length still characterises many dialects, although a number of dialects have developed vowel length as a contact-induced feature (cf. Boretzky and Igla 1993: 34–39, 2004: 33–34; Elšík, Hübschmannová and Šebková 1999; Matras 2002: 59). The latter holds true for most Central dialects, in which vowel length has been developed under the influence of Hungarian and West Slavic (with the exception of Polish and East Slovak dialects, which generally lack it).²³ In certain Romani dialects, such as that of Slovenian Prekmurje (Halwachs 2002), Lovari varieties in former Czechoslovakia (Wagner 2012) and some Sinti varieties (e.g. the Timișoara variety documented for the RMS project), some long vowels have undergone either partial or complete diphthongisation (see also Boretzky and Igla 1993: 39). Since such diphthongisation also occurs in Eastern Uzh Romani, the issue of diphthongs cannot be separated from vowel length, and therefore, both will be discussed together.

In Eastern Uzh Romani, distinctive vowel length is present, but its exact phonological status is dubious for most vowels. The least problematic is open central /ā/ [a:], which contrasts with short [a], as in *bar* [bar] ‘stone’ versus *bār* [ba:r] ‘fence’. Distribution of /ā/

²³ So far, vowel length in Central Romani has been described in a detail only for some South Central dialects (cf. Elšík, Hübschmannová and Šebková 1999; Elšík 2002, 2016; Bodnárová and Wiedner 2015).

will be described below in a greater detail. There are also long close vowels [i:/ɪ:] and [u:], at least phonetically, e.g. [mɪ:ro] ‘my’ and [p^hu:ro] ‘old’, but these tend to diphthongise to become [ij/ɪj] and [uɯ] or are even decomposed into sequences of vowel plus consonant, i.e. [ij/ɪj] and [uv], which is also the way they are represented in writing ⟨mijro, phuvro⟩. Both are described in section 2.2.2.2. The most complex issue occurs with respect to the long mid vowels. First, there are lengthened monophthongs [e:] and [o:] that never diphthongise, but they are extremely marginal in their distribution and their length is unstable (see 2.2.2.5). Second, there are long mid vowels that are commonly diphthongised into [eɪ] and [ou]. They may also be realised as long monophthongs, in particular in the fast and careless speech, e.g. [teɪle ~ te:le] ‘below’, [foɯros ~ fo:ros] ‘town, Uzhhorod’, but they may also be analysed as sequences of vowel plus consonant [teɪle, fovros]. They are discussed in detail in 2.2.2.3.²⁴

2.2.2.1 Long open vowel /ā/

As has already been mentioned, long /ā/ [a:] is the only unambiguous long vowel phoneme in Eastern Uzh Romani. It always has a monophthongal phonetic realisation and, unlike in Hungarian, does not differ from the short /a/ in terms of its quality. It occurs independently of stress, e.g. *ármin* [ˈa:r.min] NOM ‘cabbage’ versus *ārminátar* [a:r.mi.'natar] ABL ‘from cabbage’ (see 2.3), and the fact that it is phonemically distinct from its short counterpart is evidenced by several minimal pairs:

bar ‘stone’ versus *bār* ‘fence’ (cf. also PL *bara* versus *bāra*)

pharil’a ‘it cracked’ versus *phāril’a* ‘it became heavy; she became pregnant’

čaladenca ‘with the touched ones’ versus *čalādenca* ‘with families’ (< Hungarian)

zarazinel ‘s/he infects’ (< East Slavic) versus *zarāzinel* ‘s/he shakes’ (< Hungarian with a Slavic prefix)

²⁴ I do not deal with the inherited sequences of two different phonemes /aj/, /oj/ and /uj/, which are often treated as ‘diphthongs’ in Romani descriptions (cf. Matras 2002: 61), as in *čhaj* ‘girl’, *duj* ‘two’, *muj* ‘mouth’, *oj* ‘she’, *roj* ‘spoon’, *sasuj* ‘mother-in-law’, *tajsa* ‘tomorrow’, etc. In Eastern Uzh Romani, words with such sequences also comprise recent and current loanwords, such as *biglajzis* ‘iron (tool)’ (via local Slavic dialects from German *Bügeleisen*), *hoj* complementiser ‘that’ (< Hungarian *hogy*), *majka* ‘T-shirt’ (< Russian/Ukrainian *майка*), *vojna* ‘war’ (< general Slavic *vojna*), etc.

As for its distribution, /ā/ occurs in all lexical layers, i.e. in inherited words (including Greek loanwords), as well as in Hungarian and North Slavic loanwords, and even in some grammatical morphemes.

In the inherited lexicon, /ā/ often occurs in the close syllable of monosyllabic nominals before a sonorant and frequently before /r/, e.g. *bār* ‘fence’, *čār* ‘grass’, *xār* ‘pit’, *kān* ‘ear’, etc., and in the first open syllable of disyllabic words, as in *āgor* ‘end’, *āro* ‘flour’, *āver* ‘other’, *bāro* ‘big; adult’, *kālo* ‘black’, *māl’a* ‘field’, *māro* ‘bread’, *pāñi* ‘water’, *phāba(j)* ‘apple’, *rā’i* ‘night’, *tāto* ‘warm’, etc. However, it may also occur in the close syllable of disyllabic nominals, e.g. *āndro* (Radvanka also *jāndro*) ‘egg, testicle’, *ārmin* ‘cabbage’, *pārno* ‘white’, *šukār* ‘beautiful’, and in trisyllabic and quadrisyllabic words, e.g. *amāro* ‘our’, *tumāro* ‘your.PL’, *angāl’i* ‘(open) arms’, *mārikl’i* ‘flat flour cake’, *bārikanō* ‘proud’, *gāvutuno* ‘rural; peasant’, etc. Verbs with /ā/ are mostly denominal derivations, e.g. *bārar-* ‘to make big, to bring up’ < *bāro* ‘big’, but several primary verbs with /ā/ are also present, such as *mār-* ‘to beat’, *pārun-* ‘to bury’, *tāv-* ‘to cook’ and *trād-* ‘to drive’. Apart from nominals and verbs, /ā/ occurs in function words as well, as in *āke* ‘right here, over here’, *kāj* ‘where’, *maškāral* ‘in the middle’ (but *maškar* ‘among, between’), *nāne* NEG.COP ‘is/are not’, in the NOM.SG.M suffix of demonstratives (*ad-ā* ‘this’), etc.

In Hungarian loanwords, /ā/ stands for the Hungarian long vowel /ál/, as in *bānatos* ‘distress, sorrow’ (Hungarian *bánat*), *barātos* ‘friend’ (*barát*), *karāčoňa* ‘Christmas’ (*karácsony*), *tāška* ‘bag’ (*táska*), *šārgo* ‘yellow’ (*sárga*), *Ungvāra* ‘Uzhhorod’ (*Ungvár*), etc., verbs such as *rāgin-* ‘to chew’ (*rág*), *vātin-* ‘to exchange’ (*vált*), etc., adverbs and particles *hā(t)* ‘yes, indeed’ (*hát*), *(i)mā(r)* ‘already’ (*(im)már*), *ritkān* ‘rarely’ (*ritkán*) and many others.

The long vowel /ā/ also occurs in words of Slavic origin, including East Slavic loanwords, which may be surprising if we take into account that East Slavic languages lack the distinctive vowel length. First, there are loanwords of apparent West Slavic origin that contain /ā/ at the place of the Slovak long /ál/, such as *brāskos* ‘icon, picture’ (Slovak *obrázok*), *konāris* ‘branch’ (Slovak *konár*), *krāl’is* ‘king’ (cf. Slovak *král*), *krāl’ovna* ‘queen’ (Slovak *kráľovná*), *mrāzos* ‘freeze’ (Slovak *mráz*), *pāl’enka* ‘spirits’ (Slovak *pálenka*), Uzhhorod *štātos* ‘country’ (Slovak *štát*), etc.²⁵ Some loanwords are based upon general Slavic words and may come from almost any Slavic language, but only West Slavic provides

²⁵ Some of these loanwords, such as *brāskos*, may have also been borrowed from local Ukrainian (Rusyn) dialects, however.

evidence for their vowel length, e.g. *komāris* ‘mosquito’ (Slovak *komár*). It is a matter of discussion to what degree /ā/ in these loanwords reflects the original Slovak long /á/ because the East Slovak dialects, with which Eastern Uzh Romani has been in contact until recently, lack vowel length (e.g. Buffa 1967: 264).²⁶ Moreover, there are loanwords containing /ā/ that have their counterparts in Slovak words with no long vowel, e.g. *plāmeñis* ‘flame’ as against Slovak *plameň*, so that /ā/ may have been introduced into such loanwords in a similar way as it was into East Slavic loanwords discussed in the following paragraph. This may also hold true for words borrowed from the local Slavic dialects, such as *kozāris* ‘mushroom’ (cf. dialectal East Slovak *kozar*).

In East Slavic loanwords, /ā/ reflects /a/ in the stressed syllable of a Russian or Ukrainian word, as in *etāžis* ‘floor (of a building)’ (Russian *эта́ж*), *moldovānos/moldovānka* ‘Moldovan M/F’ (Russian/Ukrainian *молдовáнин/молдовáнка*), *prāžņikos* ‘feast’ (Russian *праздник*), *tarakānos* ‘cockroach’ (Russian *таракáн*), *vagzālis/vogzālis* ‘railway station’ (Russian/Ukrainian *вокзáл*), *zakāzin-* ‘to order’ (Russian *заказáть*, 3SG *заказáжет*), *žālovin-REFL* ‘to complain’ (Russian *жалóватъся*), including loanwords of monosyllable words, such as *krānos* ‘tap’ (Russian/Ukrainian *кра́н*). Importantly, /ā/ occurs independently of the stress in these East Slavic loanwords, which justifies its position as a long vowel, e.g. NOM *etāžis* [e'ta:žis] but GEN *etāžískero* [eta:'žiskero], IMP.2SG *zakāzin* [za'ka:zin] ‘Order!’ but PFV.2SG *zakāzind'al* [zaka:'ziŋjal] ‘you ordered’, etc. If no stressed open vowel occurs in the source East Slavic word, no /ā/ occurs in the loanword either, cf. Russian *такси́*, Ukrainian *таксі́* > *taksis* (PL *taksija*) ‘taxi’ (Khudlovo and Sereďnie also ‘car’), Russian *зараз-úть* (3SG *заразúт*), Ukrainian *зараз-úти* > *zarazin-* ‘to infect’. The long vowel [ā] may also occur in some Slavic proper names, such as a name of a West Ukrainian town *Sāmboris* ‘Sambir’ (Polish *Sambor*, Russian *Сáмбор*, Ukrainian *Сáмбір*, LOC *Самборі*), but, strangely enough, not in the name of Radvanka *Radvanka* (Ukrainian *Рáдванка*).²⁷

²⁶ In any case, even some Romani varieties of East Slovakia have vowel length, at least in some dialect regions. For example, the variety described by Lípa (1963), spoken north of Humenné in northeastern Slovakia beyond the current Hungarian linguistic area, is documented to possess long counterparts of all vowels, even in Slovak loanwords.

²⁷ Another Slavic loanword with /ā/ is probably *jālo* ‘raw’ if it originates from South Slavic (Serbo-Croatian) *jalov* ‘barren, sterile’. Notwithstanding its exact etymology, this adjective is definitely of pre-Hungarian origin, so that its vowel length must have occurred under the same circumstances and in the same relative time as in the inherited words.

The long vowel /ā/ also occurs in several grammatical morphemes, in particular in those of Hungarian origin, such as agentive *-āš-* (*čovr-āš-is* ‘thief’), adjectival *-āšn-* (*buvť-āšn-o* ‘hard-working’), nominal *-(i)šāg-* (*gil'av-išāg-os* ‘singing’), verbal *-āz-* (*lubň-āz-in-* ‘to behave as a whoremonger’), free-choice *akār-* in Uzhhorod (*akār-so* ‘whatever’), adverbial *-ān* in Khudlovo and Serednie (*žuvž-ān* ‘cleanly’), etc. In addition, /ā/ occurs in the contracted 1SG future and imperfect/potential (remote non-perfective) verb forms, such as *kerā* ‘I will do’ and *kerās* ‘I was doing’ (see 3.2.1.2 and 3.2.1.3). There are also instances of the morphophonological alternations of /a/ ~ /ā/ in noun inflection, e.g. SG *gav* (OBL *gav-es*) ‘village’ versus PL *gāv-* (NOM *gāv-a*, OBL *gāv-en*), SG *jakh* (OBL *jakh-a-*) versus PL *jākh-* (NOM *jākh-a*, OBL *jākh-en-*), NOM.SG *rāt'-i* ‘night’ versus OBL.SG *rat'-a-*, in comparison, e.g. *bār-o* big > *bar-eder* ‘bigger’, and rarely in adjective derivation, as in *bāl-o* ‘pig’ > *bal-an-o* ‘pork’ and *dzār* ‘public hair’ > *dzar-al-o* ‘hairy’.

2.2.2.2 Long (diphthong-like) segments of close vowels

Long close vowels [i:/i:] and [u:] are also present, even in minimal pairs with their short counterparts, e.g. [kuṭʃaha] ‘with the expensive one (F)’ as against [ku:tʃaha] ‘with a cup’. However, they tend to be realised as combinations of the close vowel with its semivocalic counterpart [kuṭʃaha] or even with the straightforward consonant [kuvʃaha], in particular in careful articulation, which is also the way they are perceived by speakers themselves and represented in writing ⟨kuvčaha⟩. The faster and more casual speech the more monophthongal and vocalic realisation they have and vice versa. Therefore, we may state that the long close back vowel has a range of possible phonetic realisations from [u:] via [uɥ] to [uv], while the long close front vowel has a similar range from [i:] via [ij̥] to [ij]. Both will be represented in orthography of this dissertation by digraphs ⟨uv⟩ and ⟨ij⟩ and because of their uncertain phonological status (long monophthongs or diphthongs²⁸ or biphonemic clusters?) they will be called as ‘segments’ rather than pure vowels. Their distribution will be outlined in the following paragraphs.

Both segments ⟨ij⟩ [i: ~ ij̥ ~ ij] and ⟨uv⟩ [u: ~ uɥ ~ uv] are mostly encountered in the inherited and Hungarian-origin words. In the inherited lexicon, they often occur in the first syllable of disyllabic nouns and adjectives provided that only a single consonant follows, e.g. *mijro* ‘my’ and *tijro* ‘your’, *cijlo* ‘stick’, *pijri* ‘pot’ and *phijko* ‘shoulder’, *buvťi* (Radvanka

²⁸ If we classify them as diphthongs, we should allow for a diphthongal combinations of elements with two identical targets, but this would be at odds with the common definition of diphthongs as vowel sounds with two different targets (see Ladefoget and Maddieson 1996: 321).

also *buvči* ‘work’, *čhuvri* ‘knife’, *kuvči* ‘cup’, *muvsı* ‘arm’, *uvčo* ‘high’, etc., and also perfective forms *muvl-* PFV of ‘to die’ (cf. also *muvlo* ‘dead; ghost’), *suvt-* PFV of ‘to sleep’ (also *zasuvto* ‘sleepy’), *uvl-* PFV of the copula ‘to be’ and a related middle verb *uvl’uv-* ‘to be born’. In some words, such as *džuvli* ‘woman’, *khuvdo* ‘woven’, *šuvlo* ‘swollen’ the segment ⟨uv⟩ represents the historical sequence that has not developed from a long vowel. In monosyllabic words, ⟨ij⟩ occurs in words *ijdž* ‘yesterday’, *sijr* ‘garlic’ and *trijn* ‘three’, while ⟨uv⟩ is rare and alternates with its short counterpart, e.g. *duvj* [du:j] ~ *duj* ‘two’ and *duvr* [du:r] ~ *dur* ‘far’.

The large group of words with both segments consists of Hungarian loanwords. The long close front segment stands for any Hungarian long front vowel, most commonly for /é/, as in *dijlos* ‘noon’ (Hungarian *dél*), *kijko* ‘blue’ (*kék*), *nijpos* ‘folk, people’ (*nép*), *šijrtin-* ‘to insult, to offend’ (*sért*), etc., but also for /í/, as in *žijros* ‘fat’ (*zsír*), and for rounded /ű/, e.g. *bijnos* ‘sin’ (*bűn*) (see also 2.2.2.4 below on rounded vowels).²⁹ The close back segment reflects the Hungarian long back vowel /ú/, e.g. *d’uvtovs* ‘lighter’ (< Hungarian *(ön)gyújtó*), *huvra* ‘string (of a musical instrument)’ (< Hungarian *húr*), *muvlin-* ‘to pass (about time), to elapse’ (*múlik*), *suvrin-* ‘to stab’ (*szúr*), etc. Some Hungarian loanwords, such as *furovs* ‘drill’ (< *fűrő*) contain only the short vowel /u/, probably because they were already borrowed with the short vowel from local Hungarian dialects.

North Slavic loanwords do not contain the close front segment (but cf. the phrase *de man smijrom* ‘leave me alone’ with *smijrom* from South Slavic *s mirom* ‘with peace’), while the close back segment occurs only in representation of the combination of /u/ and /v/ of the source form, such as *vuvtorkos* ‘Tuesday’ from dialectal Ukrainian *ввѣторок*. The stressed vowels /i/ and /u/ of East Slavic forms are reflected as short /i/ and /u/ in Romani loanwords.

2.2.2.3 Long (diphthong-like) segments of mid vowels

The definitely most diphthongal elements in Eastern Uzh Romani, at least on the phonetic level, are long counterparts of mid vowels, which may be called ‘long or diphthong-like segments of mid vowels’ and are indicated as ⟨ej⟩, e.g. in *tejle* ‘below’, and ⟨ov⟩, e.g. in *fovros*

²⁹ In several Hungarian loanwords, only the short vowel /i/ occurs at the place of long /í/ of Standard Hungarian, as in *birovs* (**bijrovs*) ‘community leader’ (< *bíró* ‘judge’) and *sivin-* (**sijvin-*) ‘to smoke cigarettes’ (< *szív* ‘to suck, to breathe in’). Since the tendency for shortening close vowels is typical of northeastern Hungarian dialects (Lizanyec and Horváth 1981), these forms were likely to be borrowed in their shortened forms already from Hungarian (cf. also Mády 2012), although intermediate Slavic sources cannot be ruled either (cf. dialectal East Slovak *birov* ‘officer etc.’).

‘town, Uzhhorod’. They may be realised as long close-mid monophthongs [e:] and [o:], especially in the fast speech, i.e. [te:le] and [fo:ros], but occur as ‘true’ diphthongs [e̞j] and [o̞j] most commonly, i.e. [te̞jle] and [fo̞jros]. In the careful articulation, they are even realised as a sequence of the vowel plus the voiced consonant, i.e. [te̞jle] and [fo̞jros]. It is noteworthy that the first vowel member of both segments is somewhat closer than that of the short monophthongs /e/ and /o/ and rather has a character of a close-mid vowel. This leads to a situation that native speakers sometimes represent the first member of these segments as a close vowel in writing; note, for example, spelling of the word *nejvo* ‘new’ as *ниїво* (*nyjvo*) in the name of a Romani NGO in the Shakhtha neighbourhood of Uzhhorod *Романо ниїво джувуне* (*Romano nyjvo džyvune* ‘Romani new life’).

Distribution of both long or diphthong-like segments of mid vowels is similar to that of the long close vowel segments. They occur in the first syllable of the inherited disyllabic words provided that only a single consonant follows, such as *nejvo* ‘new’, *pejlo* ‘penis’, *tejle* ‘below’, *šejlo* ‘rope’, *šejro* ‘head’, *bovri* ‘daughter-in-law’, *fovros* ‘town, Uzhhorod’, *govd’i* ‘mind, reason’, *lovlo* ‘red’, *lovve* [lo̞vve] ‘money’, including some adverbs, such as *khejre* ‘(at) home’ and *jejva* ‘for free’, the verb *čovr-* ‘to steal’ (cf. also *čovrāšis* ‘thief’, *čovrduno* ‘stolen’, *čovral* ‘secretely’), the perfective stem of the verb ‘to go’ *gejl-* (e.g. *gejl’om* ‘I went’), the Greek-origin numeral *ejña* ‘nine’, and *sejra* ‘side’ of unclear origin. In monosyllabic words, they occur, for example, in *dejl* ‘God’, *xejv* ‘hole’, and *xovr* ‘deep’. An example of a polysyllabic inherited word is *khangejri* ‘church’.

Furthermore, the diphthong-like segment of the mid back vowel, i.e. ⟨ov⟩, often occurs as an original sequence, as in *xolov* ‘trousers’, *kovlo* ‘soft’, *šov* ‘six’, including in inflectional forms of some oikoclitic nouns that end in /v/ in the nominative singular, such as PL *xolovva* [xolo̞vva] ‘pieces of trousers’, the OBL form of the numeral ‘six’ *šovven-* [šo̞vven-], as in ABL *šovvendar* [šo̞vendar] ‘at six’. Many derived forms, such as *rovlar-* ‘to make cry’ (< *rov-*), *sovlar-* ‘to put to sleep’ (< *sov-* ‘to sleep’), *thovker-* ‘to put (multiple objects)’ (< *thov-* ‘to put’), as well as inflectional forms of primary verbs that end in /ov/, e.g. *rovlas* ‘he was crying’, also contain such segment.

In Hungarian loanwords, ⟨ej⟩ stands partly for the Hungarian long mid /é/, as in *rejzos* ‘copper’ (< *réz*) (but see above that in some Hungarian loanwords ⟨ij⟩ occurs for the Hungarian /é/), partly for the long mid rounded /ő/ [ø:], as in *ejsos* ‘autumn’ (< *ősz*) (see also below). The back segment ⟨ov⟩ stands for the Hungarian long mid back vowel /ó/, e.g. *drovtoš* ‘wire’ (< Hungarian *drót*), *fijovka* ‘drawer’ (< *fiók*), *ovra* ‘hour’ (< *óra*), *šovgoris* ‘brother-in-

law' (< *sógor*), including words that end in *-ó* in Hungarian and are reflected as xenoclitic zero masculines with the base in *-ov* in Romani (see 4.1.1.3.3): *birov-s* 'community leader' (*bíró* 'judge'), *čikov-s* 'foal' (< *csikó*), *ňaklov-s* 'horse collar' (< *nyakló*), *tanitov-s* 'teacher' (< *tanító*), including their inflectional forms, cf. PL *tanitovva* [tanitoʋva] 'teachers'.

Interestingly, ⟨ej⟩ occurs in several Slavic loanwords as a substitute of the Slavic short /e/, as in *cejlo* 'whole' (cf. Slovak *cely*), *pejšones* 'on foot' (cf. Slovak *pešo*), Uzhhorod and Perechyn *cintejris* (dialectal East Slovak *cinter*), while it stands for the sequence of /e/ plus /j/ in some other Slavic loanwords, e.g. *flejta* 'flute' (Russian *флейта*). The segment ⟨ov⟩ in Slavic loanwords mainly reflects /ov/ of the Slavic source word, e.g. *krāl'ovna* 'queen' (< Slovak *kráľovná*), *morkovka* 'carrot' (Ukrainian/Russian *морковка*), *šovdra* 'ham' (< dial. Slavic *šovdra*, e.g. in East Slovak), *vovkos* 'wolf' (< Ukrainian *вовк*). Interestingly, it is also present in *dvovra/drovra* 'court' (cf. Slavic *dvor*). Proper locality names that end in *-ov(o)* in Slavic are reflected as xenoclitic zero masculine in *-ov-s* in Eastern Uzh Romani: *xudl'ov-s* 'Khudlovo' (cf. Ukrainian *Худльово*), *l'ivov-s* 'Lviv' (cf. Russian *Львов*), *poroškov-s* 'Poroshkovo' (*Порошково*), *raxov-s* 'Rakhiv' (dial. Slavic *Рахово*), etc.

2.2.2.4 Long (diphthong-like) segments of front rounded vowels

As mentioned in 2.2.1, front rounded vowels /ö/ [ø] and /ü/ [y] occur in some Hungarian loanwords in Eastern Uzh Romani, but they are in free variation with their unrounded counterparts /e/ and /i/. In Hungarian, rounded vowels have their long counterparts /ö/ [ø:] and /ü/ [y:], which may also have two realisations in words borrowed into Eastern Uzh Romani. They may either be delabialised and merge with the long (diphthong-like) segments of mid and close front vowels respectively or maintain their nature of rounded vowels. If the latter option takes place, the long rounded vowels may be realised as diphthongs [øʋ] and [yʋ] and this diphthongal realisation will be indicated in orthography as ⟨öv⟩ and ⟨üv⟩. Thus, for example, Hungarian *csődör* 'stallion' > Eastern Uzh Romani *čejderis* [tʃejderis] or *čövdöris* [tʃövdøris], *gyeplő* 'reins' > *d'iplejva* [ɟiplejva] or *d'iplövnva* [ɟipløʋva], dialectal Hungarian *tükör* (Standard *tükör*) 'mirror' > *tijkeris* [ti:keris] or *tüvköris* [tyukøris]; the latter noun also has a frequent variant *tejkeris* [tejkeris], developed probably by regressive assimilation of the vowel height.

The situation is quite different if /ö/ or /ü/ occur as a final vowel in the Hungarian source word. The long mid vowel /ö/ completely loses its frontness in the Romani loanword and yields to [oʋ] before a suffix, as in Hungarian *fedő* 'pot lid' > *fedov-k-a* [fedoʋka] (instead of **fedejka*), *reszelő* 'grater' > *resel'ov-s* [reseʋoʋs]. In contrast, the Hungarian close

vowel /ǔ/ is attested to be decomposed into a diphthong-like segment of a front vowel with its back counterpart, i.e. [iǔ], e.g. *gombostǔ* ‘pin’ > *gomboštǔv-k-a* [gombostyuka] ~ *gomboštiv-k-a* [gombostyuka]. However, some of these words may have been borrowed via local Slavic dialects rather than directly from Hungarian and their form may, therefore, reflect the local Slavic form.

2.2.2.5 Lengthened mid monophthongs

In addition to diphthong-like segments of mid vowels discussed above, there are rarer lengthened (rather than unambiguously long) mid vowels [e:] and [o:] that are never diphthongised. They occur in a couple of inherited words and morphemes in the environment preceding /r/ but are quite unstable with a tendency to become short in unstressed syllables. The lengthened front vowel [e:] occurs in a single word [p^he:rdɔ] (alongside [p^herɔ]), which functions either as an adjective ‘full’ or as a multal quantifier ‘lots of’ (see 8.2.2), while the lengthened back vowel [o:] occurs in an adjective [tʃ^ho:ro] (Khudlovo and Sereďnie also [tʃ^ho:ro]) ‘poor’, in the second syllable of a predicative adjective [korko:ro] ‘alone’ and in the diminutive suffix [o:r], as in [tʃ^havo:ro] ‘little boy, child’, [dajo:rɪ] ‘mother (affectionately)’, etc. Owing to frequency of diminutives in actual texts, [o:] may have a high token frequency, although it has a low type frequency. It is not quite clear whether these lengthened monophthongs represent independent phonemes, although pairs such as [tʃ^ho:ro] ‘poor’ versus [koro] ‘blind’ seems to confirm their phonemic nature. They will be represented with the macrons as ⟨ē⟩ and ⟨ō⟩ in this work (*phērdɔ*, *čōro/čhōro*, *-ōr-*, *čhavōro*, *dajōri*).

2.2.2.6 Summary and historical explanation

Historically, Eastern Uzh Romani varieties must have possessed long counterparts of all short basic vowels /a, e, o, i, u/.³⁰ In the current language, the only unproblematic long vowel phoneme is open central /ā/, while the other long vowels undergo or have undergone a development that changes their phonetic nature. At the core of this development is diphthongisation, which mainly affects the long mid vowel series [e: > eɪ], [o: > oɪ]. Diphthongisation is further reanalysed as a biphonemic sequence of a vowel plus a voiced consonant, which not only happens with the mid vowel series [ej], [ov] but also with the series of long close vowels [ɪj/ij], [uv], which are otherwise still realised as long monophthongs [ɪ:/i:], [u:] in the common articulation.

³⁰ Postulation of long vowels /ā, ē, ō, ī, ū/ in the Sereďnie variety was my earlier stance (Beníšek 2013b).

Thus, what we observe in contemporary Eastern Uzh Romani is decomposition of all historical long vowels but /ā/ into sequences of a vowel plus a consonant via their transitional diphthongal stage, i.e. /V:/ → /VV/ → /VC/. The orthography employed in this dissertation and inspired by the writing practice of the native speakers reflects the final stage of this development, as well as the fact that the relevant cases of this development, such as *lovlo* ‘red’ (< **lolo*) and *buvti* ‘work’ (< **buti*), can no longer be distinguished in actual articulation from the cases where this /VC/ sequence is etymological, as in *kovlo* ‘soft’ and *džuvli* ‘woman’.

Vowel length is likely to have emerged under the Hungarian influence and not necessarily at the present territory, as it may have already occurred before the arrival of the speakers to the northeastern periphery of the Hungarian language area. At the same time, contact with northeastern Hungarian dialects has obviously triggered diphthongisation of the long mid vowels, which is typical of Hungarian of the area (Lizanyec and Horváth 1981). The trigger of the biphonemic reanalysis /VC/, at least with respect to the back vowel segments [u̯] and [o̯], is probably the fact that their second member, the bilabial glide [u̯], is an allophone of the voiced labiodental fricative /v/ in the coda (see 2.1.6), which is a feature induced by contact with local Slavic dialects.

In Hungarian loanwords, the Hungarian long vowels are reflected by their respective counterparts in Eastern Uzh Romani, i.e. /ā/ stands for the Hungarian /á/ (*tāska* ‘bag’ < Hungarian *táska*), while the Hungarian long vowels /é, ó, í, ú/ are represented by the diphthong-like and potentially biphonemic segments, as in *rejzos* ‘copper’ < Hungarian *réz*, *žijros* ‘fat’ < *zsír*. The fact that these segments are historically connected with the long vowel /ā/ can also be demonstrated by the morphology of certain forms, in which these segments are placed on a par with /ā/, such as the possessive kinship formations *trov dad* [tro̯.dad] ‘your father’, *trij daj* [tri:.daj] ‘your mother’, *trā dake* [tra:.da.ke] ‘to your mother’, etc. (see 6.1.1.2 and also Bodnárová and Wiedner 2015 for similar formations in Vend Romani).

In addition, there are more marginal lengthened mid vowels /ē/ and /ō/, which occur in a couple of words only. Their development must be of more recent origin than the diphthongisation of the long mid vowels. While in *phērdo* ‘full, lots of’, /ē/ may have arisen from an emphatic pronunciation of this expression of a large quantity, the development of /ō/ in the adjectives *čōro* and *korkōro* as well as in the diminutive suffix *-ōr-* may be due to compensatory lengthening connected with simplification of a rhotic geminate */r̥r/ from the

historical retroflex flap */ɽ/, which occurred in these forms (but cf. *koro* ‘blind’ with the short vowel).

2.2.3 Vowel elisions

In connected speech, the final vowel of a word may optionally be lost if the following word begins in another vowel provided that there is no prosodic break, e.g. *čhiv mang’ ad’ odi lopta* (Ser)^{LQCR} ← *čhiv mange ade odi lopta* ‘Throw me the ball here’. Such apocope is particularly common in forms that form a single unit for stress assignment with the following word (see 2.3 below). For example, the non-factual complementiser *te* and the negation particle *na* frequently become asyllabic before verbs beginning in a vowel, e.g. *te ejn* → *t’ ejn* ‘to be’, *na ejha* → *n’ ejha* ‘you won’t be’, etc. It is also applied to the oblique forms of the article *le/la* if they are combined with a word beginning in a vowel, e.g. *le aposkero* → *l’ aposkero* ‘of the daddy’. In the nominative, however, no such reduction normally occurs with the definite article, e.g. *o apos* ‘the daddy’. There seem to be idiolectal differences between speakers in frequency of such an elision, but, in general, it is very common. Moreover, there are certain fixed expressions that always occur with elided forms, e.g. *k’ od’ odā* (← *ko odā odā*) ‘Who is it?’, *s’ od’ odā* (← *so odā odā*) ‘What is it?’. In sentence examples of this dissertaion, vowel apocope of this kind will be marked by an apostrophe.

2.3 Stress

Proto-Romani had a grammatical and predominantly ultimate stress pattern, which is still found in various Romani dialects (Boretzky and Iгла 1993: 28–34; Matras 2002: 62–63; Oslon 2012). Eastern Uzh Romani, like other Central dialects, has largely abandoned the conservative stress pattern and replaced it with fixed penultimate stress (the second-last syllable is stressed), which is typical of Polish and East Slovak dialects, e.g. *čháve* [ˈtʃʰa.ve] ‘boys.NOM’, *čháven* [ˈtʃʰa.ven] ‘boys.ACC’, *čhavénca* [tʃʰa.ˈven.tsa] ‘with boys’, *nasválo* [nas.ˈva.lo] ‘ill’, *nasval’árel* [nas.va.ˈka.rel] ‘s/he makes ill, infects’, vocative forms *phéñe* [ˈpʰe.je] ‘sister’, *phéñále* [pʰe.ˈja.le] ‘sisters’, verb forms *denášel* [de.ˈna.jel] ‘s/he runs, flees’, *dénaš* [ˈde.naʃ] ‘Run away! Get away!’ (IMP.2SG), *denáš’áhas* [de.naʃ.ˈka.has] ‘s/he would have run’, *pát’an* [ˈpa.can] ‘they believe’, *paťánas* [pa.ˈca.nas] ‘they believed’, copula forms *híno* [ˈhi.no] ‘he is’, *náñe* [ˈna.ːne] ‘s/he isn’t, they aren’t’, *éjla* [ˈe.ːla ~ ˈe.ːla] ‘s/he will be’, *uv’áhas* [u.ˈka.has ~ uv.ˈka.has] ‘s/he would have been’, adverbs *adād’íve* [a.da.ˈji.ve] ‘today’, *míšto* [ˈmiʃ.to] ‘well’, *pálal* [ˈpa.lal] ‘in/to the back’, *palunéstar*

[pa.lu.'nes.tar] ‘from the back’, interrogatives *kána* ['ka.na] ‘when’, *kéci* ['ke.ʦi] ‘how much/many, how long’, etc.

Stress is independent of the length, at least with respect to /ā/, as in *šúkār* ['ʃu.ka:r] ‘beautiful’, NOM *báro* ['ba:.ro] ‘big, adult’ versus DAT *bāréske* [ba:.'res.ke] ‘to the big one, to the adult’, NOM *jákha* ['ja:.k^ha] ‘eyes’ versus INST *jākhénca* [ja:.'k^hen.ʦa] ‘with eyes’, and is also independent of the diphthong-like segments of mid and close vowels (see above), e.g. *séjra* ['se:.ra ~ 'sej.ra] ‘side’ versus *sejrátar* [se:.'ra.tar ~ sej.'ra.tar] ‘from side’, *búvti* ['bu:.ci ~ 'buv.ci] ‘work’ versus *buvtášno* [bu:.'ca:ʃ.no ~ 'buv.'ca:ʃ.no] ‘hard-working’. However, the lengthened mid vowels /ē/ and /ō/ (see 2.2.2.5) tend to be shortened in unstressed syllables, e.g. *čhavōro* [tʰa.'vo:.ro] ‘child’ but *čhavořeske* [tʰa.vo.'res.ke] alongside *čhavōřeske* [tʰa.vo:.'res.ke] ‘to a child’.

Certain word classes that have grammatical rather than lexical functions and are never uttered in isolation, such as the definite article, prepositions, the non-factual complementiser and the negation particle of verbs, make a phonological word with the word they precede. As a result, they are stressed if they occupy the penultimate syllable of such a phonological word. For example, the article is obligatorily stressed if it determines a monosyllabic nominal form and the whole noun phrase is disyllabic, e.g. *é daj* ['e.daj] ‘the mother’, *ó phral* ['o.p^hral] ‘the brother’, *lé čhas* ['le.tʰas] ACC ‘the son’, *lá čha* ['la.tʰa] ACC ‘the daughter’, etc. In a similar manner, a preposition takes stress if it is combined with a monosyllabic component of a prepositional phrase, e.g. *pál tu* ['pal.tu] ‘for you, after you’, *andró kher* [an.'dro.k^her] ‘in(to) the house’, etc. In verb phrases, the non-factual complementiser *te*, which functions as an infinitive particle, and the negation particle *na* are stressed if the following verb form is monosyllabic, e.g. *té len* ['te.len] INF ‘to take’, *ná xal* ['na.χal] ‘s/he doesn’t eat’, *ná dža* ['na.dža] IMP ‘don’t go’, etc.

However, there are exceptions to penultimate stress (the IPA transcription will no longer be provided for the following examples). Antepenultimate stress occurs in the genitive forms in *-ker-/ger-*, as in *léskero* (*léskoro*) ‘his.M’, *lákere* ‘her.PL’, *pésjera* ‘his own.OBL.SG.F’, *phraléskeri* ‘of brother.F’, *čhavéngere* ‘of children.PL’ *perečinákere* ‘of Perechyn.PL’, etc., including their adverbialised forms, such as *paliždžésjero* (*paliždžésjero*) ‘the day before yesterday’ and *paltajsáskero* (*paltajsáskoro*) ‘the day after tomorrow’. In fact, the Layer II case suffixes, including the genitive marker, can never be stressed, which may be considered one of the conservative features of the dialect.

Certain deictic expressions in the nominative have irregular ultimate stress, viz. the adnominal and pronominal demonstratives, such as (*k*)*adā* (F (*k*)*adí*) ‘this’, (*k*)*odā* (F (*k*)*odí*)

‘that’, *akã* or *okã* (F *akí* or *okí*) ‘the other one, last’, the adjectival quality deictic (*k*)*ajsó* (F (*k*)*ajsí*, PL (*k*)*ajsé*) ‘such’, and sometimes even the adverbial demonstratives and deictics such as *adé* ‘here’ and *ajcí* ‘so much’. Furthermore, the contracted first-person future and imperfect/potential forms, such as *kerá* ‘I will do’ and *kerás* ‘I was doing’ respectively (see 3.2.1.2 and 3.2.1.3), are also oxytonic.

Initial stress mostly occurs in the disyllabic paroxytones or in the genitival trisyllabic proparoxytones. Apart from these forms, in which the penultimate or antepenultimate stress happens to fall on the initial syllable, there are polysyllabic words with obligatory initial stress, such as the universal pronoun *sávaro* ‘everything’ (PL *sávore* ‘everybody’), which, strangely enough, exhibits the initial stress even in non-nominative forms, as in *sávoreha* (INST.SG) ‘with everything’, *sávorendar* (ABL.PL) ‘from everybody’, etc. In addition, the negative prefixes *ñi-* (with pronouns) and *na-* (with adjectives and adverbs) are stressed, so that forms marked by these prefixes also have initial stress, e.g. *ñíkaha* ‘with nobody’, *ñíkhatar* ‘from nowhere’, *nádočirla* ‘not so long ago’, *námišto/námištes* ‘wrong’, *nášukār* ‘unsightly’, etc.

Finally, East Slavic loanwords of Ukrainian or Russian origin may retain the original stress of the source form and consequently exhibit an irregular (non-penultimate) stress position. The original East Slavic stress position of a word is commonly preserved in morphologically non-integrated loan nouns, such as *ózero* ‘lake’ (Ukrainian/Russian *ózero*), *tumán* ‘fog’ (Ukrainian/Russian *тумán*), and in various adverbial forms and discourse particles of East Slavic origin, such as *vesnój* ‘in the spring’ (Russian *весно́й*), *piškóm* ‘on foot’ (Russian *пешко́м*), *po-ukrájinski* ‘in Ukrainian’ (Russian colloquial *по-укра́ински*), *ítieno* ‘exactly, namely’ (*и́менно*), *naprimér* ‘for example’ (*напримéр*), etc. East Slavic loanwords that are morphologically integrated normally adapt their stress to the penultimate pattern, e.g. *táksis* ‘taxi’ (Khudlovo, Serednie ‘car’) versus Ukrainian *таксі́*, Russian *такси́*. Still, the borrowed feminine nouns, which end in *-a* in both East Slavic and Romani, often maintain their East Slavic stress position in the Romani nominative, as in *hostíñica* ‘hotel’ (Russian *гості́ница*) and *simjá* ‘family’ (Ukrainian *сім’я́*, Russian *семья́*), although in some feminines the stress position is adapted, as in *túrma* ‘prison’ versus Ukrainian *тю́рмá*, Russian *тю́рмá*. As discussed in 2.2.2.1 above, the East Slavic open vowel /a/ in the stressed position of an East Slavic word is phonologically adapted as long /ā/ in morphologically integrated loanwords. Such long /ā/ is then an intrinsic part of the loanword and is independent of the regular penultimate stress, as in *aftomexāñíkos* ‘car mechanic’ from

Russian *автомеханик*, NOM *tumǎnos* ‘fog’, ABL *tumǎnóstar* ‘from fog’ from Ukrainian/Russian *туман*, etc.

Elsewhere in this dissertation, stress is only marked in borrowed East Slavic forms in which it differs from the penultimate pattern.

2.4 Historical phonology

The following sections provide a brief outline of some aspects of the historical phonology of Eastern Uzh Romani in the broader dialectological context of North Central Romani. The aim is not to describe the historical phonology of the dialect in all its detail but rather to point out the most significant features, mostly of the innovative nature, that are shared with other related dialects. The discussion starts with innovations reflected in almost all North Central dialects and continues by discussing the more exclusive innovations of what may be classified as Eastern North Central Romani. The conservative features are discussed only in reference to Uzh Romani; common North Central or Eastern North Central retentions are not addressed. The overall objective is to show affinities of Eastern Uzh Romani with the rest of the North Central Romani dialect continuum on the phonological level, as well as to indicate its specific peripheral position.

The last section deals with phonological variation related to specific words within Eastern Uzh Romani.

2.4.1 Common North Central Romani innovations

There are crucial phonological innovations typical of all, or almost all, North Central Romani dialects.³¹ One of these innovations is debuccalisation of Proto-Romani sibilants in an intervocalic position in some grammatical morphemes. For example, the instrumental suffix **-sa*³² has changed into *-ha* after the assimilated masculine singular suffix *-es-*, e.g. **phrale(s)-sa* > *phrale-ha* ‘with a brother’, and after the feminine singular suffix *-a*, e.g. **phenja-sa* > *pheña-ha* ‘with a sister’. In a similar manner, the respective 2SG and 1PL verb suffixes **(e)s-* and **(a)s-* have changed into *-(e)h-* and *-(a)h-* when followed by a tense suffix, e.g. **ker-es-a* > *ker-eh-a* ‘you (will) do’, **ker-as-a* > *ker-ah-a* ‘we (will) do’. Debuccalisation has also taken place in the third-person present copula **(e)si(n)*, leading to

³¹ Some of these innovations also occur in South Central Romani, which is, however, disregarded here. The present discussion is limited to North Central Romani.

³² The asterisk is not only provided for reconstructed forms, including those of Proto-Romani, but also for the conservative forms that are attested in Romani dialects outside the North Central branch. Forms present in other North Central Romani dialects are not marked by an asterisk even if they do not occur in Eastern Uzh Romani.

(*e*)*hi(n)* ((*e*)*hin* in Eastern Uzh Romani). Some further processes of debuccalisation of the sibilant have been limited to Western dialects of North Central Romani and are, therefore, not shared with Uzh Romani (e.g. past copula (*e*)*has*, in Uzh Romani (*e*)*sas*).³³

Another significant development that has affected all North Central Romani dialects was a large-scale loss of iotation in inflection and derivation. The iotation has been either replaced by palatalisation of the preceding stops, as in the deadjectival verb **bang-jar-* ‘to bend, to crook’ (from *bang-o* ‘bent, crooked’) > *band'-ar-*, or lost with no trace, as in **bar-jar-* ‘to make big’ (from *bar-o* ‘big’) > *bar-ar-* (*bārar-* in Eastern Uzh Romani). This development has also involved the disappearance of iotated feminines (see also 4.1.1.2.1), such as *suv* ‘needle’, OBL.SG/NOM.PL **suvj-a* > *suv-a*, which have merged with the non-iotated feminines, such as *džuv* ‘louse’, OBL.SG/NOM.PL *džuv-a* (see Elšík 2000a for more details).

Further innovations have affected individual morphemes or words. The alveolar stop /t/ in the quantity interrogative **keti* ‘how much’ has undergone affrication, giving rise to *keci* in North Central Romani. The alveolar affricate reflex /c/ also occurs in the word for ‘cheese’ *ciral* from Proto-Romani **kiral* (< OIA *kilāṭa* ‘inspissated milk’; see CDIAL 3181). Another consonant change has modified the Proto-Romani adjective **šušo* ‘clean, pure’³⁴ to *žužo* in North Central Romani through regressive assimilation of the sibilant. The Armenian loanword **ogi* ‘soul’ (Boretzky 1995a: 139) displays palatalisation of the original velar stop as well as prothesis in /v/ in the North Central form *vod'i* (Eastern Uzh Romani *vovd'i*).

The Proto-Romani consonant clusters have been changed in several words, viz. */dl/ in **gudlo* ‘sweet’ (< MIA *guḷa-*) has undergone regressive assimilation and simplification to yield *gulo*, while **buhlo* ‘wide’ (< OIA *bahula-*) has changed to *buxlo*. In the temporal adverb **tasja* ‘tomorrow’ (from Greek *taxiá* [taçia] with /x/ having a voiceless palatal fricative as its allophone), an internal metathesis has given rise to *tajsa*.

2.4.2 Eastern North Central Romani innovations

Some phonological innovations reflected in Eastern Uzh Romani are shared with the North Central Romani dialects in East Slovakia, in southeastern Poland (‘Bergitka Romani’) and in Ukrainian parts of Galicia (Halychyna). Such innovations distinguish all these dialects from the North Central dialects spoken in western regions of Slovakia and in pre-war Moravia and

³³ For a cross-dialectological discussion of /s/ and /h/ alternation in Romani, see Matras (1999a) and Boretzky and Iglá (2004: 62–63).

³⁴ Perhaps from older **šudžo* < OIA **šudhya-* ‘to be made pure’ of the root *śudh-* ‘to purify’ (cf. Turner 1926: 162).

Bohemia. A selection of the most significant Eastern North Central Romani innovations follows.

An alveolar affricate /c/ occurs in the initial position of several words as a reflex of older stops /t/ or /k/, viz. in *cikno* ‘small’ (< *tikno*), *cindo* ‘wet’ (< **kindo*), *cirax* ‘boot’ (< **tirxaj*), and in the verb *cin-* ‘to buy’ (< *kin-*). In an etymologically related verb for ‘to pay’ *pokin-*, the velar stop underwent palatalisation, leading to *poč’in-*.³⁵

Some common innovations are reflected in the development of old consonant clusters. The development of the Proto-Romani cluster of a nasal /n/ with the retroflex rhotic /ɽ/ from the Indo-Aryan retroflex stop /ʈ/ or /ɖ/ is split in Eastern Uzh Romani, like in most other eastern dialects of North Central Romani. It is reflected as /ndr/ in (*j*)*āndro* ‘egg’ (< Proto-Romani **anɽo* < OIA *āṇḍa-*), *kandro* ‘thorn’ (< Proto-Romani **kanɽo* < OIA *kaṇṭa-*), and *pindro* ‘foot’ (< Proto-Romani **pinɽo* < OIA *piṇḍa-*), but as /r/ in *māro* ‘bread’ (< Proto-Romani **manɽo* < OIA *maṇḍaka-*; cf. also *mārikl’i* ‘flat cake’) and *mijro* ‘my’ (< Proto-Romani **minɽo*; cf. *maṛḍā* in Western Panjabi dialects referred to in CDIAL 9691). Except for dialects spoken in the northeastern periphery of North Central Romani, where both *mandro* ‘bread’ and *mindro* ‘my’ do occur, the identical reflexes of the consonant cluster */nɽ/ in the given lexemes are common to Eastern North Central Romani dialects in general.

Another change in a consonant cluster has taken place in the word for ‘hen’ *kahni*, which has become *kaxñi* in Eastern North Central Romani but not in Western North Central Romani. In certain etymons, the consonant clusters have been affected by various metatheses. The Proto-Romani etymon **sastri* ‘iron’ (< OIA *śastra-*) is reflected as *trast* in all Eastern dialects, while **patri* ‘leaf’ (< OIA *patra-*) has developed into *prajtin* or *prajč’in*.

Lastly, the development of the penultimate stress pattern, which is typical of Slavic dialects of the Polish and East Slovak language area, is a contact-induced feature shared by all Eastern North Central dialects (see 2.3).

2.4.3 Uzh Romani innovations

The term ‘Uzh Romani innovations’ may be somewhat misleading here because none of the innovations discussed in this section is confined to Uzh Romani. Nevertheless, the innovations discussed in the following paragraphs are typical of both Uzh Romani dialects in

³⁵ In a large number of North Central Romani varieties in East Slovakia, the palatal stop has been further affricated to yield *poč’in-*.

Slovakia and Ukraine and, at the same time, they occur in a more limited distribution than the Eastern North Central features dealt with in the previous section.

The most conspicuous phonological feature of Uzh Romani is the prominence of diphthongs [e̯] and [o̯], in the orthography represented as ⟨ej⟩ and ⟨ov⟩, which have developed from the long mid vowels, as in *khejre* ‘at home’ and *lovlo* ‘red’ (see 2.2.2.). In today’s Uzh Romani, there is no articulatory distinction between the original sequence /ov/, as in *kovlo* ‘soft’, and the secondary sequence /ov/, as in *lovlo*. Diphthongs from the long mid vowels are common to both Western and Eastern dialects of Uzh Romani and also occur in adjacent varieties of the Zemplín region of Slovakia.³⁶

Another innovation is progressive assimilation and simplification of the historical consonant clusters /št/ and /st/ into plain sibilants /š/ and /s/ respectively, provided that the stop /t/ was palatalised in the original cluster. In some other Eastern North Central dialects, such clusters often contain the respective homorganic affricates /č/ and /c/ instead of the stop, and these dialects obviously reflect an intermediate stage of the Uzh development. In other words, the development was probably as follows: /št/ > /štʰ/ > /šč/ > /š/ and /st/ > /stʰ/ > /sc/ > /s/. Palatalisation of the original stop /t/ occurred if the close vowel /i/ or the palatal approximant /j/ followed. Examples are the Uzh modal particle *naši* ‘cannot’ < *našti* via *našti* and *našči*, derivations from the now-lost adjective *sasto* ‘healthy’, such as *sasar-* ‘to cure’ < **sastjar-* via *sastʰar-* and *sascar-*, *sasipe(n)* ‘health’ < *sastipen* via *sastʰipen* and *sascipen*, the verb *uš-* ‘to stand up’ (cf. the imperative *uši* ‘Stand up!’) < **ušti-* (cf. *uštʰ-* and *ušč-* in other North Central dialects), and the Greek-origin noun *parašovin* ‘Friday’ < **paraštjovin* (cf. *paraštʰovin* and *paraščovin* in other North Central dialects). In Western Uzh Romani, assimilation of the palatalised cluster **stʰ/* to */s/* is also reflected in *angrusi* ‘ring’ < **angrusti*, which in all Eastern Uzh varieties occurs in forms with secondary suffixation as either *angrusni* (in Khudlovo and Sereďnie) or *angrusni* (in Uzhhorod and Perechyn). The consonant clusters of sibilants with the non-palatalised alveolar stop /t/ remain unchanged, as in *bister-* ‘to forget’, *štār* ‘four’, *trastuno* ‘made of iron’, *uštav-* (Radvanka *uštar-*) ‘to wake’, *vasta* ‘hands’, etc.

³⁶ Oscillation between the diphthong [o̯] and the long vowel [o:] was documented by Lípa (1963) for a Zemplín dialect spoken north of the town of Humenné, judging from his transcription of several words. For example, the word for ‘town’ occurs as *fóros* (i.e. *fōros*) in his description, while the adjective ‘red’ is transcribed as *lovlo*, and the noun for ‘sack’ is given in both forms *góno* and *govno*. On the other hand, only the long vowel [e:] and no diphthong instead, as in *khére* (i.e. *khēre*), is indicated in his description.

There are also word-specific phonological innovations that affect Uzh Romani varieties in Slovakia and in Ukraine. For example, the internal mid vowel in *dženo* ‘person’ has been lowered to yield *džano*, which is encountered not only in Uzh Romani but also in some Zemplín and Abov dialects as far west as the town of Košice. Another example pertains to the noun *balval* ‘wind’, which has undergone lateral dissimilation and rhotacism, resulting in *barval* or *barval’* in Uzh Romani and beyond.³⁷

A number of other phonological innovations are found in Uzh Romani. However, the majority of these innovations have affected some of Uzh varieties only and are not common to the entire Uzh region of Slovakia and Ukraine. Some of them will be discussed in 2.4.5 below. In the following section, several conservative features maintained by all Uzh Romani varieties will be discussed.

2.4.4 Uzh Romani conservations

In addition to shared innovations, there are certain phonological retentions that set both Western and Eastern Uzh Romani dialects apart from the rest of North Central Romani. Some of these conservations may also be found in adjacent Zemplín or Galician dialects, while some are exclusive to the Uzh territory.

An example of a relatively widespread conservative feature is the maintenance of the mid vowel in the adjective *kerko* ‘bitter’ (< MIA *kaḍua-* via **kaḍukka-*; OIA *kaṭu(ka)-* ‘pungent, bitter’, CDIAL 2641). The form *kerko* is characteristic of both Uzh dialect branches together with adjacent Zemplín and Ukrainian Galician dialects, contrasting with *kirko* or *krko* elsewhere.

A somewhat more exclusive conservation is the absence of a metathesis in the word for ‘teardrop’ in Uzh and some southern Zemplín dialects: Proto-Romani **asvi*, Eastern Uzh Romani *āsvin* (or *āsma*; see 2.4.5.3 for the internal variation of /v/ and /m/ in this word). In most North Central Romani dialects, an internal consonant metathesis has taken place and yielded forms such as *avs(in)* or *aps(in)*.

The most exclusive conservative feature peculiar to Uzh Romani is the retention of the consonant cluster /vd/ in *dživdo* ‘alive, living’ (from *dživ-* ‘to live’), *khuvdo* ‘knitted, woven’ (from *khuv-* ‘to knit, to weave’) and *sivdo* ‘sewn’ (from *siv-* ‘to sew’), which otherwise occur as *džido*, *sido* and *khudo* elsewhere in North Central Romani. Note that other perfective forms

³⁷ In Khudlovo, the word has also been documented as *balvaj* (along with *barvaj*), which displays no rhotacism. It cannot be ruled out that the form *balvaj* is a loanword from another Romani dialect in Khudlovo.

of verb bases in /v/ exhibit deletion of /v/ even in Uzh Romani, e.g. *čhido* instead of **čhivdo* ‘thrown’ (from *čhiv-* ‘to throw’; see 3.2.2.1.1.5 for more details).

2.4.5 Phonolexical variation within Eastern Uzh Romani

The last sections of the subchapter on historical phonology discuss word-specific phonological innovations that are encountered in certain (but not all) varieties of Eastern Uzh Romani. Some of these innovations also occur in a part of Western Uzh Romani, or in some other dialects in East Slovakia, and may represent isoglosses that cross the political border between Western and Eastern Uzh Romani.

2.4.5.1 Vowel changes

The verb for ‘to sell’ occurs in a form *biken-* in Uzhhorod and Perechyn, and *bikin-* in Khudlovo and Sereďnie (sporadically also in Radvanka), differing in the quality of the second vowel. It is not clear what constitutes the more innovative form here. From the viewpoint of etymology, the more original form is undoubtedly *bikin-* (< OIA *vi-krī*; cf. 3SG *vikrīṇāti*), while *biken-* has developed through vowel dissimilation. However, the form *bikin-* in the contemporary varieties may also represent secondary vowel assimilation, which would lead to restoration of the more original form. Only *biken-* occurs in Western Uzh Romani.

The word for ‘dog’ is *rukono*, but in Perechyn, regressive vowel assimilation has led to *rokono*. The form *rukono* itself may represent partial regressive vowel assimilation of *rikono* known from other dialects in Slovakia (borrowed from the Armenian *koriwn* ‘whelp, puppy’; Boretzky 1995a: 143). Only *rukono* occurs in Western Uzh Romani,³⁸ while *rokono* is attested in a Zemplín variety of Klenová in northeastern Slovakia, close to the Ukrainian border.

2.4.5.2 Consonant changes

The conservative form of the adjective *nango* ‘nude, naked’ (< OIA *nagna-*) occurs in all varieties except in Shakhta, which has a form with the initial lateral *lango*. In the other Uzhhorod variety, i.e. in Radvanka, both *nango* and *lango* occur. The form *lango*, also documented in the Sobrance variety of Western Uzh Romani, may have developed through confusion of *nango* with another adjective *lang* ‘lame’ (< OIA *laṅga-*), which is found in other Romani dialects.

³⁸ However, the conservative form *rikono* occurs in the word list of an Uzh variety published in Miklosich (1872); see 1.3.4.

An etymologically related verb for ‘to bath’ has a nasal-initial form *nand’ar-* (ITR *nand’uv-*) in Perechyn, Khudlovo and Serednie, but a lateral-initial form *land’ar-* (ITR *land’uv-*) in Uzhhorod. In Radvanka, the *l*-form has been documented even in idiolects of those speakers who use *nango* for ‘naked’. A similar variation of *nand’ar-* and *land’ar-* occurs in Western Uzh Romani.

The verb that means ‘to hit’ occurs in two variants *dem-* and *lem-*, differing in their initial consonant. Both forms are attested in all Eastern Uzh varieties and, not infrequently, they are both employed by a single speaker, so that they are inadequate as dialectologically diagnostic features. Still, just a single variant seems to prevail in every variety, at least with respect to their frequency in the data. The variant *dem-*, which is typical of Western Uzh Romani, is commonly encountered in Uzhhorod (both Shakhta and Radvanka), while the variant *lem-*, typical rather of varieties in northeastern Slovakia and in Ukrainian Galicia, seems to prevail in all *gāvutune* varieties. Although synchronically, *dem-* and *lem-* seem to represent phonological variants, their distinction may, in fact, have morphological origins. It cannot be ruled out that *dem-* and *lem-* are etymologically connected to different light verbs *de-* ‘to give’ and *le-* ‘to take’ respectively, compounded with a nominal element.

The initial aspirated velar stop of *khasa-* ‘to cough’, current in Uzhhorod and Perechyn, has become a fricative in Khudlovo and Serednie, leading to *xasa-*.

Certain words display variation with respect to their affrication or palatalisation. The nouns *buv’i* ‘work’ and *rā’i* ‘night, at night’ have optional affricated variants *buv’či* and *rā’či* in Radvanka, which are reminiscent of the large-scale affrication of palatal stops /tʃ/ and /dʃ/ in many dialects of East Slovakia. The word for ‘leaf’ has a non-palatalised base *prajt-* (*prajtin*, *prajta*) in both Uzhhorod varieties, while in the remaining varieties, the base is palatalised in *prajt’-* (*prajt’i(n)*, *prajt’a*). Another pair *lidža-* ~ *l’idža-* ‘to carry off’ seems to be in free variation or purely idiolectal.

2.4.5.3 Changes in consonant clusters and metatheses

The noun for ‘tear’ has a conservative form *āsvin* or *āsva* in all varieties with the exception of Radvanka, where ‘tear’ is *āsma* with /m/ instead of /v/. This innovation is shared with a cluster of Western Uzh varieties in the vicinity of Pavlovce nad Uhom (and including the variety of Pavlovce nad Uhom) in Slovakia.

Another Radvanka innovation shared with Pavlovce nad Uhom and exclusive within Eastern Uzh Romani is velarisation of the stop in the adjective *šutlo* ‘sour’, in Radvanka

šuklo. Since the form *šuklo* has not been documented elsewhere in Central Romani, it may be considered one of the crucial features that link Radvanka to Pavlovce nad Uhom.

The consonant cluster /vn/ in **guruvni* (feminine derivation from *guruv* ‘bull’) has two reflexes: /vň/ (*guruvňi*) and /mň/ (*gurumňi*). In Radvanka and Sereďnie, only *guruvňi* has been documented, while in Khudlovo, the only attested form is *gurumňi*. In Shakhta and Perechyn, both forms occur. Note that there is no variation of the similar consonant cluster in the etymon **sovnakaj* ‘gold’, which is reflected as /mn/ (*somnak(aj)*) across Eastern Uzh Romani.

The Iranian-origin verb for ‘to kill’ occurs in the form *murdar-*, but in Uzhhorod, nasalisation has given rise to *mundar-*. While only *mundar-* has been recorded among Shakhta speakers, both *murdar-* and *mundar-* exist in Radvanka. Only *murdar-* (and also *mudar-*), but no *mundar-*, occur in Western Uzh Romani.

The word for ‘soldier’, which is apparently based on the South Slavic noun *sluga* ‘servant’, is *slugad’is* in Khudlovo and Sereďnie, and *suglad’is* or *sugl’ad’is* in Uzhhorod and Perechyn, with a transference of the lateral. A metathesis has taken place in the Hungarian loan verb *l’ivin-* ‘to shoot’, which is *vil’in-* in Khudlovo. Some other metatheses are rather idiolectal. A Hungarian loanword *vilāñis* ‘light, electricity’, (cf. Hungarian *villany*, but also in local Slavic dialects) has a metathetic variant *livāñis* in Shakhta and Perechyn, and a Slavic loanword *koreñis* ‘root’ is attested as *rokeñis* from a single speaker in Shakhta.

2.4.5.4 Protheses and aphaereses

An extraordinary vowel prothesis has developed in an inherited verb that means ‘to read’ (plus ‘to count’ outside of Uzhhorod): *egen-* in Uzhhorod and Perechyn as against non-prothetic *gen-* in Khudlovo and Sereďnie (< OIA *gaṇ-* ‘to count’). The prothetic form *egen-* is also known from several Western Uzh varieties and, with a palatal glide in a form *jegen-*, even in some Northern Zemplín varieties.

Eastern Uzh Romani is invariably conservative with respect to absence of prothesis of the palatal approximant /j/ in a number of words, such as *ārmin* ‘cabbage’, *āro* ‘flour’ and *āsvin/āsva/āsma* ‘tear’, which may occur with a prothesis in other Romani dialects. Still, in certain other words, the dialect region is not so uniform. The word for ‘egg’ occurs as *āndro* with no prothesis in all varieties, but in Radvanka, prothetic *jāndro* exists in addition to *āndro*. Like other Radvanka-specific features, the prothetic form is shared with the Western Uzh variety of Pavlovce nad Uhom. However, this shared innovation does not hold such dialectological relevance since the prothesis in the reflexes of Proto-Romani **anro* is widespread in Central dialects of Slovakia and occurs in a greater number of varieties than its

absence. Another variation in terms of the initial /j/ occurs in the word for ‘heart’: *ilo* in Perechyn, Khudlovo and Serednie, and *jilo* in both Uzhhorod varieties (optionally also in Khudlovo). The form *ilo* seems to be more conservative, continuing Proto-Romani **ilo* from MIA *hidaa-* (< OIA *hrdaya-*). However, it is possible that *ilo* is a secondary development of the loss of the prothetic /j/ in *jilo* in given Uzh varieties, which would lead to a restoration of the more original form. In Western Uzh Romani, *jilo* occurs almost everywhere except in Sobrance, where the form is *ilo*.

The most common reflex of the Proto-Romani etymon **azd-* ‘to lift’ (perhaps from a Proto-Romani phrase **ast d-* [hand give])³⁹ is *hazd-* in all varieties. Still, in Radvanka and sporadically even elsewhere, the verb has an optional form *vazd-* with the initial /v/ used by some speakers. Both *hazd-* and *vazd-* occur in Western Uzh Romani, though in different varieties.

In Khudlovo, the name for ‘corn, wheat’ is a two-word fixed phrase *žužo d’iv*, which consists of an attributive adjective related to *žuvžo* ‘clean’ and a masculine noun *d’iv* from Proto-Romani **giv*. The latter word no longer occurs as an independent noun without *žužo*. In both Uzhhorod varieties, this phrase has undergone univerbation and syllable aphaeresis, leading to the form *žod’iv*. Such an aphaeretic form is shared with a southern cluster of Western Uzh Romani varieties, principally with those that also display nasalisation in the word for ‘tear’ *āasma*. In Perechyn and Serednie, the etymon has already been replaced by a Slavic loanword *pšěnica* or *pšičica*.

³⁹ There is also an alternative Iranian etymology mentioned by Boretzky and Iglá (1994: 298).

3 VERBS

This chapter discusses the morphology of verbs (for verb-related syntactic aspects, see chapter 12). It briefly outlines the tense, aspect and mood categories before it provides a detailed description of verb inflection, including that of the copula. The sections on inflection are followed by an overview of non-finite verb forms. The final subchapter deals with derivation of verbs, with a focus on valency-changing morphology and on productive lexical-semantic modifications by means of derivational affixes.

3.1 TAM categories

The following sections provide a brief overview of the inflectional TAM categories and their functions in Eastern Uzh Romani. For an overall introduction to the TAM categories in Romani in cross-dialectal and diachronic perspectives, see Matras (2001) and Elšík and Matras (2006: 188–202).

3.1.1 Aspect

The crucial dimension along which the Romani verb inflection takes place is the aspectual opposition of perfective versus non-perfective, which describes events and actions encoded by verbs either as completed or as those lacking such reading. Functionally, such an opposition is relevant in the past tense only since the perfective has an inherent past time (aorist) reading in Eastern Uzh Romani, while the non-perfective forms may refer to the past, present and future. Anticipated completion with future-time reference, mentioned by Matras (2001: 165, 2002: 151) as a possible function of the Romani perfective, does not occur in Eastern Uzh Romani. It follows that the present and future tenses have no aspectual opposition. It is possible to overtly express completeness or another perspective by various aktionsart modifications, but this is rather a lexical, derivational category of the Romani verb, e.g. *ker-* ‘to do’ > *doker-* ‘to complete’ (see 3.5.1.5, cf. also 12.3.5). Furthermore, the aspectual opposition is semantically irrelevant in the copula, although the aspectual morphology manifests itself in the copula.

In the past time reference, the non-perfective verbs will be called ‘imperfect’ (see below). See sentence (1) in which the non-perfective forms refer to actions with no indication whether they were accomplished, while in the second sentence (2), the emphasis is on completion of the actions referred to by the perfective verbs.

- (1) *te phennas mange, klāri džā ker kodā,*
if say.AOR.3PL I.DAT Klari go[IMP.2SG] do[IMP.2SG] that.SPEC

me kerās, džā šulav opre kode,
 I do.AOR.1SG go[IMP.2SG] sweep[IMP.2SG] up there.SPEC

me šulavās (...),
 I sweep.AOR.1SG

me kerās, so ča phennas mange (Uzhhs)
 I do.AOR.1SG what only say.AOR.3PL I.DAT

‘If they were telling me: “Klari, go do that!” I was doing [it], “Go sweep up!” I was sweeping (...). I was just doing [everything] they were telling me.’

- (2) *bešle paž o skamin, xāle pile khelde,*
 sit.AOR.3PL beside ART table eat.AOR.3PL drink.AOR.3PL dance.AOR.3PL
otpal'ikerde, geje khejre fs'o (Uzhhs)
 finish_thanking.AOR.3PL go.AOR.3PL home end

‘They sat at the table, they ate, drunk, danced, expressed their thanks, went home and nothing more.’

3.1.2 Tense

All three basic grammatical tenses, the past, present and future, are formally distinguished in Eastern Uzh Romani, unlike in Late Proto-Romani, which is assumed by Matras (2002: 155, 157), as well as by Elšík and Matras (2006: 82–83), to have not distinguished between the present and future tenses (in the indicative mood). According to both authors, the non-differentiated present/future was inherent to forms marked by the indicative suffix **-a*, which was added to the person/number markers (the so-called ‘long forms’ as opposed to ‘short forms’ with no TAM marking). Boretzky and Iгла (2004: 138), on the contrary, suggest that the present/future polysemy may be a secondary and partly contact-induced development in the dialects where it occurs. In any case, North Central Romani, including Eastern Uzh Romani, distinguishes between the present and the future in that the ‘long forms’ in *-a* refer to the future only, while the unmarked short forms have the present-tense interpretation (see 3.2.1 for more details).

- (3) *on dikhen hoj amen gil'avas (Uzhhr)*
 they see.PRS.3PL FCOMP we sing.PRS.1PL

‘They see that we are singing.’

- (4) *kurke dikhena la (Uzhhr)*
 on_Sunday see.FUT.3PL she.ACC

‘They will see her on Sunday.’

However, the present-tense forms are also used in reference to the immediate intentional future, as in:

- (5) *aves manca ?* (Uzhhs)
 come.PRS.2SG I.INST
 ‘Will you join me for a walk?’ (Literally: ‘Are you coming with me?’)
- (6) *užar, me lidžav le grajes aro x’ivos* (Ser)
 wait[IMP2SG] I lead.PRS.1SG ART horse.ACC in stable
 ‘Wait [a while], I’ll lead the horse into the stable.’

The basic tense dimension in Late Proto-Romani is proposed by Matras (2002: 151–152; see also Elšik and Matras 2006: 188 and elsewhere) to have been an opposition of remote versus non-remote tenses. Remoteness is a category within which various temporal and conditional functions of the remoteness marker may be subsumed. It serves to contextualise the event encoded by the verb with respect to a contextual reference point, such as the speaker or the participant affected by the event. More specifically, remoteness expresses placement of the event outside the reach of the referential point and its inaccessibility to the participant. It may, therefore, refer to a past, as well as to a conditional action whose fulfilment is beyond the capabilities of the participant. Remoteness is not an aspect category, as it does not interfere with the aspectual distinction, and may be encoded in both non-perfective and perfective verb forms. The remote non-perfective often expresses the imperfect, while the remote perfective often has a pluperfect reading in Romani dialects (see Matras 2001: 165–167).

In Eastern Uzh Romani, the remoteness marker is *-as*, like in many other Romani dialects, which is descended from Proto-Romani **-asi* (< OIA 3SG imperfect copula *āsīt* via MIA *āsi*; see Sampson 1926: 192; Bloch 1932: 52; Bubeník 1995: 10). There are both non-perfective and perfective remote forms in Eastern Uzh Romani, but the remote perfective forms no longer have a temporal function, which is why they will be discussed below as a category of the mood. The remote non-perfective expresses the imperfect, that is an imperfective past tense.

- (7) *čirla amen phirahas te mangavkeren* (Per)
 long_ago we go_often.IPF/POT.1PL NCOMP beg.INF
 ‘In the past, we used to go begging.’

- (8) *e vojna džalas,*
 ART war go.IPF/POT.3SG
oj rodzinkerlas le čhavōren (Khu)
 she give_birth_to.ITER. IPF/POT.3SG ART child.DIM.ACC.PL
 ‘The war was going on, she was giving birth to children.’

In addition, the remote non-perfective forms express a potential mood, which will be discussed in the following section.

3.1.3 Mood

The basic mood is the indicative, which has no special marking in Eastern Uzh Romani. There are two non-indicative mood values, subjunctive and potential, which exist as grammatically distinct forms only in the copula, while they are identical to the indicative forms in all other verbs. In addition, the irrealis exists as a mood category in all verbs. There is also a category of the optative, which is, however, formed syntactically and will be discussed in the chapter on verb syntax in 12.2.

The subjunctive is a syntactic rather than semantic category in Eastern Uzh Romani. Its forms are distinct from those of the indicative in the present and past copula (see 3.3 for more details), while in the future copula, as well as in all other verbs, it is either absent or identical to the indicative, depending on analysis. The subjunctive copula is obligatory with the non-factual complementiser *te* and with the optative particle *mi* (see 3.4.3, 12.2 and 13.2.1,) and after modal particles of possibility *šaj* ‘can’ and *naši* ‘cannot’ (12.5.2).

- (9) *amen mā naši avas* *ajse diline (Khu)^{LQCR}*
 we already cannot COP.PRS.SBJV.1PL such silly.PL
 ‘We can no longer be so silly.’

as against (indicative):

- (10) *amen sam roma but džane (Khu)*
 we COP.PRS.1PL Rom.PL many person.PL
 ‘We, the Roma, are many people.’

The potential is a kind of conditional mood (the other one being the irrealis, see below), which expresses an attainable possibility, potential or wished situations. In the copula, it is expressed through the remote future-subjunctive-potential copula root (see 3.3.2).

- (11) *te ejhas honno* (Uzhhs)
 if COP.POT.2SG able
 ‘If you were able.’

as against (indicative):

- (12) *te sal honno* (Uzhhs)
 if COP.PRS.2SG able
 ‘If you are able.’

Cf. also:

- (13) *te menk kapka on podbāronas,*
 if still a_bit they grow_up.IPF/POT.3PL
on ejnas bareder sar lengoro dad (Ser)^{LQCR}
 they COP.POT.3PL big.COMPR how their father
 ‘If they grew up a bit more, they would be bigger than their father.’

In all other verbs, the potential forms are identical to those of the imperfect, that is, they are expressed by the remote non-perfective forms (see above).⁴⁰ Note that a special Slavic-origin conditional particle *bi* (in Uzhhorod and sporadically also in the other varieties) or *bo* (in Perechyn, Khudlovo and Serednie) may optionally be present in potential clauses, as in (15) and (17) (cf. also 13.3.1).

- (14) *ta soske dahas āvrenge?* (Uzhhr)
 so why give.IPF/POT.1PL other.DAT.PL
 ‘So why would we give [it] to others?’

- (15) *tumen bi bistro sikl'onas* (Khu)
 you.PL COND quickly learn.IPF/POT.2PL
 ‘You (PL) would learn quickly.’

- (16) *kamās igen te džanen len* (Khu)
 want.IPF/POT.1SG very NCOMP know.INF they.ACC
 ‘I would like to know them a lot.’

- (17) *me bo kapka pijās* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 I COND a_bit drink.IPF/POT.1SG
 ‘I would drink a bit.’

⁴⁰ In an alternative analysis, one might state that the potential occurs only in the copula, while it is missing in all other verbs, where the real conditional is a possible function of the imperfect (or the remote non-perfective).

The other conditional mood is the irrealis, which is based on the perfective forms marked by the remoteness suffix *-as* (see 3.2.2.3). In contrast to other Romani dialects, and to the reconstructed Proto-Romani system (cf. Elšík and Matras 2006: 83), the remote perfective does not have a temporal (pluperfect) function in Eastern Uzh Romani. The irrealis serves to express an imagined and non-actualised event (see (18)) or a counterfactual action (19). Like the potential, it may be accompanied by the special conditional particle *bi/bo* ((19) and (21) below).

- (18) *mijra romňake ov te phend'ahas džungāles,*
 my wife.DAT he if say.IRR.3SG obscene.ADV
me leske o nak phagl'omas andre,
 I he.DAT ART nose break.IRR.1SG inside
iľomas les le šejreha,
 take.IRR.1SG he.ACC ART head.INST
lemad'omas kade andro nakh,
 hit.IRR.1SG here.SPEC in nose
the o rat lestar gej'ahas (UzhhS)
 and ART blood he.ABL go.IRR.3SG
 'Had he said [anything] obscene to my wife, I would fracture his nose. I would seize him by the head, punch [him] here on the nose, and he would have bled.'
- (19) *on bo othodahas pen, abo nāne kāj* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 I COND hide.IRR.3PL REFL.PL but NEG.COP.PRS.3 where
 'They would hide themselves, but there is no [place] where [to hide].'

The irrealis is also used to express a wish whose fulfilment is hard to achieve (20) and may pragmatically be used in requests for the purpose of politeness (21). Cf. the following examples with the potential ones in (16) and (17) above.

- (20) *kaml'omas te phuteren romano centros le čhavage* (Per)
 want.IRR.1SG NCOMP open.INF Romanicentre ART child.DAT.PL
 'I would love to open a Gypsy centre for children.'
- (21) *me piľomas bi kapkica* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 I drink.IRR.1SG COND a_little_bit
 'I would like to have a drink.'

Finally, the imperative mood as a formally distinct category exists in the 2SG, while it is identical to the present indicative in the 2PL, except in the copula. There is also the 1PL imperative which is actually a cohortative ('let's'), and its form is also different from that of the indicative in the copula only (see 3.2.1.4 and 3.3.2).

- (22) *dža vičin le mama!* (Per)
 go[IMP.2SG] call[IMP.2SG] ART mother.ACC
 'Go call [your] mother!'
- (23) *džan avri, na mišinen ade!* (Per)
 go.IMP.2PL out NEG disturb.IMP.2PL here
 'Get out, don't disturb [us] here!' (plural)
- (24) *avas učharas o skamin!* (Per)^{LQCR}
 come.IMP.1PL cover.IMP.1PL ART table
 'Let's go and set the table!'

3.2 Verb inflection

Inflectional categories of lexical verbs are aspect, number, person, tense, plus mood. There are two aspect categories, non-perfective and perfective, whose opposition is encoded in the stem marking and in the distinctive subject (person/number) marking. Both a two-fold number distinction, singular and plural, and a three-fold person distinction, are encoded in cumulative suffixes that serve to express the subject cross-reference.

The inflectional base of a verb may be identical to a root, e.g. *ker-el* [do-3SG] 's/he does', *dža-l* [go-3SG] 's/he goes', or it may be represented by a more complex stem, e.g. *pis-in-el* [write-INTEGRATION-3SG] 's/he writes', which contains a Slavic root *pis-* plus the loan-verb integration suffix *-in-*, *lis-isar-ker-el* [bald-FACT-ITER-3SG] 's/he repeatedly makes bald', which contains the iterative stem of the deadjectival verb 'to make bald', *xol'-isal'-il'-a* [anger-INCH-PFV-3SG] 's/he got angry', in which the inflectional suffixes of the perfective marking and the 3SG are attached to the inchoative stem of the denominal derivation from *xol'i* 'anger', etc. Romani verbs occur in two distinctive aspect stems: a non-perfective stem, commonly called 'present stem' (e.g. Matras 2002: 135; Boretzky and Iglá 2004: 138), and a perfective stem. The non-perfective stem is encoded by a zero suffix in most verbs, and the person/number markers are attached directly to the inflectional base, e.g. *ker-Ø-av* [do-NPFV-1SG] 'I do/am doing'. However, in the class of middle verbs, a distinctive non-perfective stem marker *-uv-* occurs in certain person categories, e.g. *axal'-uv-av* [understand-NPFV-1SG] 'I understand'. The perfective stem is overtly marked by a suffix that is inserted between the

inflectional base and the person/number markers (see also Matras 2002: 151), e.g. *ker-d'-om* [do-PFV-1SG] ‘I did/have done’. The set of person/number suffixes is different in both aspect categories (cf. NPFV *-av* as against PFV *-om* for the 1SG), which is why both non-perfective and perfective inflectional patterns will be discussed separately.

3.2.1 Non-perfective inflection

The tense and mood values of lexical verbs in the non-perfective inflection are the present indicative, the future indicative, the undifferentiated imperfect and potential, also called ‘remote non-perfective’, and the imperative. The present indicative has no overt TAM marking and is expressed by forms marked by plain person/number suffixes, e.g. *ker-el-∅* [do-3SG-PRES] ‘s/he does, s/he is doing’. The future and the imperfect/potential, on the contrary, have overt markers suffixed to the person/number markers, e.g. *ker-el-a* [do-3SG-FUT] ‘s/he will do’, *ker-el-as* [do-3SG-REM] ‘s/he was doing, s/he would do’. For the imperative, see 3.2.1.4 below.

3.2.1.1 Person/number marking (present inflection)

Three inflectional classes of non-perfective inflection can be postulated. After their phonological and semantic properties, they will be called (i) active consonantal verbs, (ii) active vocalic verbs, and (iii) middle verbs.

3.2.1.1.1 Active consonantal verbs

First, there are verbs with a base that ends in a consonant, hence consonantal verbs. This is the most productive verb class that comprises most verbs, including virtually all recent loan verbs. The person suffixes of the consonantal verbs all begin in a vowel, which is /a/ in the first person and /e/ in the second and third persons.

The inflection of consonantal verbs is illustrated in Table 4 by person inflection of the inherited verb *ker-* ‘to do’ and the loan verb *pisin-* ‘to write’, whose inflectional base comprises the Slavic root *pis-* and the integration morpheme *-in-* (see 3.2.3).

Table 4: Inflection of consonantal verbs

	SINGULAR			PLURAL		
	SUFFIX	<i>ker-</i>	<i>pisin-</i>	SUFFIX	<i>ker-</i>	<i>pisin-</i>
FIRST	<i>-av</i>	<i>kerav</i>	<i>pisinav</i>	<i>-as</i>	<i>keras</i>	<i>pisinas</i>
SECOND	<i>-es</i>	<i>keres</i>	<i>pisines</i>	<i>-en</i>	<i>keren</i>	<i>pisinen</i>
THIRD	<i>-el</i>	<i>kerel</i>	<i>pisinel</i>	<i>-en</i>	<i>keren</i>	<i>pisinen</i>

3.2.1.1.2 Active vocalic verbs

Second, there are vocalic root bases that end in /a/, hence vocalic verbs or *a*-verbs. This class represents a non-productive and closed set of verbs that have certain phonological and semantic characteristics in common to some degree. It includes disyllabic verbs that express feelings and psychological or bodily states ('psych' verbs), such as *asa-* 'to laugh', *dara-* 'to fear', *dukha-* 'to hurt, to be painful', *izdra-* 'to shiver', *khasa-* (Uzhhorod, Perechyn), *xasa-* (Khudlovo, Serednie) 'to cough', *ladža-* 'to be ashamed', *pa'a-* 'to believe', *troma-* 'to dare', a monosyllabic motion verb *dža-* 'to go' and related *lidža-/lidža-* 'to carry off, to take away',⁴¹ plus a monosyllabic verb *xa-* 'to eat'. The vocalic verbs display the identical person suffixes like the consonantal bases, but ones in which the vocalic part of the suffix is elided. In contrast to some other (non-North Central) Romani dialects, there are no other vocalic verbs than the *a*-verbs in Eastern Uzh Romani. The Romani verb *pi-* 'to drink' (cf. Vlach *pel* 3SG 's/he drinks') consistently occurs with a palatal glide throughout the paradigm (1SG *pij-av*, 2SG *pij-es*, 3SG *pij-el*, etc.), and is therefore based on the root *pij-* and inflected as a consonantal verb. In Table 5, the vocalic verb inflection is exemplified by the monosyllabic verb *dža-* 'to go' and the disyllabic verb *pa'a-* 'to believe'. For the somewhat aberrant verb *čul'a-* see below.

Table 5: Inflection of vocalic verbs

	SINGULAR			PLURAL		
	SUFFIX	<i>dža-</i>	<i>pa'a-</i>	SUFFIX	<i>dža-</i>	<i>pa'a-</i>
FIRST	-v	<i>džav</i>	<i>pa'av</i>	-s	<i>džas</i>	<i>pa'as</i>
SECOND	-s	<i>džas</i>	<i>pa'as</i>	-n	<i>džan</i>	<i>pa'an</i>
THIRD	-l	<i>džal</i>	<i>pa'al</i>	-n	<i>džan</i>	<i>pa'an</i>

3.2.1.1.3 Middle *uv*-verbs

The third verb class consists of mostly intransitive middle verbs that contain an overt non-perfective stem suffix *-uv-* before the person suffixes in certain person/number categories. Historically, verbs in *-uv-* were regular consonantal verbs that have undergone contraction of *-uv-* with the following person suffix in some contexts (cf. Matras 2002: 136–137), although contraction may still be optional to a certain degree (see below). Middle verbs, which are also called 'mediopassives' in Romani descriptions (cf. Bubeník and Hübschmannová 1998;

⁴¹ Another motion *a*-verb known from other Romani dialects, viz. *prasta-* 'to run', is missing in Eastern Uzh Romani.

Matras 2002), also comprise intransitive (anticausative and inchoative) derivations, but a small part of them is transitive (e.g. *axal'uv-* ‘to understand’). Owing to the deadjectival inchoative derivations (see 3.5.2.2), the class of middle verbs is productive.

In Table 6, the inflection of middle verbs is exemplified by the synchronically underived verb *axal'uv-* ‘to understand’ and by the inchoative verb *bār-uv-* ‘to grow’ (derived from the adjective *bār-o* ‘big’).

Table 6: Inflection of middle verbs

	SINGULAR			PLURAL		
	SUFFIX	<i>axal'uv-</i>	<i>bār-uv-</i>	SUFFIX	<i>axal'uv-</i>	<i>bār-uv-</i>
FIRST	<i>-uv-av</i>	<i>axal'uvav</i>	<i>bāruvav</i>	<i>-uv-as</i>	<i>axal'uvas</i>	<i>bāruvas</i>
SECOND	<i>(-uv-es)</i>	<i>axal'uves</i>	<i>bāros</i>	<i>(-uv-en)</i>	<i>axal'uven</i>	<i>bāron</i>
	<i>-os</i>	<i>axal'os</i>		<i>-on</i>	<i>axal'on</i>	
THIRD	<i>-ol</i>	<i>axal'ol</i>	<i>bārol</i>	<i>(-uv-en)</i>	<i>axal'uven</i>	<i>bāron</i>
				<i>-on</i>	<i>axal'on</i>	

Note that in the first person, the verb forms are marked by the regular suffixes of the consonantal verb inflection, added to the base in *-uv-*. There are never contracted forms in the first person of both numbers. In the second and third persons, contracted forms occur in which the suffix *-uv-* coalesces with the vowel segment of the person suffix, giving rise to /o/ plus the consonant segment of the person suffix. While for the inchoative verb *bār-uv-* only contracted forms occur in the second and third persons, in the case of *axal'uv-* non-contracted forms of the consonantal verb inflection are still sporadically attested in the 2SG, 2PL and 3PL. Nonetheless, the contracted forms are much more common even with *axal'uv-* in the second and third persons.

Furthermore, a single verb *čul'a-* ‘to flow (about liquid), to ooze’ seems to combine the inflection of the vocalic verbs with that of the middle verbs. In the second and third persons, the verb is inflected as a vocalic *a*-verb, thus 2SG *čul'as*, 3SG *čul'al*, 2/3PL *čul'an*. In the first person, the verb is attested as a middle verb in Shakhta, cf. 1SG *čul'uvav*, 1PL *čul'uvav*. However, this verb is probably rarely used in persons other than the third person due to its meaning, and all the forms of the first and second persons have been documented in translation elicitation from a single consultant only.

3.2.1.2 Future inflection

The future indicative is marked by the suffix *-a*, which is added to the person/number markers, e.g. *xa-n-a* [eat-3PL-FUT] ‘they will eat’. See Table 7 for the future paradigm of the verbs *ker-*, *dža-* and *axal’uv-* in Eastern Uzh Romani.

Table 7: Future inflection

	SINGULAR			PLURAL		
	<i>ker-</i>	<i>dža-</i>	<i>axal’uv-</i>	<i>ker-</i>	<i>dža-</i>	<i>axal’uv-</i>
FIRST	<i>kerava</i> <i>kerā</i>	<i>džava</i> <i>džā</i>	<i>axal’uvava</i> <i>axal’uvā</i>	<i>keraha</i>	<i>džaha</i>	<i>axal’uvaha</i>
SECOND	<i>kereha</i>	<i>džaha</i>	<i>axal’oha</i>	<i>ker(e)na</i>	<i>džana</i>	<i>axal’ona</i>
THIRD	<i>ker(e)la</i>	<i>džala</i>	<i>axal’ola</i>	<i>ker(e)na</i>	<i>džana</i>	<i>axal’ona</i>

Note that the suffixation of *-a* triggers some morphophonological changes. First, the sibilant segment of the respective 2SG and 1PL suffixes *-es* and *-as* undergoes debuccalisation (changes to *-h-*; see also 2.4.1). Second, the 1SG suffix *-av-* optionally merges with the future suffix *-a* into a single lengthened and stressed suffix *-ā*. Furthermore, the vocalic segment of the 3SG and 2/3PL of consonantal verbs may optionally be syncopated in future-marked forms, which may result in gemination, as in *pisinena* ~ *pisinna* ‘you/they will write’ (see also 2.1.7).

The middle verbs in *-uv* always occur with the stem contraction *-o-* in the second and third persons of the future tense (cf. 3.2.1.1.3). The non-contracted forms like **axal’uveha* were not recorded.

3.2.1.3 Imperfect and potential (remote non-perfective) inflection

The non-perfective forms may be marked by a tense/mood suffix *-as*, which Matras (2001: 165–166, 2002: 152) proposes to call a marker of ‘remoteness’. Remoteness is a category that unites various temporal (past-tense) and conditional functions in that it expresses placement of the event outside the reach of the contextual referential point and its inaccessibility to the participant (see also 3.1.2). It is relevant for both non-perfective and perfective aspect dimensions (see 3.2.2.3 for the remote perfective).

In Eastern Uzh Romani, ‘remote’ non-perfective forms combine a tense function of the imperfect (imperfective past indicative) with a mood function of the potential conditional. The suffix *-as* is added to the person/number suffixes, like the future suffix, e.g. *xa-n-as* [eat-3PL-REM] ‘they were eating/ they would eat’. See Table 8.

Table 8: Imperfect/potential (remote non-perfective) inflection

	SINGULAR			PLURAL		
	<i>ker-</i>	<i>dža-</i>	<i>axal'-uv-</i>	<i>ker-</i>	<i>dža-</i>	<i>axal'-uv-</i>
FIRST	<i>kerās</i>	<i>džās</i>	<i>axal'uvās</i>	<i>kerahas</i>	<i>džahas</i>	<i>axal'uvahas</i>
SECOND	<i>kerehas</i>	<i>džahas</i>	<i>axal'oahas</i>	<i>ker(e)nas</i>	<i>džanas</i>	<i>axal'onas</i>
THIRD	<i>ker(e)las</i>	<i>džalas</i>	<i>axal'olas</i>	<i>ker(e)nas</i>	<i>džanas</i>	<i>axal'onas</i>

Note that the same morphophonological changes as those encountered in the future inflection occur, e.g. debuccalisation of the sibilant in the 2SG and 1PL suffixes, i.e. *-es* > *-eh(-as)*, *-as* > *-ah(-as)* respectively. In the 1SG, the suffix *-as* coalesces with the preceding 1SG suffix *-av-* into a single cumulative morpheme *-ās* with the long and stressed vowel. In contrast to the future, where such a contraction is optional, the 1SG past/potential virtually always occurs in the contracted form. Though the non-contracted 1SG forms in *-av-as* are attested, they are very rare⁴² and explicitly characterised by consultants as incorrect or at least less acceptable.

Like in the future inflection, the vocalic segment of the 3SG and 2/3PL markers of consonantal verbs may be syncopated, which may lead to geminate consonants, e.g. 3SG *khelelas* ~ *khellas* ‘s/he was dancing, s/he would dance’ (*khel-* ‘to dance’), 2/3PL *phenenas* ~ *phennas* ‘you/they were saying, you/they would say’ (*phen-* ‘to say, to tell’). That such syncope is only optional is shown by the following sentence example from Khudlovo. Initially, the speaker made use of the shortened 3PL verb form *dživnas* ‘they were living’ and subsequently repeated the verb in its unshortened variant *dživenas*:

- (25) *adaj o roma čirla igen bedno dživ-n-as,*
 here ART Rom.PL long_ago very poorly live-3PL-REM
igen igen bedno dživ-en-as (Khu)
 very very poorly live-3PL-REM

‘Here Roma lived in great poverty (literally: very poorly) in the past, in extreme poverty (literally: very very poorly).’

⁴² In the LQCR-based elicited translations, there are 135 occurrences of *-ās* and only 9 occurrences of *-avas* (6.25%) in the whole Eastern Uzh Romani. In Perehyn and Serednie, there are no occurrences of *-avas* at all. In Shakhta, there is a single occurrence of *-avas*, in Khudlovo there are 3 occurrences and in Radvanka there are 5 occurrences of *-avas* in the LQCR data.

The middle verbs in *-uv* never occur non-contracted in the second and third persons when suffixed by *-as* (**axal'uvehas*).

3.2.1.4 Imperative inflection

The imperative, which also serves to express the prohibitive (see 12.4), has distinct 2SG forms, while the 2PL imperative and 1PL imperative (cohortative) forms are identical to those of the present indicative. Otherwise, there are no third-person imperative forms, nor is there a 1SG imperative. See Table 9 for the imperative inflection of the verb *ker-* ‘to do, to make’.

Table 9: Imperative inflection

PERSON	SG	PL
1		<i>keras</i>
2	<i>ker</i>	<i>keren</i>
3		

The 2SG imperative may be marked by one of the following suffixes: (i) a zero suffix, (ii) *-i*, and (iii) *-e*, so that three imperative classes may be postulated. The three classes are indicated in Table 10.

Table 10: Imperative classes

<i>-∅</i>	<i>-e</i>	<i>-i</i>
<i>ker-∅</i>	<i>d-e</i>	<i>xut'-i</i>
<i>dža-∅</i>	<i>l-e</i>	<i>uš-i</i>
<i>axal'uv-∅</i>	<i>xud-e</i>	<i>ur-i</i>

The 2SG imperative of most verbs is marked by the zero suffix, which means that the imperative form is identical to the plain inflectional base. The zero suffix occurs with most consonantal verbs, including all loan verbs integrated by *-in-*, e.g. *pisin-∅* ‘write!’, and all derived verbs, e.g. *lisisar-∅* ‘make bald!’. In addition, all vocalic and middle verbs mark the 2SG imperative by *-∅*, as shown in Table 10. Consequently, the imperative forms of middle verbs end in the non-perfective stem suffix *-uv*, cf. also *paš'uv-∅*⁴³ ‘Lie (down)!’. The verb *pij-* (2/3PL *pijen*) ‘to drink’ has the imperative form *pi*, which does not contain the palatal glide of other non-perfective forms.

⁴³ In surface pronunciation, the final *-v* of *-uv* is pronounced as [ɥ] in line with the phonological rules (see 2.1.6) but as such it is often dropped, leaving just *-u*, i.e. *paš'lu*.

The 2SG imperative marking in *-e* characterises the monoconsonantal verbs *d-* ‘to give’ and *l-* ‘to take’ (see Table 10). In addition, the suffix *-e* occurs with verbs whose base ends in *-d* (for the slightly divergent situation in Khudlovo see the following paragraph) and some of them are historical compounds of the verb *d-* with a nominal element, such as *čumid-* ‘to kiss’ (IMP.2SG *čumid-e*), *cird-* ‘to pull’ (*cird-e*), *hazd-* (*vazd-*) ‘to lift’ (*hazd-e* or *vazd-e*), *xud-* ‘to catch, to get, to begin’ (*xud-e*), Serednie *icard-* ‘to hurl’ (*icard-e*), *ispid-* ‘to push’ (*ispid-e*), *kid-* ‘to collect, to gather’ (plus ‘to dress’ in Khudlovo and Serednie) (*kid-e*), *kikid-* ‘to press’ (*kikid-e*), *phurd-* ‘to blow’ (*phurd-e*), *rod-* ‘to look for, to search’ (*rod-e*), *trād-* ‘to drive’ (*trād-e*). However, verbs with the base in /nd/, such as *čhand-* ‘to vomit’, *phand-* ‘to close, to shut’ and *rand-* ‘to scrape’, do not partake in the morphology of other *d-*verbs as their 2SG imperative lacks the overt marking, cf. *čhan(d)-∅*, *phan(d)-∅* and *ran(d)-∅*.⁴⁴ The imperative form of the verb *khand-*, in contrast, has been documented as *khand-e* in Shakhta and Serednie, but *khand-∅* in Khudlovo.

In Khudlovo, most verbs in /d/ (except for those in /nd/) also mark the 2SG imperative by *-e*, as in *xud-e*, *kid-e*, *rod-e*, *hazd-e*, *ispid-e*, but the verbs *čumid-* ‘to kiss’ and *čhungard-* ‘to spit’ have the zero-marked imperative forms *čumid-∅* and *čhungard-∅*, respectively.⁴⁵ Imperative forms of *cird-*, *icard-*, *kikid-*, *phurd-* and *trād-* are not attested in the Khudlovo variety.

Finally, the 2SG imperative suffix *-i* only occurs with three verbs *xut-* ‘to jump’, *uš-* ‘to stand up’ and *ur-* ‘to dress’ (in Uzhhorod and Perechyn) or ‘to put shoes on’ (in Khudlovo and Serednie).

3.2.2 Perfective inflection

The perfective inflection is characterised by overt aspect marking through the perfective stem. There are two distinct tense and mood categories in the perfective: aorist or the non-remote perfective, which has a function of the perfective past indicative, and the irrealis or the remote perfective, which has a specific mood function. While the aorist is unmarked, e.g. *ker-d'-al-∅* [do-PFV-2SG-AOR] ‘you did/have done’, the irrealis has overt marking by means of the ‘remoteness’ suffix *-as*, as in *ker-d'-al-as* [do-PFV-2SG-REM] ‘you would have done’ (see also 3.1).

⁴⁴ The final *-d* after the preceding nasal is often left unpronounced, resulting in imperative forms *čhan*, *phan* and *ran* respectively.

⁴⁵ The verb *čhungard-* also occurs in Serednie (IMP.2SG *čhungard-e*), while it has a slightly different form *čhungar-* with no *d*-element in Uzhhorod and Perechyn (IMP.2SG *čhungar-∅*).

3.2.2.1 Perfective stem marking

The perfective stem is marked by a suffix that is attached to the inflectional base and is followed by the perfective person/number marker. The perfective stem of verbs also plays a role in forming oikoclitic participles (see 3.4.1.1), in certain verb derivations, such as anticausatives (3.5.1.3), and in some deverbal nominalisations (4.2.2.2).

There are several perfective suffixes, whose selection is partly lexically and partly phonologically conditioned (see below). Furthermore, all perfective suffixes are subject to palatalisation, which is conditioned morphosemantically: it occurs in all finite perfective forms except in the 3PL, where the basic – unpalatalised – form of the suffix occurs. Palatalisation of perfective suffixes proceeds in the regular manner /d/ > /dʲ/, /l/ > /lʲ/, /n/ > /nʲ/, and /t/ > /tʲ/ (see also 2.1.3). Particular verbs always have a single perfective suffix in two – palatalised and unpalatalised – variants.

In the following sections, the perfective stem suffixes are discussed along with the phonological properties of the inflectional bases to which they are attached, i.e. / base/ → /PFV suffix/. The vocalic and middle verbs are discussed separately. For the perfective stem of the copula, see 3.3. In the end, a general overview of individual perfective suffixes and their application to different verbs will be presented in a brief summary.

3.2.2.1.1 Perfective stem of consonantal verbs

3.2.2.1.1.1 Monoconsonantal verbs

The two monoconsonantal roots *d-* ‘to give’ and *l-* ‘to take’ have perfective stems *din-* and *il-*, marked by the suffixes *-in-* (*-iň-*) and *-l-* (*-lʲ-*), respectively. Note that the perfective stem of the latter verb contains the suppletive root *i-* in the perfective stem. Alternatively, one might postulate a zero suppletive root and the perfective stem suffix *-il-* for the verb of taking, i.e. \emptyset -*il-* [take-PFV].

3.2.2.1.1.2 Bases ending in /l/ or /r/

While the bases ending in the lateral are few in number, the inflectional bases ending in the rhotic are highly frequent.

Two sets of bases ending in /r/, each consisting of two members, form their perfective stems differently to others. First, *mer-* ‘to die’ and *per-* ‘to fall’ possess weak suppletive roots *muvl-* and *pejl-* to which the perfective stem marker *-l-* (*-lʲ-*) is attached, i.e. *muvl-* and *pejl-*. Second, verbs *čār-* ‘to lick’ and *čovr-* ‘to steal’ mark their perfective stems by *-n-* (*-ň-*), i.e. *čārn-* and *čovrn-*.

All other verbs with bases in /l/ and /r/ invariably mark their perfective stems by *-d-* (*-d'*), e.g. *bister-* ‘to forget’ > *bisterd-*, *ker-* ‘to do, to make’ > *kerd-*, *khel-* ‘to dance’ > *kheld-*, *leper-* ‘to remind’ > *leperd-*, *mor-* ‘to wash’ > *mord-*, *pal'iker-* ‘to thank’ > *pal'ikerd-*, *phuter-* ‘to open’ > *phuterd-*, *vaker-* ‘to speak’ > *vakerd-*, etc., including all transitive derivations in *-ar-* and *-isar-*, such as (*bāro* ‘big’ >) *bārar-* ‘to raise, to bring up’ > *bārard-*, (*xoli* ‘anger’ >) *xol'ar-* ‘to make angry’ > *xol'ard-*, (*zdravo* ‘healthy’ >) *zdravisar-* ‘to heal’ > *zdravisard-*, and all iterative derivations in *-ker-*, e.g. *morker-* ‘to wash repeatedly, to wash lots of stuff, to launder’ > *morkerd-*. In Uzhhorod and Perechyn, this class also involves the verb *čhungar-* ‘to spit’ > *čhungard-*.

3.2.2.1.1.3 Bases ending in /n/

The verbs whose bases end in the alveodental nasal /n/ mark their perfective stems by the suffix *-d-* (*-d'*), e.g. *an-* ‘to bring’ > *and-*, Uzhhorod and Perechyn *biken-*, Khudlovo and Serednie *bikin-* ‘to sell’ > *bikend-*, *bikind-*, *cin-* ‘to buy’ > *cind-*, *xin-* ‘to defecate’ > *xind-*, *po'in-* ‘to pay’ > *po'ind-*, *phen-* ‘to say, to tell’ > *phend-*, *šun-* ‘to hear, to listen to, to obey’ > *šund-*, *uxan-* ‘to comb’ > *uxand-*, including all borrowed verbs marked by the integration suffix *-in-* (see 3.2.3), such as *pisin-* ‘to write’ > *pisind-*.

The only exception is the verb *džan-* ‘to know’, which has the perfective stem *džanl-* containing the perfective suffix *-l-* (*-l'*) in all varieties save Khudlovo. In Khudlovo, a Vlux-like perfective stem *džangl-* with the biconsonantal perfective suffix *-gl-* (*-gl'*) stands out.

3.2.2.1.1.4 Bases ending in velar, palatal, affricate or sibilant consonants

The perfective stem of bases that end in velar, affricate or sibilant consonants is most commonly marked by the lateral suffix *-l-* (*-l'*), e.g. *muk-* ‘to leave’ > *mukl-*, *pek-* ‘to bake’ > *pekl-*, *arakh-* ‘to find, to meet’ > *arakhl-*, *dikh-* ‘to see, to look’ > *dikhl-*, *phag-* ‘to break’ > *phagl-*, *phuč-* ‘to ask’ > *phučl-*, *khos-* ‘to wipe’ > *khosl-*, *beš-* ‘to sit’ > *bešl-*, *denaš-* ‘to run’ > *denašl-*, *ruš-* ‘to be angry’ > *rušl-*, etc.

Two verbs, viz. *ačh-* ‘to stay, to remain’ and *uš-* ‘to stand up’, form their perfective stems by *-il-* (*-il'*), i.e. *ačhil-* and *ušil-*, which is otherwise typical of middle verbs (see below). In Uzhhorod and Perechyn, the suffix *-il-* also occurs with the only base that ends in the palatal /tʃ/, viz. *xuť-* ‘to jump’ > *xuťil-*, while in Khudlovo and Serednie, this verb possesses the perfective stem in *-l-* (*-l'*), i.e. *xuťl-*, which entails depalatalisation of the root palatal.

3.2.2.1.1.5 Bases ending in /v/

Verbs whose bases end in /v/ may be classified into several groups according to their perfective stem marking.

First, the verb *sov-* ‘to sleep’ has the perfective stem *suvt-* consisting of a weakly suppletive root *suv-* and a unique perfective suffix *-t-* (*-t’-*).

Second, the root *av-* ‘to come’ is the only verb in /v/ that is marked by *-l-* (*-l’-*) in its perfective stem *avl-*.

Third, the verb *rov-* ‘to weep’ displays the nasal suffix in its perfective stem *rovn-*.

Three verbs in /v/ form their perfective stems by means of the suffix *-d-* (*-d’-*) with no morphophonological changes: *dživ-* ‘to live’ > *dživd-*, *khuv-* ‘to weave’ > *khuvd-* and *siv-* ‘to sew’ > *sivd-*. The stem *dživd-*, moreover, appends another perfective suffix *-il-*, leading to the complex perfective stem *dživd’il-* of the verb of living.

The remaining verbs also mark their perfective stems by *-d-* (*-d’-*) but attachment of this suffix entails deletion of the preceding /v/, so that the perfective marker instantly follows a vowel in the surface forms, e.g. *čhiv-* ‘to throw’ > *čhid-* (< **čhivd-*), *tāv-* ‘to cook’ > *tād-*, *thov-* ‘to put’ > *thod-*, and the same kind of perfective marking occurs with historical causatives and other derivations in *-av-*, as in *bolav-* ‘to baptise’ > *bolad-*, *darav-* ‘to threaten’ > *darad-*, *gil’av-* ‘to sing’ > *gilad-*, *našav-* ‘to lose’ > *našad-*, *sikav-* ‘to show’ > *sikad-*, etc. The Uzhhorod and Khudlovo verb *garuv-* ‘to hide’ has the perfective stem *garud-*, but in Khudlovo the form *garuvd-* with no v-deletion has also been recorded.

3.2.2.1.1.6 Bases ending in /d/ barring /nd/

Verbs with the inflectional base in the voiced alveodental stop /d/, which should be distinguished from those with the base in the consonant cluster /nd/ (see the following section), mark their perfective stems by the nasal suffix *-n-* (*-ñ-*). The application of this suffix may, however, result in three outcomes described in the following paragraphs.

First, *-n-* is simply attached to the base, e.g. *čumid-* ‘to kiss’ > *čumidn-*, *xud-* ‘to catch, to get, to begin’ > *xudn-*, *rod-* ‘to search’ > *rodn-*, *trād-* ‘to drive’ > *trādn-*. This is the most conservative, quite regular and morphologically transparent option, but it seems to be least common.

Second, the base consonant /d/ and the perfective suffix *-n-* are metathesized, which leads to seeming infixation, e.g. *čumid-* > *čumind-*, *xud-* > *xund-*, *rod-* > *rond-*, *trād-* > *trānd-*. Such a metathesis in perfective stems is attested in all varieties, and most commonly in Perechyn, Khudlovo and Serednie, while rather rare in the data from Uzhhorod.

The third option is the assimilation of the base consonant /d/ to the perfective suffix or its overall deletion: *čumid-* > *čumi(n)n-*, *xud-* > *xu(n)n-*, *rod-* > *ro(n)n-*, *trād-* > *trān-*. This option is most often encountered in Uzhhorod, but also occurs in the other varieties. Furthermore, it is the most common perfective marking of bases that end in consonant clusters in all varieties (with no gemination), such as *cird-* ‘to pull’ > *cirn-*, *hazd-* ‘to lift’ > *hazn-*, Khudlovo and Serednie *čhungard-* > *čhungarn-*, Khudlovo and Serednie *icard-* ‘to hurl’ > *icarn-*. Note that similar simplification of the consonant cluster /dn/ into plain /n/ or geminate /nn/ is active in other words as well (see 2.1.7).

The concrete realisation of the perfective marking of *d*-verbs is, therefore, subject to variation, and such variation may even occur in a single idiolect. For example, one Shakhta speaker has been recorded to make use of the conservative and regular perfective stem *rodn-* of the verb *rod-* ‘to search’, but the reduced stem *zaron-* of the aktionsart derivation *zarod-* ‘to earn’. It also indicates that different aktionsart derivations of a single *d*-base may display different morphophonological operations.

3.2.2.1.1.7 Bases ending in /nd/

Verbs with bases that end in the consonant group /nd/ have their perfective marking different from that of other bases in /d/ (see the previous paragraph).

First, there is a unique verb *khand-* ‘to stink’, which most commonly occurs in the perfective stem *khandisal'il-*. However, *khandisal'il-* is, strictly speaking, the perfective stem of the derived middle verb *khand-isal'(-uv)-* ‘to stink all of a sudden’, which is attested in non-perfective forms as well (see 3.5.1.3), rather than the perfective stem of the base verb *khand-* itself. The perfective stem of the underived verb *khand-* has been recorded as *khandil-* in Shakhta, marked by the perfective suffix *-il-* (*-il'*), but seems to be rare. Due to morphosemantic properties of the finite perfective forms, which are used to express a completed action, the derived verb in the perfective stem *khandisal'il-* is preferred over *khandil-* in the given contexts.

The other group of *nd*-verbs comprises *čhand-* ‘to vomit’, *phand-* ‘to bind, to close’ and *rand-* ‘to scrape’. In all varieties save Khudlovo, the perfective stems of these three verbs are marked by the suffix *-l-* (*-l'*) with deletion of the base consonant /d/ in the surface forms, i.e. *čhanl-*, *phanl-* and *ranyl-*. In Khudlovo, the voiced velar stop occurs additionally in the perfective stems, i.e. *čhangl-*, *phangl-*, *rangl-*, for which the biconsonantal suffix *-gl-* (*-gl'*) should be postulated, like in *džangl-* referred to above 3.2.2.1.1.3.

3.2.2.1.1.8 Bases ending in /m/, /p/ or /j/

The bases that end in /m/, /p/ or /j/ belong to the least frequent. There are two verbs ending in the bilabial nasal /m/, while bases in /p/ or /j/ contain a single verb each.

The verb *kam-* ‘to want, to love’ marks its perfective stem by *-l-* (*-l'*), i.e. *kaml-*. The other verb in *-m* is *dem-* or *lem-*, which are variants of a single verb ‘to hit’ (see 2.4.5.2). The verb *dem-/lem-* is characterised by a unique perfective stem *demad-/lemad-*, which closely resembles the perfective stem of causative bases in *-av-*, such as *darav-* > *darad-* (see above). Therefore, an underlying affix *-av-* should be postulated in the perfective stem of this verb, i.e. *demav-/lemav-*, which is subject to regular perfective marking by *-d-* (*-d'*) accompanied by deletion of the base consonant /v/ (see 3.2.2.1.1.5 above). Note that the extended stem *demav-/lemav-* can be found in the iterative derivation of this verb *demavker-/lemavker-* (3.5.1.4).

The only verb with the root ending in /p/ is the modal verb of necessity *kamp-e(l)* ‘to be needed’, which has the perfective stem *kampil-* marked by *-il-* (*-il'*) (see 12.5.3.2 for more details about this defective verb).

The verb *pij-* ‘to drink’ forms its perfective stem by the suffix *-l-* (*-l'*) with deletion of the palatal glide, i.e. *pil-*.

3.2.2.1.2 Perfective stem of vocalic verbs

While dialectal variation of perfective marking of consonantal verbs is rather insignificant within Eastern Uzh Romani, vocalic verbs, more specifically the disyllabic vocalic verbs, display a noteworthy degree of variability in terms of their perfective marking.

The perfective stems of the motion verb *dža-* ‘to go’ and the etymologically related verb *lidža-/lidža-* ‘to carry off’ (cf. Beníšek 2013a) contain the suppletive roots *gej-* and *ligen-/ligen-* plus stem suffixes *-l-* (*-l'*) and *-d-* (*-d'*), respectively, i.e. *dža-* > PFV *gejl-* and *lidža-/lidža-* > PFV *ligend-/ligend-*. Perfective marking of both these verbs is invariable within the dialect region, as is that of the verb *xa-* ‘to eat’, which has its perfective stem *xāl-* marked by *-l-* (*-l'*) and characterised by lengthening of the root vowel.

The verb *čul'a-* ‘to drip, to flow’ has its perfective stem *čul'il-* in Uzhhorod and Perechyn, which contains the perfective marker of middle verb *-il-* (*-il'*) suffixed to the reduced base *čul'*. In both Uzhhorod varieties, a slightly distinct stem *čul'al'il-* with a complex suffix *-l'il-* (*-l'il'*) is also common. For *čul'a-* in Khudlovo and Serednie, see below.

The perfective marker of the remaining disyllabic vocalic verbs is *-n-* (*-ñ-*) in both Uzhhorod varieties, e.g. *asa-* ‘to laugh’ > *asan-*, *dara-* ‘to fear’ > *daran-*. In Perechyn, the

additional lateral segment commonly occurs in addition to the nasal in the perfective stems *asanl-* and *daranl-*. Such perfective marking in *-nl-* (*-nl'*) in Perechyn has probably developed through analogy with other perfective stems marked by *-l-*, such as *džanl-* (see above), in which the perfective suffix *-l-* is added to the base in /n/. Interestingly, there are even sparsely attested perfective forms of these vocalic verbs marked by *-nd-*, such as *asand-* and *darand-*, or even *-nn-*, such as *darann-*, which seem to be analogical to the perfective forms of other verb bases ending in a nasal, such as *an-* > *and-*, or to optional perfective forms of the type *xunn-* of *d-*verbs (see above). It follows that in Perechyn the perfective stems marked by *-n-*, such as *asa-n-*, which are still common in Uzhhorod, have been reanalysed as suppletive bases that end in /n/, i.e. *asan-*, and are suffixed by an additional stem marker.

In Khudlovo and Serechnie, the perfective stems of all disyllabic vocalic bases (with the exception of the aforementioned *lidža-*) consist of the perfective marker *-il-* (*-il'*) suffixed to a base extension *-ngl'* in Khudlovo and *-nd'* in Serechnie, as in *asa-* > *asangl'il-/asand'il-*, *čul'a-* > *čul'angl'il-/čul'and'il-*, *dara-* > *darangl'il-/darand'il-*.

Table 11: Perfective stems of vocalic verbs

MEANING	ROOT	PERFECTIVE STEM			
		Uzhh	Per	Khu	Ser
to go	<i>dža-</i>	<i>gejl-</i>			
to carry off	<i>lidža-</i>	<i>ligend-</i>			
to eat	<i>xa-</i>	<i>xāl-</i>			
to drip, to flow	<i>čul'a-</i>	<i>čul'il-</i> <i>čul'alil-</i>	<i>čul'il-</i>	<i>čul'angl'il-</i>	<i>čul'and'il-</i>
to laugh	<i>asa-</i>	<i>asan-</i>	<i>asanl-</i> (<i>asand-</i>)	<i>asangl'il-</i>	<i>asand'il-</i>
to fear	<i>dara-</i>	<i>daran-</i>	<i>daranl-</i> (<i>darand-</i> <i>darann-</i>)	<i>darangl'il-</i>	<i>darand'il-</i>
to pain	<i>dukha-</i>	<i>dukhan-</i>	<i>dukhanl-</i>	<i>dukhangl'il-</i>	<i>dukhand'il-</i>
to cough	<i>khasa-</i> <i>xasa-</i>	<i>khasan-</i>	<i>khasanl-</i>	<i>xasangl'il-</i>	<i>xasand'il-</i>
to feel ashamed	<i>ladža-</i>	<i>ladžan-</i>	<i>ladžanl-</i>	<i>ladžangl'il-</i>	<i>ladžand'il-</i>
to believe	<i>pa'a-</i>	<i>pa'an-</i>	<i>pa'anl-</i>	<i>pa'angl'il-</i>	<i>pa'and'il-</i>
to dare	<i>troma-</i>	<i>troman-</i>	<i>tromanl-</i>	<i>tromangl'il-</i>	<i>tromand'il-</i>

3.2.2.1.3 Perfective stem of middle verbs

All middle verbs are marked by the suffix *-il-* (*-il'*) in their perfective stems. The perfective suffix *-il-* entails palatalisation of the preceding /d/ (> /d'/), /t/ (> /t'/), /n/ (> /n'/) and /l/ (> /l'/) in middle verbs. The stem suffix *-uv-*, which occurs in some non-perfective inflectional forms (see 3.2.1.1.3), never occurs in the perfective stem. Thus, for example, *axal'(-uv)-* 'to understand' > *axal'il-*, *khaml'(-uv)-* 'to perspire' > *khaml'il-*, *lab(-uv)-* 'to burn' (ITR) > *labil-*, *pašl'(-uv)-* 'to lie' (position) > *pašl'il-*, *visal'(-uv)-* 'to turn' (ITR) > *visal'il-*, including intransitive derivations, such as *bār(-uv)-* 'to grow up' > *bāril-*, *čhind'(-uv)-* 'to get cut, to tear' (ITR) > *čhind'il-*, *čhingersal'(-uv)-* 'to get torn, to get shredded' > *čhingersal'il-*, *zdravisal'(-uv)-* 'to recover' > *zdravisal'il-*, etc.

3.2.2.1.4 Perfective suffixes: summary

In Eastern Uzh Romani, four perfective suffixes are common: *-d-* (*-d'*), *-l-* (*-l'*), *-il-* (*-il'*) and *-n-* (*-n'*). In addition, there are two unique suffixes *-in-* (*-iñ-*) and *-t-* (*-t'*) plus *-gl'* (*-gl'*) occurring in a single variety.

With respect to the type frequency, the most common perfective marker is *-d-* (*-d'*), which marks the perfective stem of very frequent inflectional bases ending in /r/, /n/ and /v/ (with a few exceptions), including lexicalised causatives in *-av-*, transitive derivations in *-(is)ar-*, all borrowed verbs integrated by *-in-*, and some suppletive or irregular bases, such as *ligen-* (*lidža-*) 'to carry off' and *demav-/lemav-* (*dem-/lem-*) 'to hit'. The crucial morphophonological rule is that the perfective marker *-d-* entails deletion of the preceding consonant of most bases ending in /v/, e.g. *thov-* > *thod-*, though some bases maintain /v/ in perfective stems.

The second most frequent perfective suffix is *-l-* (*-l'*). It is the perfective marker of suppletive or irregular bases that end in a vowel (or a diphthong), such as *gej-* (*džā-*) 'to go', *i-* (*l-*) 'to take', *xā-* (*xā-*) 'to eat', *muṽ-* (*mer-*) 'to die', *pej-* (*per-*) 'to fall', *pi-* (*pij-*) 'to drink'. Furthermore, the suffix *-l-* occurs with almost all bases ending in velar, affricate or sibilant consonants, with roots ending in the consonant cluster /nd/ (barring *khand-*), and with some other verbs, such as *av-* 'to come', *džān-* 'to know', and *kam-* 'to want, to love'. In Khudlovo and Serednie, the verb *xuṽ'* 'to jump' also has the perfective suffix *-l-*, while in Perechyn, *-l-*, alongside *-n-*, occurs as part of the complex perfective marking of most disyllabic vocalic verbs, such as *asa-* (PFV *asanl-*) 'to laugh' and *dara-* (PFV *daranl-*) 'to fear'.

The other perfective suffix *-il-* (*-il'*) is primarily the perfective stem marker of middle verbs. Furthermore, it occurs with several other intransitive verbs, such as *ačh-* ‘to become, to remain’, *khand-* ‘to stink’ and *uš-* ‘to stand up’, with the defective verb *kampe(l)* (PFV *kampil-*) ‘to need’, and with *čul'a-* (PFV *čul'il-* or *čul'al'il-*) ‘to drip, to flow’ and *xuť-* ‘to jump’ in Uzhhorod and Perechyn. It is also part of the complex perfective marker *-d-il-* of the verb *dživ-* (PFV *dživ'il-*) ‘to live’. In Khudlovo and Serednie, *-il-* marks the perfective stems of the disyllabic vocalic verbs, such as *asa-*, *čul'a-* and *dara-*, in which *-il-* is suffixed to the base extension *-ngl'* in Khudlovo and *-nd'* in Serednie (e.g. Khudlovo *asangl'il-*, Serednie *asand'il-*).

The nasal marker *-n-* (*-ň-*) characterises several sets of verbs. First, it marks the perfective stems of bases that end in /d/, such as *cird-* ‘to pull’, *čumid-* ‘to kiss’ and *xud-* ‘to catch, to get, to start’. Various morphophonological changes often occur in the perfective marking of this group of verbs, such as a metathesis of the perfective suffix and the base consonant or assimilation of the base consonant, which results in variable perfective stems, such as *xudn-*, *xund-*, *xunn-* and *xun-* for the verb *xud-*. Second, *-n-* occurs in the perfective forms of most disyllabic vocalic verbs, such as *asa-* and *dara-*, in Uzhhorod. Finally, *-n-* marks the perfective stems of *čār-* ‘to lick’, *čovr-* ‘to steal’ and *rov-* ‘to weep’.

The only verb that occurs with the perfective marker *-in-* (*-iň-*) is *d-* (PFV *din-*) ‘to give’, while *-t-* (*-t'*) occurs with the weakly suppletive base *suv-* (PFV *suvt-*) of the verb *sov-* ‘to sleep’.

The biconsonantal perfective suffix *-gl-* (*-gl'*) occurs only in Khudlovo with the verb *džan-* (PFV *džangl-*) and with verbs that end in the consonantal group /nd/ and delete /d/ in their perfective stems, such as *phand-* (PFV *phangl-*).

3.2.2.2 Person/number marking (aorist inflection)

The person/number suffixes of the perfective inflection are different from those of the non-perfective one. From the general Romani perspective, the Eastern Uzh person/number marking exhibits the distinctive features of North Central dialects of East Slovakia, such as the specific 2SG marker *-al* and the lack of differentiation of the paradigm of intransitive verbs from that of transitive verbs (see Matras 2002: 147–148; Elšík and Matras 2006: 81–82 for more details). As already discussed in 3.2.2.1 above, the perfective stem marker occurs in its palatalised variant before all person/number categories except in the 3PL.

Table 12 presents the perfective paradigm of the transitive verb *ker-* (perfective stem *kerd-*) ‘to do’, the intransitive verb *dža-* (PFV *gejl-*) ‘to go’ and the middle verb *axal'(-uv)-* (PFV *axal'il-*) ‘to understand’.

Table 12: Aorist inflection

	SINGULAR				PLURAL			
	SUFFIX	<i>ker-</i>	<i>dža-</i>	<i>axal'-uv-</i>	SUFFIX	<i>ker-</i>	<i>dža-</i>	<i>axal'-uv-</i>
FIRST	<i>-om</i>	<i>kerd'om</i>	<i>gejl'om</i>	<i>axal'il'om</i>	<i>-am</i>	<i>kerd'am</i>	<i>gejl'am</i>	<i>axal'il'am</i>
SECOND	<i>-al</i>	<i>kerd'al</i>	<i>gejl'al</i>	<i>axal'il'al</i>	<i>-an</i>	<i>kerd'an</i>	<i>gejl'an</i>	<i>axal'il'an</i>
THIRD	<i>-as/-a</i>	<i>kerd'a(s)</i>	<i>gejl'a(s)</i>	<i>axal'il'a(s)</i>	<i>-e</i>	<i>kerde</i>	<i>gejle</i>	<i>axal'ile</i>

Note that the 3SG suffix occurs in two variants: *-a* and *-as*. While the variant *-a* occurs in all varieties and is used by all speakers consulted, the more conservative form *-as* is a less common variant of the suffix in Serednie and Khudlovo and is also documented from some Uzhhorod speakers. However, whereas there are many speakers who invariably use only *-a*, no speakers have been encountered who use *-as* as the only variant. The development of the 3SG suffix *-as* > *-a* contributes to a certain kind of symmetrical paradigm, in which the first- and second-person suffixes end in a consonant, while the third-person suffix adopts a vowel ending, irrespective of the number.

(26) *muk-l'-a* *la,* *gej-l'-as* (Uzhhs)
 leave-PFV-3SG she.ACC go-PFV-3SG
 ‘[She] left her [and] went off.’

(27) *kadā* *čhavōro* *muter-d'-a,*
 this.SPEC boy.DIM urinate-PFV-3SG
a *može* *menk* *the* *xin-d'-as* *are* *xolov* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 and/but maybe still also defecate-PFV-3SG in trousers
 ‘This boy here peed and perhaps even pooped into his trousers.’

Perfective forms marked by the plain person/number suffixes, i.e. with no other tense/mood marker, serve to express the perfective past indicative, which is called ‘aorist’ in this dissertation.

3.2.2.3 Irrealis (remote perfective) inflection

The perfective forms may be marked by the remoteness suffix *-as* added to the person/number suffixes, as in *ker-d'-om-as* [do-PFV-1SG-REM] ‘I would have done’, *ker-d'-am-as*

[do-PFV-1PL-REM] ‘we would have done’. Such remote perfective forms have an exclusive mood interpretation in Eastern Uzh Romani, referring to unreal events, and may therefore be called the irrealis (conditional) forms (see 3.1.3). The irrealis paradigm of the verbs *ker-* ‘to do’ and *dža-* ‘to go’ is shown in Table 13.

Table 13: Irrealis mood inflection

	SG		PL	
	<i>ker-</i>	<i>dža-</i>	<i>ker-</i>	<i>dža-</i>
FIRST	<i>kerd'omas</i>	<i>gejl'omas</i>	<i>kerd'amas</i>	<i>gejl'amas</i>
SECOND	<i>kerd'alas</i>	<i>gejl'alas</i>	<i>kerd'anas</i>	<i>gejl'anas</i>
THIRD	<i>kerd'ahas</i>	<i>gejl'ahas</i>	<i>kerdahas</i>	<i>gejlahas</i>

Note that the third-person marker occurs as *-ah-* in both singular and plural and thus differs from the respective 3SG and 3PL suffixes *-a(s)* and *-e* of the aorist (non-remote) inflection. The underlying form of this *-ah-* may be assumed to be *-as-*, whose sibilant undergoes regular debuccalisation (> /h/) before the remoteness suffix *-as*, like the sibilant in the non-perfective inflection (e.g. *ker-as* [do-1PL] > *ker-ah-as* [do-1PL-REM]; see 3.2.1.3). Furthermore, this originally 3SG suffix has extended to the plural, whereas palatalisation of the perfective stem suffix has not extended. It means that the third-person marker is the same for both numbers, and the singular and the plural only differ with respect to the quality of the perfective stem consonant (3SG *kerd'ahas* as against 3PL *kerdahas*); see also the following sentences:

- (28) *ov bo otho-d'-ah-as pes* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 he COND hide-PFV[NON_3PL]-3-REM REFL.SG
 ‘He would have hidden himself.’
- (29) *on bo otho-d'-ah-as pen* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 they COND hide-PFV[3PL]-3-REM REFL.PL
 ‘They would have hidden themselves.’

In Perechyn, another irrealis paradigm occurs in the speech of young and middle-aged speakers. It differs from the common paradigm in the innovative third-person marking that has taken over the second-person suffixes in both numbers, i.e. *-al-* 2SG → 3SG, *-an-* 2PL → 3PL. See Table 14 for the irrealis paradigm of the verbs *ker-* and *dža-* in Perechyn.

Table 14: Innovative irrealis inflection in Perechyn

	SG		PL	
	<i>ker-</i>	<i>dža-</i>	<i>ker-</i>	<i>dža-</i>
FIRST	<i>kerd'omas</i>	<i>gejl'omas</i>	<i>kerd'amas</i>	<i>gejl'amas</i>
SECOND	<i>kerd'alas</i>	<i>gejl'alas</i>	<i>kerd'anas</i>	<i>gejl'anas</i>
THIRD				

The following sentences elicited from a young speaker in Perechyn show undifferentiation of the second and third persons in both numbers:

- (30) *tu bo otho-d'al-as pes* (Per)^{LQCR}
 you COND hide-PFV-2/3SG-REFL REFL
 'You would have hidden yourself.'
- (31) *ov bo otho-d'al-as pes* (Per)^{LQCR}
 he COND hide-PFV-2/3SG-REFL REFL
 'He would have hidden himself.'
- (32) *tumen bo otho-d'an-as pes* (Per)^{LQCR}
 you.PL COND hide-PFV-2/3PL-REFL REFL
 'You (PL) would have hidden yourselves.'
- (33) *one bo otho-d'an-as pes* (Per)^{LQCR}
 they COND hide-PFV-2/3PL-REFL REFL
 'They would have hidden themselves.'

A trigger for the change is probably the homonymy of the second person with the third person in the non-perfective plural inflection (e.g. *ker-en* [do-2/3PL]) and its analogical extension to the remote perfective inflection. That it is the second-person marker *-an-* that extends in the plural has probably been due to its similarity to the non-perfective 2/3PL suffix *-(e)n(-)*. Note that in Radvanka, a similar extension of the 2PL past copula *sanas* to the 3PL occurs (see 3.3.1). It follows that extension of the second-person suffix to the third person was probably initiated in the plural and only subsequently it was followed by the same extension in the singular. Extension of the 2SG suffix to the 3SG then probably represents an attempt to achieve some kind of intraparadigmatic symmetry in which the second and third persons are not distinguished, irrespective of the number.

Such an innovative irrealis paradigm is an obviously recent development in Perechyn since old speakers, who were born in the 1940s, consistently use the conservative forms that

are shared with other varieties. Moreover, the 3SG irrealis forms are still sporadically attested with the conservative suffix *-ah-* even in the speech of younger speakers in Perechyn, e.g. 3SG *likerd'ahas* alongside *likerd'alas* 's/he would have held', which indicates that the change is ongoing and has not been completed yet, at least in the singular.

3.2.3 Loan-verb integration

Late Proto-Romani had a complex morphology that served to integrate verbs borrowed from Greek (cf. Matras 2002: 128–135). Eastern Uzh Romani, like other Central Romani dialects, has inherited the suffix *-in-* out of this morphology (perhaps from Greek *-εἶν-ω*, *-ύν-ω*; cf. Boretzky and Iglá 2004: 177), and this suffix is now a productive means of integrating loan verbs into the Romani system. The loan-verb integration segment *-in-* is suffixed to the borrowed base and occurs in both transitive and intransitive verbs, irrespective of the TAM categories, e.g. South Slavic (Croatian) *vič-* 'to shout' > *vič'in-* 'to call sb., to invite' (3SG *vičinel*, PFV *vičind'a(s)*), Hungarian *szív-* 'to suck, to sip' > *siv'in-* 'to smoke (cigarettes, pipe, joint and the like)', Slavic *pis-* 'to write' > *pisin-*.⁴⁶ All loan verbs in *-in-* have the inflection of consonantal verbs.

In addition to plain *-in-*, there is an extended variant of the loan-verb integration suffix *-āl'in-*. It was probably extracted from loans of Hungarian denominal verbs, such as *hasnāl'in-* 'to use, to utilise' in Uzhhorod from Hungarian *használ* (from *haszna* 'benefit, utility'), common Eastern Uzh *probāl'in-* 'to try' from Hungarian *próbál* (from *próba* 'trial, test'), etc. The suffix *-āl'in-* is now productive for integrating the most recent loan verbs from Slavic, although almost all loan verbs in *-āl'in-* are attested alongside their variants in plain *-in-*, e.g. *had'in-* ~ *hadāl'in-* 'to guess, to foretell' (cf. Slovak *hádat'*, Ukrainian *zadamu*), *pereživ'in-* ~ *pereživāl'in-* 'to worry' (Russian *переживать* 'to live through'), *strad'in-* ~ *stradāl'in-* 'to suffer' (Russian *страдать*), *zivin-* ~ *zivāl'in-* 'to yawn' (Slavic *zívat'*, Russian *зевать*, Ukrainian *zieamu*), etc.⁴⁷ The Uzhhorod verb *cigāñ'in-* 'to tell a lie', which is a regular adaptation of the non-standard Slovak verb *cigániť* 'to lie' (from *cigán*, dialectal *cigáň*, 'liar' < 'Gypsy'), has a common variant *cigāl'in-*, in which the borrowed base *cigāñ(-in)-* is modified to *cigāl'(-in)-* probably on analogy with other loan verbs in *-āl'in-*, which results in a reanalysis of the verb root as *cig-*, i.e. *cigāñ'in-* > *cig-āl'in-*.

⁴⁶ There is also an old loan verb *pār'un-* 'to bury' of Greek origin (cf. Greek *παράχων-*; Boretzky 2012a: 28), in which the variant of the integration suffix *-un-* can be postulated.

⁴⁷ Note that *-āl'in-* also occurs in the denominal derivation of a verb *čhibāl'in-* 'to be cheeky' from *čhib* 'tongue' (see 3.5.2.3).

Several intransitive loan verbs have the inchoative-like middle morphology in that they contain the suffix *-isal-* added to the borrowed base (see 3.5.2.2), e.g. ITR *krucisal'uv-* ‘to rotate, to twist’ as against TR *krucin-* (cf. Slovak *krútiť*, dialectal *krucic*, Russian *кpытумь* ‘to twist’), ITR *rāzisa'uv-* ‘to shake, to tremble’ as against TR *rāzin-* (from Hungarian *ráz*), Per *izbidñisa'uv-* ‘to become poor’ (from Ukrainian *збідни́ти*), etc. Such morphology of borrowed intransitive verbs may be a relic of once productive integration of intransitive loan verbs by means of the Greek sigmatic aorist (cf. Matras 2002: 129–130). Otherwise, the productive strategy of decreasing valency of transitive verbs is their syntactic reflexivisation (see 12.3.2), and both mentioned verb forms *krucin-* and *rāzin-* may occur as semantically intransitive verbs in reflexive constructions instead of their morphologically intransitive counterparts *krucisal'uv-* and *rāzisa'uv-* respectively; see the following sentence pair:

- (34) *oj xund'a te rāzisa'on le xol'atar* (Per)^{LQCR}
 she begin.AOR.3SG NCOMP tremble.INF(ITR) ART anger.ABL
- (35) *oj xund'a pes te rāzinen la xol'atar* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 she begin.AOR.3SG REFL NCOMP tremble.INF(TR) ART anger.ABL
 ‘She began trembling with anger.’

3.3 Copula

As in other Romani dialects,⁴⁸ the copula ‘to be’, which also functions as an existential verb, differs from other verbs in a number of respects, such as strong suppletion (up to eight suppletive roots of the copula in Eastern Uzh Romani), copula-specific person/number marking, and a higher degree of morphosyntactic complexity in that it expresses the indicative vs. subjunctive distinction lacking in lexical verbs (see 3.1.3). In addition, the past indicative and the potential are differentiated in the copula, and the formally non-remote perfective copula, which matches the aorist formation in lexical verbs, serves to express the past subjunctive with no indicative function. Even though the aspectual morphology is present in the copula, the aspect is irrelevant as a semantic category. Table 15 shows the TAM values of the copula in the dialect under description. The exemplified copula forms are those of the 2SG.

⁴⁸ Cf. Boretzky (1995b and 1997) for a discussion of the copula in Romani dialects in a comparative and historical perspective.

Table 15: TAM values of the copula

TENSE/MOOD	2SG COPULA
PRESENT INDICATIVE	<i>sal</i>
PAST INDICATIVE	<i>salas</i>
FUTURE INDICATIVE	<i>ejha</i>
IMPERATIVE	<i>av</i>
PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE	<i>ejs</i>
POTENTIAL	<i>ejhas</i>
PAST SUBJUNCTIVE	<i>uv'lal</i>
IRREALIS	<i>uv'lalas</i>

The following suppletive roots of the copula occur in Eastern Uzh Romani: *s-*, *h-*, *av-*, *ej-* and *uv-*, being supplemented by two third-person negative copula forms *nāne* (in the present) and *nesas* (in the past), which are discussed in 12.4, and a special optative copula *mije* ‘let/may it be so’, which functions as the third-person copula in affirmative optative and purpose clauses (see 12.2.2, 13.3.8). In what follows, inflection of the copula in affirmative clauses will be discussed according to the following scheme:

1. the present and past indicative inflection with the copula roots *s-* and *h-*,
2. the non-perfective and non-indicative plus future indicative inflection with the copula in *av-* and *ej-*,
3. the perfective and non-indicative inflection of the copula in *uv-*.

3.3.1 Present and past indicative copula in *s-* and *h-*

The basic present and past indicative copula in Eastern Uzh Romani has the inflection shown in Table 16:

Table 16: Present and past indicative inflection of the copula

PERSON	PRESENT		PAST	
	SG	PL	SG	PL
FIRST	<i>s-om</i>	<i>s-am</i>	<i>s-om-as</i>	<i>s-am-as</i>
SECOND	<i>s-al</i>	<i>s-an</i>	<i>s-al-as</i>	<i>s-an-as</i>
THIRD	<i>h-in / eh-in</i> M <i>h-in-o</i> F <i>h-iñ-i</i>	<i>h-in / eh-in</i> <i>h-in-e</i>	<i>s-as / es-as</i>	<i>s-as / es-as</i>

The indicative copula has two roots *s-* and *h-*. The forms in *(-)s-* occur in the first and second persons of the present tense and in all persons of the past tense, while the forms in *(-)h-* are restricted to the third-person present forms. In the first and second persons, *s-* is followed by the perfective-like person/number markers (cf. 3.2.2.2), while in the third person, the unique suffix *-in* occurs in the present but not in the past tense. The past-tense forms are marked by the remoteness suffix *-as* attached to the person/number markers. An exception is the third person, where *-as* is attached directly to the copula root. It means that the third person of the past copula is marked zero: *s-∅-as* [COP-3-REM] ‘s/he was, they were’ as against *s-om-as* [COP-1SG-REM] ‘I was’.

In the third person, the situation is quite complex with respect to the presence of various copula forms. In the present tense, the basic copula form is *hin*, which is common especially in existential and possessive constructions:

- (36) *od'a xustoste hin phērdo vlaxi,*
 there Khust.LOC COP.PRS.3 full Vlax.PL
the od'a avka hin o pjaca (Uzhhr)
 also there thus COP.PRS.3 ART market.PL
 ‘There are a lot of Vlax Roma there in Khust. There are markets there as well.’

- (37) *hin lāčhe a hin nalāčhe* (Khu)
 COP.PRS.3 good.PL and/but COP.PRS.3 not_good.PL
 ‘There are good (= decent) [people] and there are wicked [people].’

- (38) *a tut keci hin pheňa ?* (Khu)
 and/but you.ACC how_many COP.PRS.3 sister.PL
 ‘And you, how many sisters do you have?’

- (39) *man hin trin čhave, jek čha man hin,*
 I.ACC COP.PRS.3 three child.PL one son I.ACC COP.PRS.3
the duj čhaja (Ser)
 and two daughter.PL
 ‘I have three children, one son and two daughters.’

The copula *hin* may also take adjective-like gender and number suffixes *-o* (SG.M), *-i* (SG.F) and *-e* (PL), leading to *hino*, *hiňi*, *hine*, which express agreement with the subject:

- (40) *ov adej hin-o* (Ser)
 he here COP.PRS.3-SG.M
 ‘He is here.’
- (41) *oj hiñ-i honno te māren pes* (Ser)
 she COP.PRS.3-SG.F able NCOMP beat.INF REFL
 ‘She can fight.’
- (42) *on hin-e honno ajsov te iskeren* (Ser)
 they COP.PRS.3-PL able such NCOMP carry_out.INF
 ‘They are able to carry out such [a thing].’

In addition, there is an extended form *ehin* with the initial vowel /e/. This extended form cannot be combined with the adjective-like subject suffixes and is used in special emphatic existential contexts:

- (43) *pāl'enka ehin!* (UzhhR)
 spirits EMP.COP.PRS.3
 ‘There are spirits [at home]!’ (A response to a statement that there are no spirits at home.)

In copular sentences with the third-person subject, the copula may also be omitted, in particular in interrogative sentences:

- (44) *jek phuvro ade xustostar* (UzhhR)
 one old here Khust.ABL
 ‘There is an old man from Khust here.’
- (45) *kāj lakeri cicka?* (UzhhR)
 where her pacifier
 ‘Where is her pacifier?’

In the past tense, two forms of the copula occur: *sas* and extended *esas*, a pair that seemingly counterparts the distinction between *hin* and *ehin* in the present tense. The following two sentences come from a single speaker:

- (46) *e mama sas brugoš* (UzhhS)
 ART mother COP.PST.3 Brugosh
 ‘The mother was Brugosh (by surname).’

(47) *mijro apos esas rudi* (UzhhS)
 my father COP.PST.3 Rudi
 ‘My father was Rudi (by name).’

However, varieties and even speakers of a single variety differ in their preference of the past copula *sas* or *esas*. While some, according to my data most, speakers prefer the basic (non-extended) form *sas*, some speakers give their preference to the extended *esas*, and hardly use the former form. This should prevent us from considering the form *esas* to be a functionally emphatic form. Even though some speakers probably make use of *esas* in emphatic contexts only, many other speakers use *esas* almost exclusively as the major option. In Table 17, I provide a comparison of frequency of each form in the elicited translations from eight speakers, based on the LQCR data, supplemented by one narrative text from another speaker from Sereďnie. For the number of occurrences of each form only affirmative sentences are taken into consideration, while any occurrence of the past copula in negation is left out of consideration. With the single exception mentioned above, Table 17 does not take into account narratives and recordings of spontaneous speech. The Radvanka variety is omitted since its data display innovations discussed in a paragraph below.

Table 17: Frequency of the past copula forms *sas* and *esas*

SPEAKER	<i>sas</i>		<i>esas</i>	
	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE
UzhhS 01	32	38%	52	62%
UzhhS 02	90	100%	0	0%
Per 01	3	4%	81	96%
Per: 02	3	100%	0	0%
Khu 01	63	100%	0	0%
Khu 02	2	100%	0	0%
Khu 03	32	100%	0	0%
Ser 01	1	1%	85	99%
Ser ^{RDZ}	17	100%	0	0%

If we scrutinise the data presented in Table 17, significant differences arise not only among particular varieties, but, and foremostly, with respect to individual speakers. In Sereďnie, for example, the speaker consulted for the LQCR provided a single occurrence of *sas*, contrasting with 85 occurrences of *esas*, while the other speaker in his 30-minute long

narrative made use of the non-extended *sas* only. Note that with the single exception (UzhS 01), all speakers gave their unequivocal preference to a single form and this form was most commonly *sas*, while they used the other form very rarely, if at all. We should therefore be careful in interpreting the data from Khudlovo, the only variety where only *sas* is attested, since the unattestation of *esas* in Khudlovo may be a matter of chance only. It should also be pointed out that the situation is entirely different in terms of the negative past copula, where the extended form *esas*, fused with the negator *na*, i.e. *nesas*, is definitely given priority over negated *sas* in the entire dialect region and is used even by those speakers from which the affirmative *esas* is not attested.

In the Radvanka variety, the situation is even more complex due to some local innovations that affect the past copula in the third person. As in the other varieties, in Radvanka, too, there are differences among speakers with respect to the preference of *sas* vs. *esas*. However, there are two innovations that occur in different groups of speakers. First, one speaker consulted for the LQCR data consistently used only the extended form but with a phonological loss of the final sibilant, i.e. *esa*. Second, several speakers from different families have been documented to make use of the non-extended form *sas* in the singular and *sanas*, alongside *sas*, in the plural. The form *sanas* is otherwise the second-person plural copula, so that here we have an example of the second-person copula that extends to the third person. A trigger for this development may be a second/third plural homonymy of the verb-subject agreement suffix *-(e)n* (see 3.2.1.1), and is facilitated by similarity of the person agreement suffix *-an* in *sanas* to the suffix *-(e)n*. However, there are no traces of such an analogy in the present tense. Therefore, in this group of speakers, the form *sas* is on its way to become the dedicated 3SG past copula, which leads, on the one hand, to expressing the number distinction in the third person, and, on the other hand, to the loss of the distinction between the 2PL and the 3PL. In Table 18, both Radvanka systems of the past copula paradigm are presented, with the innovated forms marked in bold (morphological segmentation is non-indicated).

Table 18: Innovative past-tense inflection of the copula in Radvanka

PERSON	INNOVATION 1		INNOVATION 2	
	SG	PL	SG	PL
FIRST	<i>somas</i>	<i>samas</i>	<i>somas</i>	<i>samas</i>
SECOND	<i>salas</i>	<i>sanas</i>	<i>salas</i>	<i>sanas</i>
THIRD	<i>esa</i>	<i>esa</i>	<i>sas</i>	<i>sas / sanas</i>

- (48) *pro drom esa khula* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 on road COP.PST.3 faeces.PL
 ‘There was manure on the road.’
- (49) *on sanas nasvale* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 they COP.PST.2/3PL ill.PL
 ‘They were ill’

3.3.2 Non-indicative and future copula in *av-* and *ej-*

The suppletive copula roots *av-* and *ej-* function basically as a non-indicative copula in the imperative, the present subjunctive and the potential conditional, but also in the future indicative. The forms in *av-* are homonymous with the verb *av-* ‘to come’ and are used only in the imperative plus in the first person singular and plural of all other categories. In the second and third persons of both numbers, the forms in *ej-*, which have developed by phonological reduction from forms based on *av-*, occur. The copula in *av-/ej-* takes on regular non-perfective person/number suffixes (see 3.2.1.1), the consonantal ones (of vocalic verbs) in case of *ej-*. The future and potential forms are regularly marked by the suffixes *-a* and *-as* respectively. See Tables 19 and 20.

Table 19: Present subjunctive, potential and future inflection of the copula

PERSON	PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE		POTENTIAL		FUTURE	
	SG	PL	SG	PL	SG	PL
FIRST	<i>av-av</i>	<i>av-as</i>	<i>av-ās</i>	<i>av-ah-as</i>	<i>av-ā</i> (<i>av-av-a</i>)	<i>av-ah-a</i>
SECOND	<i>ej-s</i>	<i>ej-n</i>	<i>ej-h-as</i>	<i>ej-n-as</i>	<i>ej-h-a</i>	<i>ej-n-a</i>
THIRD	<i>ej-l</i>	<i>ej-n</i>	<i>ej-l-as</i>	<i>ej-n-as</i>	<i>ejl-a</i>	<i>ej-n-a</i>

Table 20: Imperative inflection of the copula

PERSON	SG	PL
FIRST		<i>av-as</i>
SECOND	<i>av-∅</i>	<i>av-en</i>
THIRD		

The following sentences instantiate the second singular copula in the imperative (50), the present subjunctive (51), the potential (52) and in the future indicative (53).

- (50) *av cixo* (UzhhS)
 COP[IMP.2SG] silent
 ‘Be quiet.’
- (51) *paž ma šaj ejs spokojno* (UzhhS)
 beside I.LOC can COP.PRS.SBJV.2SG serene
 ‘With me you can be serene.’
- (52) *te ejhas honno* (UzhhS)
 if COP.POT.2SG able
 ‘If you were able.’
- (53) *kanāke tu ačheha manca,*
 now you stay.FUT.2SG I.INST
ejha mijro rom (UzhhS)
 COP.FUT.2SG my husband
 ‘Now you will stay with me, you will be my husband.’

The 2/3PL subjunctive copula *ejn* functions after the particle *te* as the infinitive copula (see also 3.4.3):

- (54) *me na kamav krāl'ovna t' ejn* (UzhhS)
 I NEG want.PRS.1SG queen NCOMP COP.INF[=PRS.SBJV.2/3PL]
 ‘I don’t want to be a queen.’

The non-indicative copula in *av-/ej-* sporadically occurs even in perfective marking at the expense of the perfective copula root *uv-* (see below). In that case, it is marked by the perfective stem suffix *-l-*, i.e. *av-l-/ej-l-*, and by the perfective person/number suffixes (see 3.2.2.2). In the following two sentences, *av-* and *ej-* occur in the non-remote perfective marking of the past subjunctive:

- (55) *tu šaj av-l'al milijoneris* (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 you can COP-PFV-2SG millionaire
 ‘You could be a millionaire.’
- (56) *naši ej-l-e ando fovros* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 cannot COP-PFV-3PL in town
 ‘They cannot have been in the town.’

This development is especially common in Perechyn, where the copula roots *av-* and *ej-*, in their perfective stems *avl-* and *ejl-*, have taken over functions of the perfective copula in *uv-* in young and middle-aged speakers. In the irrealis (remote perfective) paradigm, the distribution of *avl-* vs. *ejl-* in the Perechyn variety mirrors that of the non-perfective paradigm: *avl-* occurs in the first person, while *ejl-* occurs in the second and third persons. As discussed in 3.2.2.3, Perechyn Romani possesses its unique irrealis paradigm in that the third-person forms are identical to the second-person forms, and the irrealis copula is not an exception from this paradigm. Still, the more conservative 3SG suffix *-ah-* (< *-as-) occurs alongside the takeover of 2SG suffix *-al-* with the copula. See Table 21 and the sentences in (57) and (58).

Table 21: Innovative irrealis inflection of the copula in Perechyn

PERSON	SG	PL
FIRST	<i>av-l-om-as</i>	<i>av-l-am-as</i>
SECOND	<i>ej-l-al-as</i>	<i>ej-l-an-as</i>
THIRD	<i>ej-l-al-as/ ej-l-ah-as</i>	<i>ej-l-an-as</i>

(57) *kid' me akor av'lomas zdravo,*
 if I then COP.IRR.1SG healthy
ej'lalas man buvti (Per)^{LQCR}
 COP.IRR.2/3SG I.ACC work

'If I had been healthy at that time, I would have had a job.'⁴⁹

(58) *kid' one menk kapka podbāri'anas,*
 if they more a_bit grow_up.IRR.2/3PL
ej'lanas bāreder čim lengero dad (Per)^{LQCR}
 COP.IRR.2/3PL big.COMPR than their father

'If they had grown a bit more, they would have been bigger than their father.'

3.3.3 Perfective copula in *uv-*

The suppletive copula root *uv-* is a reflex of the OIA verb of existence *bhū-* 'to become' and exclusively occurs in the perfective stem *uvl-*. In Perechyn, as already indicated above, *uv-* is obsolete, being used by elder speakers, while replaced by *av-/ej-* in young speakers. Table 22 shows the conservative perfective inflection of the copula, which still occurs in most varieties.

⁴⁹ Compare this sentence with that in (38) below.

Table 22: Past subjunctive and irrealis inflection of the copula

PERSON	PAST SUBJUNCTIVE		IRREALIS	
	SG	PL	SG	PL
FIRST	<i>uv-l'-om</i>	<i>uv-l'-am</i>	<i>uv-l'-om-as</i>	<i>uv-l'-am-as</i>
SECOND	<i>uv-l'-al</i>	<i>uv-l'-an</i>	<i>uv-l'-al-as</i>	<i>uv-l'-an-as</i>
THIRD	<i>uv-l'-a(s)</i>	<i>uv-l'-e</i>	<i>uv-l'-ah-as</i>	<i>uv-l'-ah-as</i>

The perfective forms of the copula have exclusive non-indicative functions. The forms marked by the plain person/number suffixes are used as the past subjunctive, unlike in lexical verbs, where they express the perfective past indicative (aorist). The perfective forms marked by the remoteness suffix *-as* express the irrealis conditional, like those of the lexical verbs.

(59) *tu šaj uv'al bāro barvalo* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 you can COP.PST.SBJV.2SG big rich
 'You could be a prominent wealthy man.'

(60) *les šaj uv'a pāndž motora* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 he.ACC can COP.PST.SBJV.3SG five car.PL
 'He could have had five cars.'

(61) *on šaj uvle barvale* (Ser)^{etr}
 they can COP.PST.SBJV.3PL rich.PL
 'They could be wealthy.'

(62) *te me uv'lomas zdravo,*
 if I COP.IRR.1SG healthy
uv'lahas man buv'i (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 COP.IRR.3SG I.ACC work
 'If I had been healthy, I would have had a job.'

3.4 Non-finite forms

In contrast to the related Indo-Aryan languages of India, Romani has rather poor non-finite verb morphology (cf. Beníšek 2010). There are two kinds of participles in Eastern Uzh Romani: adjectival and adverbial participles. Participles are supplemented by a distinct category of the infinitive whose presence is an innovation typical of the whole Central Romani.

3.4.1 Adjectival participles

The adjectival participles, also called ‘perfective participles’, ‘past participles’ or ‘passive participles’ (cf. Matras 2002: 159), continue the category of the OIA and MIA past passive participles that are descended from Proto-Indo-European verbal adjectives in **-tó*. In Eastern Uzh Romani, like in other Eastern North Central dialects, two morphological compartments of adjectival participles must be distinguished: oikoclitic participles on the one hand and xenoclitic participles on the other hand. Oikoclitic participles are based on the perfective stem of verbs, while xenoclitic participles are marked by a special participial suffix. As in nouns and adjectives, this compartmentalisation largely overlaps with the origin of the base verbs: oikoclitic participles occur with non-borrowed and derived verbs, while xenoclitic participles are mainly formed from loan verbs.

The adjectival participles mostly occur with transitive verbs and refer to the semantic patient (cf. Matras 2002: 160), so that they are passive in nature, as in the following:

- (63) *o kher roskindo* (Ser)^{etr}
 ART house dismantle.PTCP.NOM.SG.M
 ‘The house is dismantled.’
- (64) *on kapka le pāñestar imā hine zaučharde* (UzhhR)
 they a_bit ART water.ABL already COP.PRS.3PL cover.PTCP.NOM.PL
 ‘They are finally protected (literally: covered) from water a bit.’
- (65) *sa sas sadzinkerdo bandurkenca* (UzhhS)
 all COP.PST.3 plant.ITER.PTCP.NOM.SG.M potatoe.PL.INST
 ‘Everything was planted with potatoes.’
- (66) *e vojna pes končind’a,*
 ART war REFL finish
a o hatāris phuterdo avri sas (Per)
 and/but ART border open out COP.PST.3
 ‘The war had ended and the border was open.’

Participles of intransitive bases are infrequent and those few that exist are rather lexicalised adjectives, such as *dživdo* ‘alive, living’ of the verb *dživ-* ‘to live’, *muvlo* ‘dead’ of the verb *mer-* ‘to die’, *zasuvto* ‘sleepy’ of the verb *zasov-* ‘to fall asleep’ (an aktionsart modification of *sov-* ‘to sleep’), etc. Some intransitive verbs that become transitive if modified by an adverb (see 12.3.5) may form a participle in such modifications, e.g. intransitive *phir-* ‘to go often, to walk’, transitive *phir- teje* ‘to tread’, participle *phirdo teje*

‘trodden’. Otherwise, most intransitive verbs are incapable of forming participles. For example, the psych *a*-verbs, such as *asa-* ‘to laugh’, *dara-* ‘to fear’ and *ladža-* ‘to feel ashamed’, posture verbs, such as *beš-* ‘to sit’, *pašl’uv-* ‘to lie’ and *terd’uv-* ‘to stand’, as well as the verb *khand-* ‘to stink’, lack any participle, and there are virtually no participles of middle verbs. Instead, participles may be formed from transitive counterparts of such verbs, e.g. *pašl’ardo* ‘laid, lying’ is a participle of the transitive verb *pašl’ar-* ‘to lay’, *predarado* ‘frightened’ is a participle of the causative derivation *predarav-* ‘to frighten’. A derived adjective may also be used instead of any participle; cf. *daravkutno* (in Uzhhorod), *darakutno* (in Perechyn), *daravgutno* (in Khudlovo and Serednie) ‘fearful, cowardly’ (see 5.2.2.6), *khanduno* ‘stinky’ (see 5.2.2.3), etc. Some intransitive verbs have neither participles, nor any transitive and adjective derivations and finite periphrases must be used instead. For example, sentence (67) was given as an elicitation translation for ‘I like smiling people.’:

- (67) *me kamav ajsen, kāj asan* (UzhR)^{LQCR}
 I want.PRS.1SG such.ACC.PL REL laugh.PRS.3PL
 ‘I like such [people] who laugh.’

Participles mainly occur in the predicative position, some frequent participles also function as plain adjectives in the attributive position, e.g. *dživdo* ‘alive, living’ (cf. *dživdo dejl* ‘living God’ in the name of a Romani church in Uzhhorod), *phuterdo* ‘open’ (e.g. *phuterdo vudar* ‘open door’), *tādo* ‘cooked, made (about a meal)’ (e.g. *tādo texan* ‘cooked meal’), etc. Some participles may be used as lexicalised adjectives in a shifted meaning. Alongside *zasuvto* ‘sleepy’ of the verb *zasov-* ‘to fall asleep’ referred to above, another example is the participle *sid’ardo* of the verb *sid’ar-* ‘to hurry’, which is attested in a phrase *sid’ard’i gil’i* in the meaning ‘fast song’ in Shakhta. Lexicalisation of participles may also be accompanied by their conversion into nouns, e.g. *movlo* ‘dead’ is commonly used as a noun in the meaning ‘ghost, dead being’, while *māt’arkerdo*, a participle of an iterative factitive verb *māt’arker-* ‘to repeatedly make drunk’ (from *māto* ‘drunk’) functions as a noun ‘drunkard’ in Uzhhorod and Perechyn.

Some participles may exist alongside various adjectives used in the same meanings. For example, the regular participle *čovr-n-o* of the verb *čovr-* ‘to steal’ (PFV *čovr-n-*) competes with the deverbal adjective *čovrduno* in the meaning ‘stolen’ (see 5.2.2.3), while regular participles of the verbs *pek-* ‘to bake’ (PFV *pek-l-*) and *phag-* ‘to break’ (PFV *phag-l-*),

viz. *pek-l-o* and *phag-l-o*, exist alongside more common adjectives *pejko* ‘baked’ and *phāgo* ‘broken’.

3.4.1.1 Oikoclitic participles

Oikoclitic participles are adjectival participles of inherited and derived verbs that are based on the perfective stem (see 3.2.2.1), e.g. *cir-* ‘to pull’ (PFV *cir-n-*) > *cir-n-o* ‘pulled’, *čhiv-* ‘to throw’ (PFV *čhi-d-*) > *čhi-d-o* ‘thrown’; iterative *čhivker-* ‘to throw in a large number, to scatter’ (PFV *čhivker-d-*) > PTCP *čhivker-d-o* ‘scattered’, *d-* ‘to give’ (PFV *d-in-*) > *d-in-o* ‘given’, *l-* ‘to take’ (PFV *i-l-*) > *i-l-o* ‘taken’, *ker-* ‘to do, to make’ (PFV *ker-d-*) > *ker-d-o* ‘done’, *kid-* ‘to gather’ (PFV *ki-n-* or *ki-nd-*) > *ki-n-o* or *ki-nd-o* ‘gathered’, *mer-* ‘to die’ (PFV *muv-l-*) > *muv-l-o* ‘dead’, *našav-* ‘to lose’ (PFV *naša-d-*) > *naša-d-o* ‘lost’, *phand-* ‘to close’ (PFV *phan-l-*, Khudlovo *phan-gl-*) > *phan-l-o*, Khudlovo *phan-gl-o* ‘closed’, *sasar-* ‘to cure’ (PFV *sasar-d-*) > *sasar-d-o* ‘cured’, *zasov-* ‘to fall asleep’ (PFV *zasuv-t-*) > *zasuv-t-o* ‘fallen asleep; sleepy’, including iterative participles of loan verbs, such as *sadzinker-* ‘to plant in a high number’ (PFV *sadzinker-d-*) > *sadzinker-d-o* ‘planted (in a high number)’. The participle *dživ-d-o* ‘alive’ of the verb *dživ-* ‘to live’ contains a single perfective suffix *-d-* in contrast to the complex perfective stem *dživ-d-il-* in finite forms (e.g. 3SG *dživd’il’a* ‘s/he lived’).

Oikoclitic participles are normally declined as the oikoclitic vocalic adjectives (see 5.1.1.1). However, some speakers do not inflect certain oikoclitic participles in the nominative. See the following sentences with the participle *kerdo* ‘made’. In the sentences elicited from a speaker of the Shakhta variety, *kerdo* occurs as a declinable adjective due to its gender and number agreement with the subject ((68) and (69)), while in the Serednie sentences, *kerdo* has a single form irrespective of the subject categories ((70) and (71)).

- | | | | | | |
|------|--|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| (68) | <i>kadi</i> | <i>angrušni</i> | <i>kerd’i</i> | <i>trastestar</i> | (Uzhhs) ^{LQCR} |
| | this.SPEC.F | ring.SG.F | made-SG.F | metal.ABL | |
| | ‘These shoes are made of snake’s leather.’ | | | | |
| (69) | <i>kadala</i> | <i>kamaš’li</i> | <i>kerd-e</i> | <i>le</i> | <i>sapeskera</i> |
| | this.SPEC.PL | shoe.PL | made-PL | ART | snake.GEN |
| | <i>morčhatar</i> | | | | (Uzhhs) ^{LQCR} |
| | leather.ABL | | | | |
| | ‘These shoes are made of snake’s leather.’ | | | | |

as against:

- (70) *kadi angrusni kerdo trastestar* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 this.SPEC.F ring.SG.F made metal.ABL
 ‘This ring is made of metal.’
- (71) *kala topānki kerdo le sapeskera kožatar* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 this.SPEC.PL shoe.PL made ART snake.GEN leather.ABL
 ‘These shoes are made of snake’s leather.’

The extension *-on-* sometimes occurs in oblique forms of some substantivised participles. See the plural ablative form *dživdonendar* ‘from living ones’ with the extension *-on-* in the following example contrasting to *muvlendar*, which lacks the extension suffix:

- (72) *kampe dživ-d-on-en-dar te daran,*
 be_needed.PRS live-PFV-EXT-OBL.PL-ABL NCOMP fear.INF
na muv-l-en-dar (Uzhhs)
 NEG die-PFV-OBL.PL-ABL
 ‘One should be afraid of living beings rather than of dead beings.’

3.4.1.2 Xenoclitic participles

Participles of loan verbs are formed by means of the xenoclitic participial suffix *-ime*, in Uzhhorod also *-imen*, which is descended from the Greek suffix of middle participles *-μένα-* (cf. Boretzky and Igla 2004: 189). The suffix is added to the borrowed base, e.g. *farb-in-* ‘to colour, to paint’ (from Slavic *farb-*, cf. Slovak *farbit*, dial. Ukrainian *фapбyму*) > *farb-ime(n)* ‘coloured, painted’, *mur-in-* ‘to brick’ (from Slavic *mur-*, cf. Slovak *murovat*) > *mur-ime(n)* ‘bricked, built with bricks’, *pis-in-* ‘to write’ (from Slavic *pis-*; cf. Slovak *písať*, Ukrainian *nucamu*) > *pis-ime(n)* ‘written’, *rāg-in-* ‘to chew, to gnaw’ (from Hungarian *rág*) > *rāg-ime(n)* ‘chewed, gnawed’.

The suffix *-ime(n)* may also occur in participles of non-borrowed verbs that contain a segment /in/ and are therefore reanalysed as loan verbs, e.g. *poťin-* ‘to pay’ > *poť-ime(n)* ‘paid’ (alongside *poťindo*), Khudlovo and Sereďnie *bikin-* ‘to sell’ > *bik-ime* ‘sold’.⁵⁰ In Shakhta, the suffix *-ime(n)* is also attested with polysyllabic bases of *d-*verbs, such as *ispid-* ‘to push’ > *isp-ime(n)* ‘pushed’, *kikid-* ‘to press, to squeeze’ > *kik-ime(n)* ‘pressed, squeezed’, including aktionsart modifications of monosyllabic *d-*verb bases, such as *ros-kid-* ‘to dismantle’ > *ros-k-ime(n)* ‘dismantled’ (as against unmodified *kid-* ‘to gather’ > *k-in-o*

⁵⁰ In Uzhhorod and Perechyn, the verb for ‘to sell’ is *biken-*, which has the oikoclitic participle *bikendo*.

‘gathered’). Note that the segment /id/ of the *d*-verbs is dropped in these xenoclitic participles. The verb *d*- ‘to give’ may also have a xenoclitic participle in Shakhta provided that it is prefixed by an aktionsart marker, e.g. *roz-d*- ‘to hand out’ > *roz-d-ime(n)* ‘handed out’ (as against unmodified *d*- ‘to give’ > *d-in-o* ‘given’). In Radvanka and in Serednie, participles of all *d*-verbs, including the aktionsart modifications of the verb *d*-, are documented as oikoclitic only; cf. Radvanka *roskino* ‘dismantled’, *oddino* ‘handed over’ (from *od-d*- ‘to hand over’), Serednie *kikindo* ‘squeezed’, *roskindo* ‘dismantled’, *oddino* ‘handed over’, etc.

In Uzhhorod, there are also xenoclitic participles of verbs whose inflectional base ends in /an/ or /un/. In such participles, the suffix occurs as *-ame(n)* or *-ume(n)* with the initial vowel reflecting the respective vowel of the verb base; cf. *pārun-* ‘to bury’ > *pār-ume(n)* ‘buried’, *ušan-* ‘to knead’ > *uš-ame(n)* ‘kneaded’ (alongside oikoclitic *ušando*), *uxan-* ‘to comb’ > *ux-ame(n)* ‘combed’ (alongside oikoclitic *uxando*). Finally, there is an irregular participle *xol’ame(n)* ‘angry’ in all Eastern Uzh varieties, which exists instead of **xol’ardo* of the denominal verb *xol’ar-* ‘to make angry’ (cf. *xol’i* ‘anger’). In Perechyn, the form *xol’ame* is also attested in a diminutive derivation *xol’amenōro* ‘cutely angry’ (with reference to little children) with the nasal resurfaced.

All xenoclitic participles are indeclinable.

3.4.2 Adverbial participle (gerund)

The adverbial participle, which has its cognates in what is commonly called ‘gerund’ in other Romani dialects (cf. Matras 2002: 160), continues the category of OIA and MIA present active participles in *-ant-*.⁵¹ In Eastern Uzh Romani, the suffix of adverbial participles is *-(i)ndos*, which is typical of Eastern North Central Romani and also occurs in other dialects (cf. Boretzky and Iglá 2004: 190).

The Eastern Uzh adverbial participles in *-(i)ndos* are indeclinable and non-productive formations derived from some non-borrowed intransitive verbs. There are no adverbial participles of transitive verbs, nor are there adverbial participles of borrowed verbs in *-in-*. The suffix *-(i)ndos* is added to the inflectional stem, cf.: *asa-* ‘to laugh’ > *asa-ndos* ‘laughing’, *beš-* ‘to sit’ > *beš-ndos* ‘sitting’, *denaš-* ‘to run’ > *denaš-ndos* ‘running’, *gilav-* ‘to sing’ > *gilav-ndos* ‘singing’, *pašl’-(uv-)* ‘to be lying’ > *pašl’-ndos* ‘lying, being in a lying position’, *rov-* ‘to cry, to weep’ > *rov-ndos* ‘crying’, *terd’-(uv-)* ‘to stand’ > *terd’-ndos* ‘standing’, *vaker-* ‘to talk’ > *vaker-ndos* ‘talking’.

⁵¹ In Central Romani, including Eastern Uzh Romani, there are no perfective adverbial participles in *-i*, which are known from some Northeastern and Balkan dialects (cf. Beníšek 2010).

The adverbial participle modifies the main predication by adding a simultaneous action.

(73) *amen piškóm džahas vaker-undos* (UzhhS)
 we on_foot walk.IPF/POT.1PL talk-PTCP.ADV
 ‘We were walking on foot and talking.’

(74) *oj rov-undos bešľa paž amende* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 she weep-PTCP.ADV sit.AOR.3SG beside we.LOC
 ‘Weeping she sat down next to us.’

3.4.3 Infinitive

In Romani, there is no true infinitive as a distinct morphological form. An Early Proto-Romani infinitive had probably been based on nominalisations (cf. Beníšek 2010) but nominalisations were replaced by finite clauses in complementation of modal and other verbs in Late Proto-Romani, as is common in the Balkan languages (cf. Joseph 2009). Whereas many Romani dialects still lack an infinitive, some dialects outside the Balkans have developed a ‘new’ infinitive through generalisation of one single form selected from the present paradigm (cf. Boretzky 1996a; Matras 2002: 161; Boretzky and Iglá 2004: 191).

Eastern Uzh Romani shares the development of the ‘new’ infinitive with the North Central dialects in the easternmost parts of Slovakia, in which the infinitive is based on the generalised 2/3PL verb forms in *-(V)n* (see 3.2.1.1). The infinitive copula is derived from the 2/3PL subjunctive verb *ejn* (3.3.2), and the infinitive form is obligatorily introduced by the non-factual complementiser *te* (see 13.2.1 for more details).

The following sentences present examples of infinitives in various constructions. Take note of the serial infinitives in (76). In (76), the infinitive complement of the modal verb *kam-* ‘to want’ is the verb *d-* ‘to give’, which functions here as a causative verb and has its own infinitive complement referring to the caused action (see 12.3.1 for more details on such periphrastic causatives).

(75) *amen na sam honno te keren nič* (UzhhR)
 we NEG COP.PRS.1PL able NCOMP do.INF nothing
 ‘We are not able to do anything.’

(76) *me tuke kamav te den te axal'on* (UzhhS)
 I you.DAT want.PRS.1SG NCOMP give.INF NCOMP understand.INF
 ‘I want to make you understand.’

- (77) *kames ade buvŕi te keren?* (Khu)
 want.PRS.2SG here work NCOMP do.INF
 ‘Do you want to work here?’
- (78) *ov džala vareso te keren* (Ser)
 he go.FUT.3SG something NCOMP do.INF
 ‘He will leave (literally: go) to do something.’

3.5 Verb derivation

In the following sections, the derivation of verbs will be discussed. I will deal with the derivation of verbs from other verbs first, before describing the derivation from other word categories, such as adjectives and nouns.

3.5.1 Deverbal derivation

Deverbal derivation comprises valency-changing morphology and various lexical-semantic modifications of verbs by means of derivational affixes. Following the conventions in the current linguistic typology, verbs derived by valency-increasing suffixes will be called causatives, while verbs derived by valency-decreasing morphological means will be called anticausatives (cf. Shibatani 1976; Haspelmath 1993; Dixon and Aikhenvald 2000). The term ‘inchoative’ as a derivational strategy will be restricted to the derivation of intransitive verbs from adjectives and nouns (see 3.5.2.2).

Like other Indo-Aryan languages, Proto-Romani possessed a rich derivational morphology of verbs (cf. Matras 2002: 119–122; Boretzky and Igla 2004: 160–170). In Eastern Uzh Romani, the productive valency-changing strategies now consist of periphrastic constructions that will be discussed in the chapter on verb syntax in 12.3.1. Still, inherited derivational morphology of causatives and anticausatives is still present, although it is rather relic and unproductive.⁵² The most productive types of deverbal derivation consist of the lexical-aspectual (aktionsart) verb modifications. Such modifications include the iterative morphology, which has developed through reanalysis of the erstwhile causative morphology, and various modifications of verbs by borrowed aktionsart prefixes of Slavic origin.

⁵² Note that other Central Romani dialects spoken in contact with Hungarian, which has a rich and productive valency-changing morphology, often display very complex and productive derivational morphology of causative and anticausative verbs (cf. Hübschmannová and Bubeník 1997; Elšík, Hübschmannová and Šebková 1999).

3.5.1.1 Lexicalised causatives in *-av-*

The oldest causatives of Indo-Aryan origin are verbs marked by the suffix *-av-* (after consonantal roots) or *-v-* (after vocalic roots). Morphosyntactic and semantic properties of the causatives in *-(a)v-* in Eastern Uzh Romani are virtually identical to those described by Hübschmannová and Bubeník (1997) for what they call ‘Slovak Romani’, i.e. North Central Romani dialects in Slovakia (as opposed to ‘Hungarian Romani’, i.e. South Central dialects). Causatives in *-(a)v-* are lexicalised verbs that exercise their primary function to increase valency with intransitive bases only, e.g. intransitive *dara-* ‘to fear’ > transitive *darav-* ‘to frighten, to terrify’ (also ‘to be jealous’). If derived from transitive verbs, they remain monotransitive, and the suffix only alters their lexical meaning. The lexical meaning of such derivations is no longer predictable, although the erstwhile causative semantics may sometimes be simply reconstructed; cf. *bol-* ‘to dip’ > *bolav-* ‘to baptise, to christen’ (from *‘to have X (= a child) dipped [into holy water] by Y (= a priest)’), *mang-* ‘to ask (for), to beg’ > *mangav-* ‘to engage, to betroth’, Uzhhorod *pij-* ‘to drink’ > *pjav-* ‘to breast feed’ (from *‘to make sb. drink’), *ur-* ‘to dress’ > *urav-* ‘to supply clothing’ (from *‘to have X dressed by Y’ via *‘to supply clothing, so that Y can dress X’).

Otherwise, there are no causatives of borrowed verbs nor are there causatives of secondary verbal derivations, such as iteratives. In a similar manner, there are no so-called second or double causatives, i.e. causatives of causatives. However, causatives themselves may form a base for other derivations, such as iteratives, e.g. *daravker-* ‘to repeatedly or intensely threaten, to threaten more people, to be often jealous’, but it is an issue of morphosyntactic capacity and productivity of the other derivations. Note that the morpheme *-(a)v-* sometimes co-occurs with the iterative marker *-ker-* in iterative derivations (see 3.5.1.4).

There are more verbs in *-av-* that developed through lexicalisation of erstwhile causatives but lost their primary (underived) counterparts, e.g. *arav-* ‘to knock down’, *bašav-* ‘to play’, *bičhav-* ‘to send’, *čalav-* ‘to touch’, *našav-* ‘to lose’, *pharav-* ‘to split’, *sikav-* ‘to show’ (see also 3.5.1.3 below and Hübschmannová and Bubeník 1997: 136–137). Another vestigial causative is *uštav-* (in all varieties save Radvanka) ‘to wake up’, which is etymologically related to the verb *uš-* ‘to stand up’ (< **ušti-*).

3.5.1.2 Causatives in *-ar-* and *-l’ar-*

Several transitive verbs with a causative meaning contain a suffix *-ar-* or *-l’ar-*. The suffix *-ar-* is descended from a Proto-Romani transitiviser **-jar-* of probable Middle Indo-Aryan origin

(cf. Bubeník and Hübschmannová 1998: 31) and is related to the factitive suffix of deadjectival verbs *-ar-* (see 3.5.2.1 below).

The most complex variant of the suffix *-lar-* occurs in three unequivocally derived causative verbs *beš'lar-* ‘to make sit’ < *beš-* ‘to sit’, *rov'lar-* ‘to make weep’ < *rov-* ‘to weep’, and *sov'lar-* ‘to put to sleep’ < *sov-* ‘to sleep’. The suffix *-lar-* has probably developed from *-ar-* combined with the perfective stem suffix *-l-* (cf. *bešl-* as the perfective stem of the verb *beš-*).

In other verbs, the suffix occurs in a plain form *-ar-*. However, rather than directly derived from their intransitive counterparts, causatives in *-ar-* form pairs with intransitive middle verbs in that they are based on the same stem. For example, the transitive verb *labar-* ‘to burn (sth.)’ and its intransitive counterpart *labuv-* ‘to burn’ contain the same root *lab-* but neither is clearly derived from the other. Another example of such a non-directed pair is *terd'ar-* ‘to stop’ and *terd'uv-* ‘to stand’. Haspelmath (1993: 1991) calls such pairs ‘equipollent alternations’, and they will be discussed in more detail in the section on anticausatives in 3.5.1.3. Note that several causative verbs in *-ar-* are rather deadjectival verbs (factitives; see 3.5.2.1), e.g. *dživd'ar-* ‘to revive, to resuscitate’ is obviously related to the verb *dživ-* ‘to live’ but is rather derived from the verbal adjective *dživdo* ‘alive’.

The monophonemic allomorph *-r-* can be identified in a single verb *čul'ar-* ‘to pour (away), to slop’, which is a transitive counterpart to the intransitive verb *čul'a-* ‘to drip, to flow (about water)’.⁵³ A unique verb *uštar-* ‘to wake up’ occurs in Radvanka⁵⁴ instead of *uštav-* in the other varieties.

3.5.1.3 Anticausatives

Anticausatives are intransitive verbs that express a spontaneous change of state or non-agentive activity (an atelic going-on; cf. Haspelmath 1993). In contrast to the deadjectival inchoatives discussed in 3.5.2.2, anticausatives are derived from transitive verbs. The Romani anticausative is usually dealt with in association with middle verbs in Romani descriptions (cf. Matras 2002: 119–122; Boretzky and Igla 2004: 160–162). In Eastern Uzh Romani, anticausatives form the essential part of middle verbs in *-uv-* (cf. Bubeník and

⁵³ Historically, both *čul'a-* and *čul'ar-* are probably denominal verbs from a Proto-Romani noun **čulo* ‘drop’ (< OIA *kṣulla-*), which no longer occurs in Eastern Uzh Romani.

⁵⁴ The verb *uštar-* for the transitive meaning ‘to wake up’ is a shared innovation of Radvanka with the Western Uzh variety of Pavlovce nad Uhom.

Hübschmannová: 1998 for their discussion in Central Romani), whose distinct non-perfective inflection is described in 3.2.1.1.3.

The Eastern Uzh Romani anticausatives are not fully productive but they are more frequent than the derived causatives. At the same time, the meaning of some anticausatives is not simply predictable from that of their transitive counterparts, which indicates a certain degree of semantic lexicalisation: cf. the meaning of the anticausative *kerd'uv-* ‘to happen, to take place’ derived from the transitive verb *ker-* ‘to do, to make’. The majority of Eastern Uzh anticausatives are based on the palatalised perfective stem of their transitive source verb, e.g. transitive root *ker-*, perfective stem *kerd-*, anticausative *kerd'uv-*. Three anticausative verbs are derived directly from the palatalised root of their source verbs with no perfective stem-mediation, viz. *dičh-uv-/dič'h-uv-* ‘to appear, to seem’ from *dikh-* ‘to see, to look at’, *peč'uv-* from *pek-* ‘to bake’ and *phad'uv-* from *phag-* ‘to break’. Note that two of these three verbs *pek-* and *phag-* may also have irregular participles *pejk-o* ‘baked’ and *phāg-o* ‘broken’, which are not based on the perfective stem (see 3.4.1.1).

Table 23: Examples of anticausative derivations

PRIMARY TRANSITIVE VERB		ANTICAUSATIVE	
FORM	MEANING	FORM	MEANING
<i>čhin-</i>	to cut (TR)	<i>čhind'uv-</i>	to cut, to tear (ITR)
<i>čhor-</i>	to spill (TR)	<i>čhord'uv-</i>	to spill (ITR)
<i>dikh-</i>	to look, to see	<i>dičhuv-/dič'huv-</i>	to appear, to seem
<i>hazd-</i>	to lift	<i>haz(d)ňuv-</i>	to rise
<i>ker-</i>	to do, to make	<i>kerd'uv-</i>	to happen, to take place
<i>makh-</i>	to grease, to smear	<i>makhl'uv-</i>	to get stained with grease
<i>mār-</i>	to beat	<i>mārd'uv-</i>	to be beaten
<i>pek-</i>	to bake (TR)	<i>peč'uv-</i>	to bake (ITR), to swelter
<i>phag-</i>	to break (TR)	<i>phad'uv-</i>	to break (ITR)
<i>phand-</i>	to close (TR)	<i>phanl'uv-</i>	to close (ITR)
<i>phurd-</i>	to blow	<i>phurňuv-</i>	to bloat
<i>pher-</i>	to fill (TR)	<i>pherd'uv-</i>	to fill (ITR)
<i>šun-</i>	to hear, to listen to	<i>šund'uv-</i>	to be heard, to smell (ITR)
<i>tāv-</i>	to cook	<i>tād'uv-</i>	to be cooked ⁵⁵

⁵⁵ Sometimes, *tād'uv-* is also used in the meaning ‘to boil’, although loan verbs *kipin-* (in Radvanka and Perechyn) and *kipit'in-* (in Khudlovo) also occur in the data for the meaning ‘to boil’.

Some disyllabic transitive verbs with the base ending in /er/, such as *čhinger-* ‘to tear’ and *phuter-* ‘to open’, do not form their anticausative counterparts by means of a perfective stem but rather with the help of the suffix *-sal-*, i.e. *čhinger-sal’uv-* ‘to tear’ and *phuter-sal’uv-* ‘to open’ respectively. The suffix *-sal-* is obviously related to the productive inchoative marker of deadjectival verbs *-isal-* (cf. 3.5.2.2) as well as to the intransitive loan-verb integration marker *-isal-* in forms such as *krucisa’uv-* ‘to rotate, to twist’ and *rāzisa’uv-* ‘to tremble’ mentioned in 3.2.3.

There are a number of other verbs that are historically derived from transitive verbs which no longer occur in the language. An example of such a verb is *reš’uv-* ‘to fit, to get in(to)’, for which there is no transitive counterpart **res-/reš-* (3SG **resel*), although such a verb form exists in other dialects in the meaning ‘to reach’, ‘to arrive’ (Boretzky 2012b: 218).

Apart from the pure anticausative derivation, there are examples of non-directed alternations of a transitive verb with an intransitive verb in which neither is derived from the other. An example of a labile non-directed alternation (cf. Haspelmath 1993: 92) is a middle verb *xand’uv-*, which is intriguing in that it is both an intransitive verb ‘to itch’ and a transitive verb ‘to scratch’:⁵⁶

- (79) *te tuke xand’ol o šejro,*
 if you.DAT itch/scratch.PRS.3SG ART head
t’ akor spokojnones xand’uv les (Khu)^{LQCR}
 so then freely itch/scratch[IMP.2SG] he.ACC
 ‘If your head is itching, then feel free to scratch it.’

A number of intransitive verbs in *-uv-* have their transitive counterpart in a causative verb in *-av-* or *-ar-*. Such pairs may be described as equipollent non-directed alternations of verbs derived from the same stem that expresses the basic situation (cf. Haspelmath 1993: 91). Historically, they are often derivations from primary verbs that have already been lost. For the pairs of a causative in *-av-* with its intransitive counterpart in a middle verb, cf. transitive *našav-* ‘to lose’ ~ intransitive *naš’uv-* ‘to disappear’ derived from the common stem *naš-*, transitive *pharav-* ‘to split’ ~ intransitive *pharuv-* ‘to burst’ derived from the common stem *phar-*, and transitive *sikav-* ‘to show, to teach’ ~ in transitive *sik’uv-* ‘to learn’ derived

⁵⁶ In other North Central dialects, the verb *xand’uv-* is restricted to the intransitive meaning ‘to itch’, while another verb *xaruv-* exists in the meaning ‘to scratch’. In all Uzh Romani varieties (i.e. including those in Slovakia), *xaruv-* has been ousted by semantic extension of the middle verb *xand’uv-*.

from the common stem *sik*.⁵⁷ The intransitive verb *taš'luv-* ‘to suffocate, to drown’ has its transitive counterpart in both causatives in *-av-* and *-ar-* with a semantic distinction: *tasav-* means ‘to strangle’, while *taš'lar-* means ‘to drown’. Quite a few equipollent alternations consist of a causative verb in *-ar-* and an intransitive middle verb, which are shown in Table 24.

Table 24: Equipollent pairs of causative and anticausative verbs

CAUSATIVE VERB IN <i>-ar-</i>		ANTICAUSATIVE	
FORM	MEANING	FORM	MEANING
<i>bi'lar-</i>	to melt (TR)	<i>bi'luv-</i>	to melt (ITR)
<i>d'ind'ar-</i>	to lengthen, to stretch (TR)	<i>d'ind'uv-</i>	to become longer, to stretch (ITR)
<i>džung'lar-</i>	to disgust, to make disgusting	<i>džung'luv-</i>	to abhor, to loathe
<i>kham'lar-</i>	to make sweat	<i>kham'luv-</i>	to sweat, to perspire
<i>labar-</i>	to burn (TR)	<i>labuv-</i>	to burn (ITR)
<i>mosar-</i> (<i>musar-</i>)	to spoil (TR)	<i>mosal'uv-</i> (<i>musal'uv-</i>)	to spoil (ITR)
<i>murdar-/mundar-</i>	to kill; to extinguish	<i>murda'uv-/</i> <i>munda'uv-</i>	to die (about animals); to go out (about fire/light)
<i>paš'lar-</i>	to lay	<i>paš'luv-</i>	to lie
<i>sasar-</i>	to heal	<i>sasuv-</i>	to recover
<i>šudrar-</i>	to cool, to make cold	<i>šudruv-</i>	to get cold
<i>terd'ar-</i>	to stop	<i>terd'uv-</i>	to stand
<i>visar-</i>	to turn (TR)	<i>visa'uv-</i>	to turn (ITR)
<i>zisar-</i>	to stun	<i>zisa'uv-</i>	to faint

Note that the anticausative verbs *mosal'uv-* (*musal'uv-*), *murda'uv-/munda'uv-*, *visa'uv-* and *zisa'uv-* contain an additional suffix *-al-* added between the lexical stem and the non-perfective middle suffix *-uv-*, which is obviously related to the inchoative suffix *-al-* of some deadjectival and denominal verbs, such as *diliñ-al'uv-* ‘to go mad’ (from *dilin-o* ‘silly crazy’) and *d'ives-al'uv-* ‘to dawn’ (from *d'ives* ‘day’).

⁵⁷ In Khudlovo, there is also a verb *sik'lar-* in the meaning ‘to teach’ (but not ‘to show’, which is always expressed by *sikav-*). The meaning ‘to teach’ is in all varieties also commonly expressed by the Slavic loan verb *učin-*, whose reflexive periphrasis (see 12.3.2) is a common expression for the intransitive meaning ‘to learn’.

The suffix *-ar-* is also a factitive marker of deadjectival verbs (see 3.5.2.1), and some of the pairs indicated in Table 24 are, in fact, historical deadjectival verbs derived from adjectives that have already been lost. For example, *sasar-* ‘to heal, to treat (medically)’ and *sasuv-* ‘to recover’ are derived from the adjective **sasto* ‘healthy’, which is well known from other Romani dialects but has been replaced by a West Slavic loanword *zdravo* in all Uzh varieties of Romani.⁵⁸ Another example is that of *šudrar-* and *šudruv-*, which reminds us of an adjective *šudro* ‘cool’ in other Romani dialects but not in Eastern Uzh Romani, where the meanings ‘cold, cool’ are expressed by another inherited adjective *šilalo*. The pair *d’ind’ar-* and *d’ind’uv-* ‘to lengthen, to stretch’ must be derived from a Proto-Romani adjective **dingo* ‘long’, which can be reconstructed on the basis of both verbs, as well as on evidence of MIA *diggha-*, OIA *dīrgha-* ‘long’.⁵⁹ Note that in present-day Eastern Uzh Romani, the meaning ‘long’ is expressed by the causative participle with an irregular long vowel *d’ind’ārdo*. For the pair *džunglar-* and *džungluv-* there is a nominal and adjectival counterpart *džung* ‘filth, filthy, impure’ (cf. also *džungālo* ‘nasty, ugly’). There are more pairs of a transitive verb in *-ar-* with an intransitive verb in *-uv-* based on the same root, but these are often regular deadjectival verbs with their retained adjective counterpart, e.g. *cindo* ‘wet’ > transitive *cind’ar-* ‘to make wet’ ~ intransitive *cind’uv-* ‘to get wet’, so that they are discussed in 3.5.2.1 and 3.5.2.2).

One might even encounter middle derivations of intransitive verbs but such forms, too, are often deadjectival or denominal derivations. For example, the intransitive verb *dživd’uv-*/*dživd’isaluv-* (3SG *dživd’ol/dživd’isal’ol*) ‘to come back to life, to regain consciousness’, as its transitive counterpart *dživd’ar-/dživd’isar-* ‘to resuscitate, to revive’, are related to the verb *dživ-* ‘to live’ but their immediate derivational base is the adjective *dživdo* ‘alive’. A less straightforward example is a pair of the intransitive verb *khandisaluv-* ‘to stink all of a sudden’ and the transitive verb *khandisar-* ‘to cause to stink, to stink up’, which are related to the underived intransitive verb *khand-* ‘to stink’ but are probably derived from a now-lost noun **khand* ‘smell, stink’ (< OIA *gandha-*), as is the verb *khand-* itself.

In their paper on intransitive derivations in Slovak and Hungarian Romani, Bubeník and Hübschmannová (1998: 35–36) point to lexical-aspectual (semelfactive and inchoative) derivations of the psych *a*-verbs, which are similar to intransitive (i.e. anticausative) derivations, e.g. *asa-* ‘to laugh’ > *asand’uv-* (3SG *asand’ol*) ‘to smile (once)’, *dara-* ‘to be

⁵⁸ There are also synchronical deadjectival derivations transitive *zdravisar-* ~ intransitive *zdravisaluv-*, which compete with *sasar-* ~ *sasuv-*.

⁵⁹ For the nasal in Proto-Romani **dingo* compare a similar development in OIA *mārg-* ‘to seek’ > MIA *magg-* > Romani *mang-* ‘to beg’.

afraid' > *darand'uv-* (3SG *darand'ol*) 'to get frightened', *ladža-* 'to be ashamed' > *ladžand'uv-* (3SG *ladžand'ol*) 'to become ashamed', etc. In Eastern Uzh Romani, these derived verbs do not exist and the given lexical-aspectual modifications are achieved by means of aktionsart prefixes of Slavic origin, e.g. *za-asa-* 'to smile (once)', *pre-dara-* 'to get frightened', *za-ladža-* 'to become ashamed' (see 3.5.1.5). Still, there are relics of such anticausative-like derivations in regular perfective stems of the respective vocalic verbs *asa-*, *dara-*, *ladža-* in Khudlovo and Serednie, viz. *asangl'il-*, *darangl'il-*, *ladžangl'il-* in Khudlovo and *asand'il-*, *darand'il-*, *ladžand'il-* in Serednie. Synchronically, however, they represent perfective (i.e. inflectional) forms rather than derivations (see 3.2.2.1.2 for more details).

3.5.1.4 Iteratives

The iterative is a kind of lexical-aspectual (aktionsart) modification of verbs. In contrast to the valency-changing derivation, the iterative derivation is highly productive in Eastern Uzh Romani, and iterative verbs may be derived from both inherited and borrowed verbs, as well as from primary (underived) and secondary (derived) verbs. The iterative marker is the suffix *-ker-*, e.g. *čhiv-ker-* is an iterative form of the verb *čhiv-* 'to throw'. The suffix *-ker-* seems to have been grammaticalised from the verb *ker-* 'to do, to make' and is probably descended from one of the causative markers of Proto-Romani (cf. Matras 2002: 124–125; Boretzky and Iglá 2004: 169–170). The iterative function of *-ker-* is a shared innovation of Central Romani dialects.

The iterative may modify the event referred to by the verb in three ways. First, it can act as a frequentative to indicate that the action takes place repeatedly, recurrently or habitually. Thus, *čhivker-* can mean 'to repeatedly throw, to be habitually throwing'. Second, it adds an intensive aspect to the action, resulting in a meaning 'to throw with force, to hurl'.⁶⁰ Third, it can indicate multiplicity of participants involved in the action, in particular in reference to patients, i.e. 'to throw lots of items'. It follows that it is not always possible to give an exact meaning of every isolated iterative form, as it depends very much on the broader context in which the iterative form occurs. The meanings of the iteratives mentioned in this section are, therefore, only illustrative and approximate. See the end of this section for sentence examples of various iteratives as they were recorded in spontaneous speech.

The suffix *-ker-* is in most verbs attached directly to the verb base, e.g. *cin-* 'to buy' > *cinker-* 'to repeatedly buy, to do the shopping', *garuv-* 'to hide' > *garuvker-* 'to repeatedly

⁶⁰ In Khudlovo and Serednie, there is also a special intensive verb *icard-* for the meaning 'to hurl', which is missing in Uzhhorod and Perechyn.

hide, to hide for a long time’, *mer-* ‘to die’ > *merker-* ‘to die (about lots of people)’, *vaker-* ‘to talk, to speak’ > *vakerker-* ‘to repeatedly talk, to talk for a long time, to chatter, etc.’ In iteratives of derived verbs, *-ker-* is suffixed to the derivational stem, e.g. *darav-* ‘to threaten, to be jealous’ > *daravker-* ‘to repeatedly/intensively terrify, to threaten lots of people, to be jealous of many people’, *diliñar-* ‘to fool, to manipulate’ > *diliñarker-* ‘to dupe, to hoodwink’, *nasval’uv-* ‘to get ill’ > *nasval’uvker-* ‘to repeatedly get ill’, *terd’ar-* ‘to stop’ > *terd’arker-* ‘to be repeatedly stopping (TR)’, *terd’uv-* ‘to stand’ > *terd’uvker-* ‘to keep stopping (ITR)’. In iteratives of loan verbs, *-ker-* follows the integration suffix *-in-*, e.g. *l’ivin-* (Khudlovo *vil’in-*) ‘to shoot’ > *l’ivinker-* (Khudlovo *vil’inker-*) ‘to shoot many people’, *pisin-* ‘to write’ > *pisinker-* ‘to repeatedly write, to write all over’, *sivin-* ‘to smoke’ > *sivinker-* ‘to regularly smoke’, *zvoñin-* ‘to ring, to call by phone’ > *zvoñinker-* ‘to repeatedly ring/call by phone’. Verbs modified by the Slavic-origin aktionsart prefixes (see 3.5.1.5) also participate in iterative productivity, e.g. *xuť-* ‘to jump’ > *potxuť-* ‘to jump up’ > *potxuťker-* ‘to be constantly jumping up’.

Some morphophonological processes may accompany the iterative derivation. More specifically, the voiced alveolar stop /d/ of the verb base is devoiced before the iterative suffix, e.g. *ispid-* ‘to push, to shove’ > *ispitker-* ‘to repeatedly/vehemently push, to push lots of items’, *kid-* ‘to gather’ > *kitker-* ‘to repeatedly gather, to collect lots of items’, *xud-* ‘to catch, to get, to start’ > *xutker-* ‘to repeatedly catch, to be getting (e.g. a salary), etc.’ However, if another consonant precedes the alveolar stop, /d/ is dropped and *-ker-* is attached to the preceding consonant, e.g. *cird-* ‘to pull’ > *cirker-* ‘to repeatedly pull, to pull many objects, etc.’, *čhand-* ‘to vomit’ > *čhanker-* ‘to intensively vomit’, Khudlovo and Serednie *icard-* ‘to hurl’ > *icarker-* ‘to repeatedly/forcibly hurl’, *phand-* ‘to close, to shut’ > *phanker-* ‘to close (all doors, etc.)’.

In certain groups of verbs, the iterative marker occurs in a complex variant *-avker-* or *-vker-* in which *-ker-* is combined with another suffix *-(a)v-* (see 3.5.1.1 for the casuative marker *-(a)v-*). Distribution of such complex markers is phonologically conditioned. The variant *-avker-* is applied to bases that end either in a velar stop or in a bilabial nasal, e.g. *dikh-* ‘to look at, to see’ > *dikhavker-* ‘to stare at, etc.’, *mang-* ‘to ask for, to demand’ > *mangavker-* ‘to beg’, *muk-* ‘to leave’ > *mukavker-* ‘to leave lots of items etc.’, *pek-* ‘to bake’ > *pekavker-* ‘to bake lots of meals, etc.’, *dem-/lem-* ‘to hit’ >

demavker-/lemavker- ‘to repeatedly/intensively hit, to hammer, etc.’,⁶¹ *kam-* ‘to love’ > *kamavker-* (in a reflexive construction) ‘to intensely love each other, to have sex in a romantic way’. The marker *-avker-* also occurs in the iterative form *davker-* ‘to distribute, to hand out’ from the verb *d-* ‘to give’. The other complex variant *-vker-* occurs in rare iterative forms of vocalic *a*-verbs, e.g. *prelidža-* ‘to translate’ (*lidža-* ‘to carry off’ modified by the aktionsart prefix *pre-*) > *prelidžavker-* ‘to repeatedly translate, to translate many words/sentences.’

Otherwise, most *a*-verbs seem not to be capable of forming iteratives. For example, there are neither iterative forms of the verbs *dža-* ‘to go’ and *xa-* ‘to eat’ nor are there iteratives of psych verbs, such as *asa-* ‘to laugh’, *dara-* ‘to fear’, *ladža-* ‘to feel ashamed’, *troma-* ‘to dare’, etc. Furthermore, the verb *l-* ‘to take’ has no iterative form, as it is blocked by the existence of the verb *kid-* ‘to gather’ and its iterative *kitker-*, and the verb *dža-* ‘to go’ has its lexical iterative *phir-* ‘to go often, to ride’, *phirker-* ‘to travel, etc.’. Modal verbs have no iteratives either except if they are used in a lexical meaning, e.g. the iterative form *kamavker-* of the verb *kam-* is connected to the lexical meaning of ‘to love’ and not to the modal meaning of ‘to want’.

The iterative suffix may also be doubled to express even more intensity or a higher degree of repetitiveness, e.g. *denaš-* ‘to run’ > *denašker-* ‘to run about/around’ > *denaškerker-* ‘to run to and fro ceaselessly, etc.’, *mor-* ‘to wash’ > *morker-* ‘to intensively wash, to do the laundry’ > *morkerker-* ‘to wash lots of laundry, etc.’, *rosčhiv-* ‘to scatter’ > *rosčhivker-* ‘to scatter about’ > *rosčhivkerker-* ‘to extremely scatter about, to scatter a large amount of objects, etc.’

Two verbs *čhinger-* ‘to cut up, to cut into pieces’ and *phager-* ‘to break up, to break into pieces’ are iterative forms of the respective verbs *čhin-* ‘to cut’ and *phag-* ‘to break’ with irregular iterative suffixes *-ger-* and *-er-* respectively. However, they are lexicalised now and can form the regular double iteratives *čhingerker-* ‘tear up, etc.’ and *phagerker-* ‘to smash many things, etc.’ respectively. Another lexicalised iterative is *košker-* ‘to curse’, which has lost its primary, non-iterative verb **koš-* (3SG **košel*). It means that *košker-* is to be synchronically considered a primary verb in which the iterative suffix has become part of the root.

Several examples of spontaneous sentences that contain iteratives follow. Note that (81) and (83) contain double iteratives.

⁶¹ Note that the perfective stem of *dem-/lem-* is *demad-/lemad-*, which is based on an underlying non-perfective form *demav-/lemav-* (see 3.2.2.1.1.8).

- (80) *but phuvre manuša mer-ker-d-e* (UzhhR)
 many old.PL people.PL die-ITER-PFV-3PL
 ‘Many old people have died.’
- (81) *džan te čovr-ker-ker-en* (UzhhR)
 go.3PL NCOMP steal-ITER-ITER-INF
 ‘They are going to repeatedly steal multiple things.’
- (82) *čhiv-ker-d-a les tejle langes* (UzhhS)
 throw-ITER-PFV-3SG he.ACC down naked.ACC.SG.M
 ‘He forcibly stripped him naked.’
- (83) *phir-ker-l-as khatar okārik,*
 go_often -ITER-3SG-REM everywhere
pal o kher denaš-ker-ker-l-as (UzhhS)
 over ART house run-ITER-ITER-3SG-REM
 ‘He was walking everywhere, running to and fro throughout the house.’
- (84) *cejlo d’ives adād’ive rov-ker-l-as* (Per)
 whole day today weep-ITER-3SG-REM
 ‘He was weeping all the day today.’
- (85) *na hordin-ker ke ma nič tijro* (Per)
 NEG carry-ITER[IMP.2SG] at/to I.LOC nothing your
 ‘Don’t bring anything of yours (repeatedly/in a large amount) to me.’
- (86) *e vojna džalas, oj rodzin-ker-l-as le*
 ART war go.IPF/POT.3SG she give_birth- ITER-3SG-REM ART
čhavōren (Khu)
 child.DIM.ACC.PL
 ‘The war was going on, she was giving birth to children.’
- (87) *phag-er-d-e, labar-ker-d-’ o khera adaj*
 break-ITER-PFV-3PL burn-ITER-PFV-3PL ART house.PL here
amenge (Khu)
 we.DAT
 ‘They broke and burnt our houses (in a large number) here.’
- (88) *ov igen nasval’-uv-ker-l-as* (Ser)
 he very ill-INCH-ITER-3SG-REM
 ‘He got repeatedly very ill.’
- (89) *ta kecivar leske te lačhar-ker-av* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 so how_many_times he.DAT NCOMP make_bed-ITER-1SG
 ‘So how many times should I make the bed for him?’

3.5.1.5 Prefixal verb modifications

A characteristic feature of Romani dialects that have been in prolonged contact with North Slavic languages, such as the North Central and the Northeastern Romani dialects, is a large-scale adoption of Slavic aktionsart prefixes. In Slavic, the aktionsart prefixes have been grammaticalised from prepositions and play an important role in aspectual inflection (e.g. Kopečný et al. 1973), whereas in Romani they are purely derivational means that modify the semantic, sometimes also morphosyntactic, properties of the verbs. In Eastern Uzh Romani, they represent one of the most substantial ways of enriching the verb lexicon.

Verbs modified by aktionsart prefixes often calque aktionsart forms in Slavic languages, and may, therefore, represent pattern borrowing in addition to matter borrowing of prefixes (see Matras and Sakel 2007 and Sakel 2007 for distinguishing both types of borrowing). For example, *pre-ačh-* ‘to cease’, derived from inherited *ačh-* ‘to become, to remain’, copies the structural pattern of *p(e)re-*[become] of Slavic languages, cf. Slovak *pre-stať*, Russian *nepe-ctamb*. Another very common example is *po-per-* ‘to get somewhere’, which is modelled on East Slavic *po-*[fall]; cf. Russian *no-nacmb* and Ukrainian *no-nacmu*. The prefix may also be part of an entire Slavic loan verb, as in *zapriťin-/ zaprišin-* ‘to forbid’ from Russian *zampemumb* (1SG *zampeuy*), but such direct loan verbs do not belong to the internal derivational system and will not be considered in the following discussions. However, if the prefix is combined with a Slavic-origin verb that also occurs without any prefix, such as *končin-* ‘to finish’ ~ *dokončin-* ‘to complete’ (cf. Slovak *končiť* ~ *dokončiť*), the aktionsart prefix is segmentable in the Romani form (*do-končin-*), and it can be considered part of the Romani derivational system.

Some verbs modified by aktionsart prefixes may be, to some degree, predictable in their meaning. For example, the prefix *roz-* (including its allomorph *ros-*) usually indicates dissolution or removal or movement apart of an action, which is clear in the verb *rozdža-* ‘to disjoin, to divorce’ derived from *dža-* ‘to go’. Still, the meaning of many verbs is not predictable in such a straightforward way, as in *rosker-* ‘to spend money’ from *ker-* ‘to do, to make’. Alongside purely semantic modifications, morphosyntactic properties may also be modified. Some verbs, e.g. the mentioned *rozdža-*, only occur in formally reflexive constructions (*reflexive tantum*; see 12.3.2), in contrast to the non-reflexive employment of their verb bases, while in other verbs, a change of valency or argument structure may take place in aktionsart modifications, e.g. *čovr-* ‘to steal’, whose direct object refers to the stolen item, as against *opčovr-* ‘to rob’, in which the direct object refers to the patient affected by stealing.

3.5.1.5.2 The prefix *ob-*

The prefix *ob-* (*op-* before voiceless consonants) is borrowed from the Slavic prefix *ob-* (Russian/Ukrainian *оb-*). It has the basic meaning of ‘around’ (‘circum-’) but many verbs marked by *ob-* have rather unpredictable and largely lexicalised meaning; cf. *ačh-* ‘to become’ > *obačh-* ‘to emerge, to happen’, *dža-* ‘to go’ > *obdža-* ‘to go around, to bypass’, reflexive ‘to do without, to dispense with’, *čovr-* ‘to steal’ > *opčovr-* ‘to rob’, *diliñar-* ‘to fool, to manipulate (somebody)’ > *obdiliñar-* ‘to deceive’, *xud-* ‘to catch, etc.’ > *opxud-* ‘to embrace, to hug’, etc.

- (91) *op-xudel* *mijre romes* (Ser)
 AKT-catch.PRS.3SG my husband.ACC
 ‘He gives my husband a hug.’

3.5.1.5.3 The prefix *od-*

The prefix *od-* (*ot-* before voiceless consonants) has its closest counterparts in West Slavic languages (cf. Czech/Slovak/Polish *od-*) and in local Ukrainian (Rusyn) dialects in Transcarpathia (*oð-* as opposed to Standard Ukrainian *oid-*; cf. also Russian *om-*). It basically expresses detachment, separation or removal (‘away’); cf. *ačh-* ‘to become, to remain’ > *odačh-* ‘to separate, to detach’, *dža-* ‘to go’ > *oddža-* ‘to make way, to step aside’, *l-* ‘to take’ > *odl-* ‘to take away, to remove’. In addition, it can indicate an action opposite to that of the base verb, as in *sikl'uv-* ‘to learn’ > *otsikl'uv-* ‘to unlearn’, or accomplishment of an initiated action, as in *mor-* ‘to wash’ > *odmor-* ‘to finish washing’, *xa-* ‘to eat’ > *otxa-* ‘to finish eating’.

- (92) *me od-ačhil'om* *ola lubňatar* (UzhhS)
 I AKT-become.AOR.1SG DEM whore.ABL
 ‘I split up from that whore.’
- (93) *tumen mā ot-xāl'an?* (Per)
 you.PL already AKT-eat.AOR.2PL
 ‘Have you (PL) finished eating yet?’

Here also belongs the verb *o(t)thov-* ‘to put aside, to hide’, which has developed through prefixal modification of *thov-* ‘to put’ with common simplification of the consonant cluster (*otthov-* > *othov-*). In Perechyn and Serednie, this verb in its extended meaning ‘to

hide’ seems to have already ousted the inherited verb *garuv-*, while in the other varieties, both *garuv-* and *othov-* are used side by side.

3.5.1.5.4 The prefix *po-*

The prefix *po-* has its source in the Slavic prefix *po-* (Russian/Ukrainian *no-*). It usually indicates limitation or partialness of an action, in addition to its occurrence in verbs with more lexicalised meanings; cf. *beš-* ‘to sit’ > *pobeš-* ‘to sit (down) for a while’, *cird-* ‘to pull’ > *pocird-* ‘to give a pull, to pull a bit’, *d-* ‘to give’ > *pod-* ‘to hand, to serve up’, *per-* ‘to fall’ > *popper-* ‘to get into’, *vaker-* ‘to speak’ > *povaker-* ‘to speak for a little while, to have a talk/word’.

- (94) *sar tu ade po-pejʎal ?* (common)^{LQCR}
 how you here AKT-fall.AOR.2SG
 ‘How have you got here?’

3.5.1.5.5 The prefix *pod-*

The prefix *pod-* (*pot-* before voiceless consonants) corresponds to the Slavic prefix *pod-* (Russian *nod-*, but in Ukrainian *nið-*). It modifies the meaning of verbs in a variety of ways, such as movement from the bottom upwards, as in *bāruv-* ‘to grow’ > *podbāruv-* ‘to grow up’, *xut-* ‘to jump’ > *potxut-* ‘to jump up’, approaching an entity, as in *av-* ‘to come’ > *podav-* ‘to approach’, *kapčīn-* ‘to button, to switch on’ > *potkapčīn-* ‘to connect, to plug in’, or drawing an analogy, as in *ker-* ‘to do, to make’ > *potker-* ‘to forge, to duplicate’. Many verbs with the prefix have rather unpredictable meanings, cf. *līker-* ‘to hold, to keep’ > *podlīker-* ‘to support’, *phen-* ‘to tell’ > *potphen-* ‘to advise’.

- (95) *amen pod-līkeras le manušes,*
 we AKT-hold.PRS.1PL ART man.ACC
hoj te n’ ejl leha bida (Uzhhs)
 FCOMP NCOMP NEG COP.PRS.SBJV.3SG he.INST trouble
 ‘We support a man so that he is not in trouble.’
- (96) *o doxtoris ke ma aňi na pod-avla* (Ser)
 ART physician at/to I.LOC not_even NEG AKT-come.FUT.3SG
 ‘The physician does not even approach me.’

3.5.1.5.6 The prefix *pre-*

The prefix *pre-* has the highest range of functions out of all verb prefixes. It is because it originates in three different Slavic prefixes *pri-*, *pro-* and *per-* (> *p(e)re-*), which are all represented by this single prefix in Eastern Uzh Romani, and verb forms marked by this prefix may consequently have very different meanings. Therefore, individual functions of *pre-* will be discussed separately, along the original Slavic prefixes.

- (i) Corresponding to Slavic *pri-* (Slovak *pri-*, Czech *při-*, Polish *przy-*, Russian/Ukrainian *npu-*), the prefix *pre-* expresses a movement of an action ‘towards’,⁶³ e.g. *cird-* ‘to pull’ > *precird-* ‘to pull something closer’, *denaš-* ‘to run’ > *predenaš-* ‘to come running’, *l-* ‘to take’ > *prel-* ‘to accept, to entertain the guests’, *pisin-* ‘to write’ > *prepisin-* ‘to add in writing; to register’, *phand-* ‘to close, to tie’ > *prephand-* ‘to band/tie (something) to (something)’. See also sentence (101) below.

- (97) *vaesar ke lende pre-denaš'la cikno rukono* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 somehow at/to they.LOC AKT-run.AOR.3SG small dog
 ‘A small dog somehow came to them running.’

- (ii) Corresponding to Slavic *pro-* (Slovak *pre-*, Czech *pro-*, Polish *prze-* (in relics *pro-*), Russian/Ukrainian *npo-*), it conveys an idea of an action that passes through an entity or takes place thoroughly; *cind'uv-* ‘to get wet’ > *precind'uv-* ‘to thoroughly get drenched’, *dikh-* ‘to see, to look at’ > *predikh-* ‘to look through, to examine’, *dživ-* ‘to live’ > *predživ-* ‘to live through, to pass through life’, *muk-* ‘to leave’ > *premuk-* ‘to let through, to leak; to release’, *pisin-* ‘to write’ > *prepisin-* ‘to thoroughly write’.

- (98) *džav man te pre-dikhen ko doxtoris* (UzhhS)
 go.PRS.1SG I.ACC NCOMP AKT-see.INF at/to physician
 ‘I am going to the physician to get examined.’

- (iii) Corresponding to Slavic *per-* > *p(e)re-* (Slovak *pre-*, Czech *pře-*, Polish *prze-*, Russian/Ukrainian *nepe-*), the prefix *pre-* indicates a movement ‘across’, ‘over’ or to

⁶³ The form *pre-* in this function has developed through a lowered pronunciation of the vowel [i] in the local Ukrainian form of the prefix [pri]. Confusion and even coalescence of [i] with [e] is attested in Ukrainian dialects and in some frontier Slovak (Sotak) dialects (cf. Zilyns'kyj 1979: 44–50; Čeripková 1995: 33).

an opposite side, as in *beš-* ‘to sit’ > *prebeš-* ‘to change one’s seat’, *d-* ‘to give’ > *pred-* ‘to pass on, to send word (a message, regards, etc.)’, *xut-* ‘to jump’ > *prexut-* ‘to jump over/across’. Following this basic meaning, it may also express abundance of quality (‘over-’), e.g. *mā’uv-* ‘to get drunk’ > *premā’uv-* ‘to overdrink, to get drunk excessively’, *pot’in-* ‘to pay’ > *prepot’in-* ‘to overpay’. Infrequently, the prefix in this function occurs in a form *pere-* (see (100)), which indicates that the East Slavic form might gradually take over this particular function of the prefix *pre-*.

- (99) *ov pre-xu’i’la odā drom* (Per)^{LQCR}
 he AKT-jump.AOR.3SG DEM path
 ‘He jumped across the path.’
- (100) *pere-de tijre druz’jenge privét* (Per)
 AKT-give.IMP.2SG your friend.DAT.PL greeting
 ‘Give my regards to your friends.’

It is obvious that, out of the major North Slavic languages, the prefix *pre-* most closely corresponds to its counterparts in Slovak. In Slovak, two of the three Slavic prefixes, **pro-* and **per-*, coalesced into single *pre-*, and it is only the Slovak prefix *pri-* that differs. In contrast, Eastern Uzh Romani does not share the form of the prefix with any of its Standard Ukrainian or Russian counterparts, barring the rare occurrence of *pere-* instead of *pre-* in its ‘over’-function.

Owing to the polysemy of the prefix *pre-* and its origin in three different Slavic prefixes, individual verbs derived by this prefix often have various meanings. Thus, for example, a verb *pre-dumin-*, derived from the Slavic loan verb *dumin-* ‘to think’, is attested to mean (i) ‘to figure out’ (cf. Russian *при-думать*), (ii) ‘to think through, to consider’ (Russian *про-думать*), and (iii) ‘to change one’s mind’ (Russian *пере-думать*). The (i) and (iii) meanings of the verb are illustrated in the following sentences from a single speaker:

- (101) *na perežin , tosāra vareso pre-duminaha* (Ser)^{RDZ}
 NEG worry[IMP.2SG] morning something AKT-think.FUT.1PL
 ‘Don’t worry, we will figure out something in the morning.’

- (102) *me imā pre-dumind'om tut te len*
 I already AKT-think.AOR.1SG you.ACC NCOMP take.INF
romňake (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 wife.DAT
 'I have already changed my mind about marrying you.'

3.5.1.5.7 The prefix *roz-*

The prefix *roz-* (*ros-* before voiceless consonants), like its Slavic source *raz-/roz-* (< **orz-*; Slovak/Czech/Polish *roz-*, Russian *раз-*, Ukrainian *роз-*; cf. Kopečný et al. 1973: 145–149), usually expresses a movement apart, splitting, dissolution or disposal; cf. *biken-* (*bikin-*) 'to sell' > *rozbiken-* (*rozbikin-*) 'to sell off', *dža-* 'to go' > *rozdža-* (reflexive) 'to disjoin, to divorce', *ker-* 'to do, to make' > *rosker-* 'to spend (money)', *mār-* 'to beat' > *rozmār-* 'to smash', *uxan-* 'to comb' > *rozuxan-* 'to disentangle the hair'.

- (103) *mā čirla pen roz-gejle* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 already long_ago REFL.PL AKT-go.AOR.3PL
 'They already divorced a long time ago.'

3.5.1.5.8 The prefix (*i*)*z-*

The prefix (*i*)*z-* has its source in two Proto-Slavic prefixes **jьz-* and **ѕь(n)-*, which in most North Slavic languages merged together (Czech/Slovak/Polish *s-/z-*, Russian *uc-/уз-*, Ukrainian *c-/з-*, rarer (in dialects) also *ic-/із-*; cf. Kopečný et al. 1973: 76–82, 244–255). The vocalic form *iz-* is optional before bases that begin in a consonant (*is-* before voiceless consonants), while bases that begin in a vowel always contain the consonantal variant *z-*. The prefix expresses exhaustion of an action, cf. *ker-* 'to do, to make' > *sker-* or *isker-* 'to manufacture, to carry out', *labuv-* 'to burn' (ITR) > *zlabuv-* or *izlabuv-* 'to burn down', movement together, cf. *kid-* 'to gather' > *skid-* or *iskid-* 'to collect together', reflexive 'to assemble, to meet', *dža-* 'to go' > *izdža*⁶⁴ reflexive 'to get together, to meet', or movement downwards, as in *učhar-* 'to cover' > *zučhar-* 'to blanket'.

- (104) *o kher z-labi'la* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 ART house AKT-burn.AOR.3SG
 'The house burned down.'

⁶⁴ The form *zdža-* with the consonantal prefix is unattested in Eastern Uzh Romani, even though it is common in Western Uzh varieties in Slovakia.

- (105) *lengero kher iz-labi'la* (Per)^{LQCR}
 their house AKT-burn.AOR.3SG
 'Their house burned down.'

3.5.1.5.9 The prefix *za-*

The prefix *za-*, borrowed from the common Slavic prefix *za-* (Russian/Ukrainian *za-*), occurs in verbs with a variety of meanings. The frequent function of the prefix is to indicate inception of an action; cf. *diliňal'uv-* 'to be mad/crazy' > *zadiliňal'uv-* 'to go mad, to start being crazy', *labar-* 'to burn' > *zalabar-* 'to set on fire', *sov-* 'to sleep' > *zasov-* 'to fall asleep', or a punctual and sudden action (semelfactive), such as *asa-* 'to laugh' > *zaasa-* 'to smile (once), to give a laugh (suddenly)', *āsvin-* (Radvanka *āsmi-*) 'to be filled with tears' > *zaāsvin-* (*zaāsmi-*) 'to get filled with tears for a short while or suddenly', *ladža-* 'to feel ashamed' > *zalahža-* 'to become ashamed for a short while or suddenly', etc. Still, many verbs prefixed by *za-* occur in rather lexicalised meanings, e.g. *ačh-* 'to become, to remain' > *zaačh-* 'to stand up (for somebody), to advocate', *rod-* 'to look for, to search' > *zarod-* 'to earn money'.

- (106) *o jākha mange za-āsmind'a* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 ART eye.PL I.DAT AKT-be_filled_with_tears.AOR.3SG
 'My eyes suddenly filled with tears.'

- (107) *one kanāke duminen pal o lovve,*
 they now think.PRS.3PL about ART money
sar te za-rodnen lovve (Per)
 how NCOMP AKT-search.INF money
 'Now they think about money, how to earn money.'

3.5.2 Deadjectival and denominal verbs

Eastern Uzh Romani has a productive morphology for deriving causative and inchoative verbs from adjectives, partly also from nouns. My discussion of deadjectival and denominal verb derivation, which is very close to the valency-changing morphology dealt with in earlier sections, is largely inspired by Hübschmannová and Bubeník (1997) and Bubeník and Hübschmannová (1998), who discuss such morphology in closely related North and South Central Romani dialects of Slovakia. Following their terminology, I will refer to the deadjectival and denominal causative verbs as 'factitives'. A description of factitive and inchoative derivation will be followed by notes on several unique denominal verbs that exhibit various and mostly word-specific derivational devices.

3.5.2.1 Factitives

Factitives are semantically causative verbs derived from adjectives, less commonly from nouns (cf. Hübschmannová and Bubeník 1997; Elšík and Matras 2006: 211), e.g. *bāro* ‘big, adult’ > *bārar-* ‘to make bigger; to bring up’, *xejv* ‘hole’ > *xejvar-* ‘to perforate’. The two main factitive markers in Eastern Uzh Romani are *-ar-* and *-isar-*, which are related to each other as well as to the causative suffix *-ar-* (3.5.1.2).

The suffix *-ar-* mainly occurs in verbs derived from inherited (oikoclitic) adjectives. Application of the suffix triggers palatalisation of the velar and alveolar consonants of the adjectival base /k, g t, d, n, l/ which change to /tʃ, dʃ, ɲ, lʃ/, cf. *bango* ‘bent, crooked’ > *band’ar-* ‘to bend, to curve’, *dilino* ‘silly’ > *diliñar-* ‘to fool, to manipulate (somebody)’. Shortening of the root vowel takes place in some verbs, as in *tāto* ‘warm’ > *ta’ar-* ‘to warm’, *šuvko* [ʃu:ko] ‘dry’ > *šu’ar-* ‘to dry’, but not in all verbs, cf. *māto* ‘drunk’ > *mā’ar-* ‘to make drunk’.

The other suffix *-isar-* historically consists of *-ar-* attached to the Greek aorist marker *-is-* (cf. Matras 2002: 124). It entails palatalisation of /n/ and /l/ only and is a highly productive means of deriving transitive verbs from borrowed (xenoclitic) adjectives, such as *cixo* ‘quiet, silent’ (from Slavic) > *cixisar-* ‘to make quiet, to quieten’, *slabo* ‘weak’ (from Slavic) > *slabisar-* ‘to make weaker, to weaken’, *šārgo* ‘yellow’ (from Hungarian) > *šārgisar-* ‘to make yellower, to yellow’, *zdravo* ‘healthy’ (from Slavic) > *zdravisar-* ‘to treat (medically), to medicate’, etc. The suffix also extends to verbs derived from inherited adjectives, which may lead to alternation of a verb in *-ar-* with that in *-isar-*, as in *cikno* ‘small’ > *cikñar-* ~ *cikņisar-* ‘to make smaller, to reduce’, *kovlo* ‘soft’ > *kov’lar-* ~ *kov’lisar-* ‘to make softer, to soften’, *pārno* ‘white’ > *pārñar-* ~ *pārņisar-* ‘to make whiter’. However, the morphological distribution of *-ar-* and *-isar-* is not fully consistent because there are verbs that are derived from inherited adjectives only by *-isar-*, such as *kerko* ‘bitter’ > *kerkisar-* ‘to make bitter’ (instead of **ker’ar-*), as well as there are verbs that are derived from borrowed adjectives by *-ar-*, such as *rovno* ‘straight, unbent’ (from Slavic) > *rovñar-* ‘to straighten, to unbend’ (instead of **rovņisar-*).

There are also cases of two factitive verbs with completely different meanings that are derived from a single adjective. For example, an adjective that means ‘nude, naked’, viz. *lango* in Uzhhorod and *nango* in the other varieties, has its factitive counterparts in (i) *land’ar-* / *nand’ar-* ‘to bathe’ and (ii) *langisar-/nangisar-* ‘to make naked, to denude’. Note that the latter verb in *-isar-* has a meaning predictable from the primary adjective in contrast to the lexicalised verb in *-ar-*.

Derivation from derived adjectives is rare and unproductive, but some forms, especially those based upon qualitative adjectives derived by *-al-*, do occur, e.g. *bokhalo* ‘hungry’ > *bokhal’ar-* ‘to make hungry’. Otherwise, there is a tendency to derive factitive verbs directly from nominal bases rather than from the denominal adjectives, although derivation from nouns is less productive than the deadjectival derivation; cf. *mel* ‘dirt’ > *mel’ar-* ‘to make dirty’ (as against *melalo* ‘dirty’), *xoli* ‘anger’ > *xol’ar-* ~ *xol’isar-* ‘to annoy, to make angry’ (as against *xol’amen* ‘angry’). Some denominal verbs in *-ar-* are not even transitive, e.g. *khañar-* ‘to fart’ from the noun *khañ* ‘fart’, and cf. also a single deadverbial derivation *sig(o)* ‘quickly, soon’ > *sid’ar-* ‘to be in a hurry, to rush’.

In addition to the regular denominal verb *xejvar-* ‘to perforate’ (from the noun *xeljv* ‘hole’), which occurs in both Uzhhorod varieties, there is a unique verb *xevl’ar-* of the same meaning with the suffix *-l’ar-* attested in all varieties except in Radvanka (note the suffix *-l’ar-* in several causatives such as *rovl’ar-* ‘to make weep’ and *sovl’ar-* ‘to make sleep’ discussed in 3.5.1.2).

3.5.2.2 Inchoatives

In this section, I will deal with deadjectival and denominal derivation of inchoative verbs, i.e. of verbs that mean ‘to become XY’ with XY being the meaning of the adjectival or nominal base, e.g. adjective *bāro* ‘big’ > *bāruv-* ‘to become big; to grow’, noun *rāti* ‘night’ > *rāt’uv-* ‘to become night’.

Like the factitive derivation, the inchoative derivation is very productive in Eastern Uzh Romani as almost any underived qualitative adjective may participate in it. The morphology of inchoative verbs derived from oikoclitic adjectives (see 5.1.1) is similar to the anticausative morphology discussed above: inchoatives are middle *uv-*verbs that contain the adjectival base. Palatalisation of the alveolar or velar consonant of the adjectival base and sometimes the word-specific shortening of long vowels occurs in a similar way as in the deadjectival factitives (cf. 3.5.2.1), e.g. *bango* ‘bent, crooked’ > *band’uv-* ‘to bend, to curve’, *māto* ‘drunk’ > *māt’uv-* ‘to get drunk’, *nasvalo* ‘ill’ > *nasval’uv-* ‘to become ill’, *šuvko* ‘dry’ > *šut’uv-* ‘to become dry’, *tāto* ‘warm’ > *ta’uv-* ‘to get warm’. In inchoative derivation from borrowed xenoclitic adjectives (5.1.2), a special inchoative marker *-isal-* is suffixed to the adjectival base, e.g. *hluxo* ‘deaf’ (from Slavic) > *hluxisal’uv-* ‘to become deaf’, *slabo* ‘weak’ (from Slavic) > *slabisal’uv-* ‘to become weaker, to lose strength’, *šārgo* ‘yellow’ (from Hungarian) > *šārgisal’uv-* ‘to become yellow’, *zdravo* ‘healthy’ (from Slavic) > *zdravisal’uv-* ‘to recover’.

The inchoative suffix *-isal-* is related to the factitive suffix *-isar-* in that it contains the Greek aorist marker *-is-*, while its second part is probably descended from the historical perfective stem **avil-* of the verb *av-* ‘to come’, which was grammaticalised as one of the intransitive markers in Late Proto-Romani (cf. Matras 2002: 126–127). The occurrence of the suffix *-isal-* in inchoative verbs largely corresponds to that of *-isar-* in factitives. It is a productive means for deriving inchoatives from borrowed adjectives (see the previous paragraph) and extends to some verbs derived from oikoclitic adjectives as well, e.g. *ňerno* ‘sober’ > *ňerňisal’uv-* ‘to get sober’, *phuvro* ‘old’ > *phu(v)risal’uv-* ‘to get old’ (rarer *ňerňuv-* and *phuruv-* are still attested in Khudlovo), sometimes resulting in common alternations, such as *cikno* ‘small’ > *cikňuv-* ~ *cikňisal’uv-* ‘to become smaller’, *lovlo* ‘red’ > *lov’uv-* ~ *lov’isal’uv-* ‘to become/turn red’. A number of inchoatives derived from oikoclitic adjectives always contain *-isal-*, e.g. *koro* ‘blind’ > *korisal’uv-* ‘to go blind’ (never **koruv-*), and there is at least one deadjectival verb in which the inchoative suffix occurs in the form *-al-* without a reflex of the Greek aorist suffix, viz. *dilino* ‘silly’ > *diliňal’uv-* ‘to become a fool, to go stupid’, which also has a common haplological form *diňal’uv-*. Note that the adjective *barvalo* ‘rich’ has three inchoative verbs attested; in addition to the regular *barval’uv-* (109) and *barval’isal’uv-* (108), there is a reanalysed form *barvisal’uv-* in Khudlovo (110), in which *-al-* of the base adjective *barvalo* is missing:

- | | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|--------------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| (108) | <i>ov</i> | <i>kamel</i> | <i>te</i> | <i>barval’isal’on</i> | (Uzhhs) ^{LQCR} |
| | he | want.PRS.3SG | NCOMP | rich.INCH.INF | |
| (109) | <i>ov</i> | <i>kamel</i> | <i>te</i> | <i>barval’on</i> | (Per.Ser) ^{LQCR} |
| | he | want.PRS.3SG | NCOMP | rich.INCH.INF | |
| (110) | <i>ov</i> | <i>kamel</i> | <i>te</i> | <i>barvisal’on</i> | (Khu) ^{LQCR} |
| | he | want.PRS.3SG | NCOMP | rich.INCH.INF | |
| | | | | ‘He wants to become rich.’ | |

Inchoative derivation from derived adjectives is unproductive, being restricted to verbs derived from some qualitative adjectives in *-al-*, such as *bokhalo* ‘hungry’ > *bokhal’uv-* ‘to starve’, *melalo* ‘dirty’ > *mel’al’uv-* ‘to get dirty’ (as against the denominal transitive derivation *mel’ar-* ‘to make dirty’). An example of a lexicalised inchoative is *lov’uv-*, which is derived from *lovko* ‘light’ but has been lexicalised in the meaning ‘to give birth’. The semantic development of this verb probably goes back to Proto-Romani because the identical meaning is attested in its cognates in other Romani dialects (cf. Boretzky and Igla 1994: 168). Another

lexicalised inchoative is *land'uv-* (in Uzhhorod) and *nand'uv-* (elsewhere) ‘to have a bath’, whose base adjective is *lango/nango* ‘naked’ (see the discussion on the factitives *land'ar-/nand'ar-* as opposed to *langisar-/nangisar-* in 3.5.2.1 above).

Denominal inchoative derivation is less productive than that from primary adjectives but there are common derivations such as *xol'i* ‘anger’ > *xol'isal'uv-* ‘to get angry’ and *rāt'i* ‘night’ > *rāt'uv-* or *rāt'isal'uv-* ‘to become night, to get dark’. In addition to *xol'isal'uv-*, remarkable inchoative verbs *xol'amisal'uv-* and *xol'imisal'uv-*, which seem to be contaminated by *xol'ame(n)* ‘angry’, are attested in Radvanka and Sereďnie respectively. Two competing inchoative verbs from *d'ives* ‘day’ are also noteworthy: *d'ivesal'uv-* ‘to dawn’, which contains the inchoative suffix *-al-* (cf. the aforementioned *diliňal'uv-* from *dilino*), and *d'ivisal'uv-* of the same meaning, which has probably developed due to contamination of *d'ivesal'uv-* by the regular inchoatives in *-isal-*. In individual varieties, some other unique denominal derivations occur, e.g. *darisal'uv-* ‘to become afraid, to get scared’ from *dar* ‘fear’ in Radvanka and *suvňuv-* ‘to be dreamed about’ from *suvno* ‘dream’ in Perechyn and sporadically in Radvanka.

3.5.2.3 Marginal denominal derivations

Alongside the derivational strategies of factitives and inchoatives, which are related to valency-changing morphology, several other denominal derivations occur in the dialect. Since such derivations are often restricted to a handful of verbs, they will be described as ‘marginal derivations’.

First, some verbs shared with related Romani dialects are unproductive denominal derivations, e.g. *dand* ‘tooth’ > *dander-* ‘to bite’, which is common in many Romani dialects, and *gil'i* ‘song’ > *gil'av-* ‘to sing’, which is typical of North Central Romani.

Furthermore, a few verbs are derived from inherited nouns through the mediation of the loan-verb integration suffixes *-in-* and *-āl'in-* (3.2.3). The former suffix *-in-* occurs in *āsvin-* (Radvanka *āsmín-*) ‘to be filled with tears’ (from *āsvin/āsva* (Radvanka *āsma*) ‘tear’) and *thuvín-* ‘to give off smoke’ (from *thuv* ‘smoke’), while the latter extended suffix *-āl'in-* occurs in the unique verb *čhibāl'in-* ‘to be impudent/cheeky’ from the noun *čhib* ‘tongue’.

Finally, a derivational marker *-āzin-*, which consists of a suffix *-āz-* of Hungarian origin and the loan-verb integration suffix *-in-*, occurs in *lubňāzin-* ‘to frequent prostitutes, to behave as a whoremonger’ from the inherited noun *lubňi* ‘whore’. This derivation is probably modelled upon a pair of Hungarian loanwords that are synonymous to *lubňi* and *lubňāzin-*, viz. *kurva* (from Hungarian *kurva*) and *kurvāzin-* (from Hungarian *kurváz*) respectively. Other internal derivations in *-āzin-* are rarely attested and may represent occasional nonce

formations, e.g. the verb *pivāzin-* ‘to drink beer (as part of a drinking-bout)’ from a Slavic loan noun *pivos* ‘beer’ has been recorded in Shakhta.

4 NOUNS

This chapter addresses the morphology of nouns. It consists of two subchapters that discuss inflectional and derivational noun patterns respectively.

4.1 Noun inflection

Eastern Uzh Romani possesses the general properties of noun inflection inherited from Late Proto-Romani, which are characteristic of Romani in general (cf. Elšík 2000a; Matras 2002: 72). Such properties include two number (singular and plural) and two gender (masculine and feminine) categories, both of which are encoded in cumulative suffixes, compartmentalisation of all nouns into two stocks and a layered system of case marking (see also Matras 1997).

The grammatical gender is an intrinsic property of a noun. It plays an essential role in noun classification and is reflected in the agreement of modifiers with their nominal head. Compartmentalisation is a distinctive feature of Romani, which divides all nouns into two compartments on the basis of their different encoding, which, to a great degree, coincides with the origin of lexemes (native and Asian loanwords versus more recent loanwords from European languages). The two compartments were formerly labelled ‘thematic’ and ‘athematic’ (Hancock 1995: 54; see also Bakker 1997; Elšík 2000a; Matras 2002: 73). The concept of thematicity was largely inspired by Indo-Aryan and Indo-European linguistics, where it is understood slightly differently, however. Since Elšík and Matras (2006), the two terms have been replaced by ‘oikoclitic’ and ‘xenoclitic’ respectively, which are the terms I will adhere to in this dissertation. The oikoclitic compartment comprises indigenous Indo-Aryan words and loanwords from West Asian (Iranian, Armenian, Georgian) languages, and even some early Greek loanwords, while the xenoclitic compartment contains loanwords from European languages, including some presumably later Greek loanwords.

The Romani case marking is represented in three different structural layers of varying age (see Matras 1997 following Masica 1991; cf. also Zograf 1976). Layer I, which reflects inflectional material of Old and Middle Indo-Aryan and, ultimately, that of Proto-Indo-European, consists of cumulative morphemes encoding gender, number and three case categories (the nominative, the oblique stem and the vocative). It is at this level that the aforementioned compartmentalisation, as well as a more subtle noun classification, are manifested. Layer II comprises agglutinative case suffixes grammaticalised from erstwhile postpositions (see Friedman 1991), which are attached to the Layer I oblique stem to encode various case relations. Finally, Layer III consists of analytic markers, some of which have been grammaticalised from adverbs; Layer III is, therefore, not part of the inflectional

morphology. As in most other Romani dialects, Layer III in Eastern Uzh Romani is represented by prepositions, which will be discussed in a separate chapter in 11.2. In what follows, I will deal with the Layer I case morphology, with the main attention devoted to issues of noun classification. Then, a survey of Layer II case suffixes will be provided. Functions and morphosyntactic properties of individual cases will be discussed in 11.1.1.

4.1.1 Layer I

Three case categories are expressed in Layer I: the ‘default’ nominative, the oblique stem and the vocative. The vocative has its own peculiarities: it will be described in a separate section (4.1.2) in more detail, but disregarded in the following discussion. In addition, gender and number are encoded in the same markers as the case, so that the Layer I markers are cumulative suffixes of three grammatical categories. The suffixes differ in each compartment and they also differ within each compartment according to further noun classes. In fact, noun classification can be established on the basis of the Layer I suffixes.

The nominative singular is marked either by a zero suffix, e.g. *phral-Ø* [brother-NOM.SG.M], *pheñ-Ø* [sister-NOM.SG.F], or by an overt suffix, e.g. *mār-o* [bread-NOM.SG.M], *bab-a* [grandmother-NOM.SG.F]. The nominative plural is almost always overtly marked, e.g. *phral-a*, *pheñ-a*, *mār-e*, *bab-i*. The only, rather marginal, exception is a class of abstract nouns, which are attested with the zero marking in the nominative plural alongside their overt marking, e.g. *gulipen-Ø* [sweets-NOM.SG.M or sweets-NOM.PL] alongside *gulipen-a* [sweets-NOM.PL] (see 4.1.1.1.2).

The oblique stem serves as a base for adding the Layer II case suffixes, e.g. *phral-es* [brother-OBL.SG.M], *phral-es-ke* [brother-OBL.SG.M-DAT] ‘to a brother’ (cf. 4.1.3). The oblique stem may also occur ‘independently’ of other overt case suffixes, viz. with the zero suffix in what is often referred to as ‘accusative’ in Romani descriptions (cf. Elšík 2000a: 13) due to its important role in marking the animate direct object (see 11.1.1.2), e.g. *phral-es-Ø* [brother-OBL.SG.M-ACC]. In very few instances, the accusative form may be identical to the nominative one but different from the oblique stem. This is attested for some polysyllabic oikoclitic zero masculines ending in [aj] (see also 4.1.1.1.3), such as *xulaj* ‘landlord, owner’ and *rašaj* ‘priest’, which may optionally retain their nominative form in the accusative contexts (see (1)), while their oblique forms *xul-as-/xulaj-es-* and *raš-as/rašaj-es-* occur with Layer II markers, as in (2). The same situation occurs in some non-integrated masculine loanwords that end in a consonant (see 4.1.1.3.4).

- (1) *me dikhav le xulaj (Ser)^{etr}*
 I see.PRS.1SG ART.OBL landlord[NOM/ACC.SG.M]
 ‘I see the landlord’

as against

- (2) *me phuč'om le xul-as-tar (Ser)^{etr}*
 I ask.AOR.1SG ART.OBL landlord-OBL.SG.M-ABL
 ‘I asked the landlord’

In the oblique singular marking, an interesting difference between the two compartments may be noticed. Whereas in the oikoclitic compartment, the oblique stem marking differs from the nominative marking (with the exception mentioned in the preceding paragraph), both the nominative and the oblique are identical in the xenoclitic compartment, which holds true for both masculine and feminine nouns. A commonality for all masculine nouns in both compartments and all classes is that their oblique singular marker possesses a sibilant segment [s], while all feminine nouns, irrespective of the compartment and class, are marked by *-a-* in the oblique singular. At the same time, all oblique singular masculine suffixes have allomorphs in forms in which this sibilant segment is deleted. Such allomorphs are applied before the Layer II instrumental suffix *-ha*, as in *phral-e-ha* [brother-OBL.SG.M-INST] versus *phral-es-tar* [brother-OBL.SG.M-ABL]. Historically, the instrumental suffix was **-sa* (cf. Elšík and Matras 2006: 73), e.g. **phral-es-sa*.

The oblique stem plural marker is the least differentiated of all Layer I markers. It occurs in a single form *-en-* across all nouns, irrespective of the compartment and class, e.g. *phral-en-*, *pheñ-en-*, although it may be extended by a further segment in certain nouns. If such an extension occurs, it characterises both the nominative and oblique of the plural number, e.g. *papu-ja* [grandfather-NOM.PL], *papu-jen* [grandfather-OBL.PL], *tanitov-va* [teacher-NOM.PL], *tanitov-ven* [teacher-OBL.PL], *rokl'-ija* [skirt-NOM.PL], *rokl'-ijen-* [skirt-OBL.PL].

In the following, a detailed classification of nouns on the basis of their Layer I suffixes will be discussed.

4.1.1.1 Oikoclitic masculine nouns

Oikoclitic masculine nouns may differ among themselves with respect to the NOM.SG marking (zero, *-o* or *-i*), which serves as the main criterion for classification of oikoclitic masculines into three basic classes. Other differences may occur within the classes with respect to the OBL.SG marking (*-es-* or *-as-*) and to the NOM.PL marking (*-a* or *-e*, rarely zero), which allows

further subclassification of the three classes. The OBL.PL marking in *-en-* is common to all oikoclitic masculines. See Table 25.

Idiosyncratic inflection of a peculiar noun *čha* ‘son, Romani boy’, unshown in Table 25, will be discussed in 4.1.1.1.3 below.

Table 25: Inflection of oikoclitic masculines

CLASS	NOM.SG	OBL.SG	NOM.PL	OBL.PL	MEANING
-∅	<i>rom</i>	<i>rom-es-</i>	<i>rom-a</i>	<i>rom-en-</i>	Rom, husband
	<i>dživipe(n)</i>	<i>dživipn-as-</i>	<i>dživip(en)-a</i> <i>dživipe(n)</i>	<i>dživipn-en-</i>	life
	<i>rašaj</i>	<i>raš-as-</i>	<i>rašaj-a</i>	<i>rašaj-en-</i>	priest
-o	<i>kirv-o</i>	<i>kirv-es-</i>	<i>kirv-e</i>	<i>kirv-en-</i>	godfather
	<i>angušt-o</i>	<i>angušt-es-</i>	<i>angušt-a</i>	<i>angušt-en-</i>	finger, toe
-i	<i>pāñ-i</i>	<i>pāñ-es-</i>	<i>pāñ-a</i>	<i>pāñ-en</i>	water

4.1.1.1.1 Oikoclitic zero masculines

Most oikoclitic masculine nouns lack any NOM.SG marking and are hence called zero masculines. Three subclasses of zero masculines may be distinguished, based on their suffixes in other case forms: (i) the basic underived zero masculines; (ii) the derived abstract nouns in *-(i)pe(n)/-(i)be(n)*; and (iii) some underived masculines ending in [aj].

4.1.1.1.1.1 Basic zero masculines

The majority of underived zero masculines are inflected as *rom* ‘Rom, husband’ (see Table 25) and are described here as the basic zero masculines. They are mostly underived, inherited nouns of Indo-Aryan origin, e.g. *bar* ‘stone’, *čhon* ‘month, moon’, *dand* ‘tooth’, *d'ives* ‘day’, *gad* ‘shirt’, *kham* ‘sun’, *manuš* ‘man, human’, *vudar* ‘door’, etc., plus pre-Greek loanwords, e.g. *čekat* ‘forehead’, *xumer* ‘dough’, *kotor* ‘piece’, *tover* ‘axe’ (cf. Boretzky 1995a), as well as some Greek loanwords, e.g. *drom* ‘journey’ (δρόμος), *kl'igin* ‘padlock’ (κλειδί), *kokal* ‘bone’ (κόκκαλο), *skamin* ‘table’ (σκαμνί ‘bench’; see Boretzky 2012a: 59), etc. In contrast to some other dialects, the zero masculines also include the Indo-Aryan noun *pašvar* ‘rib’ and the Iranian loanword *patav* ‘rag’, which in other dialects may occur as *o*-masculines *pašvar-o* and *patav-o*. This subclass also includes a noun *texan* ‘food, meal’, which has developed through morphologisation of an infinitive phrase *te xan* ‘to eat’ (see 4.2.2.3).

Some zero masculines are affected by phonological restriction on the occurrence of certain consonant clusters, viz. /st/ and /št/, which are simplified into plain sibilants in the

final position (see 2.1.7). This means that nouns such as *trast* ‘metal’, *vast* ‘hand’, *kašt* ‘wood’ and *vušt* ‘lip’ occur as *tras vas*, *kaš* and *vuš* in the NOM.SG, while the alveolar /t/ resurfaces before suffixation, as in NOM.PL *trast-a*, *vast-a*, *kašt-a*, *vušt-a*.

Vowel quality of most zero masculines does not change in different inflectional forms, e.g. *bal* ‘hair’ > NOM.PL *bal-a*, *kān* ‘ear’ > *kān-a*, *phral* ‘brother’ > *phral-a*. Still, *gav* ‘village’, OBL.SG *gav-es-*, is subject to morphonological change of vowel quality in plural forms: NOM.PL *gāv-a*, OBL.PL *gāv-en-*.

Other unique irregularities in inflectional bases may occur in some basic zero masculines. The noun *dejl* ‘God’ has the OBL.SG form *devl-es-* or *dejvl-es-* with the inserted labiodental fricative /v/, which was formerly present in the nominative form as well (cf. *devel* in other dialects; < OIA *devatā-*).⁶⁵ The labiodental fricative also occurs in rare plural forms NOM.PL *dejvl-a* and OBL.PL *devl-en-*. The Greek-origin noun *karfin* ‘nail (fastener)’ (< Greek *καρφί*), OBL.SG *karfin-es-*, has optional plural forms *karf-a* (NOM) and *karf-en-* (OBL), in which *-in-* of the singular forms is lacking, although *karfin-a* and *karfin-en-* are attested as well (in Shakhta and Khudlovo). A peculiar noun is *ternoxār* ‘male adolescent, teenager’, which is a historical compound of *terno* ‘young’ plus the old Romani word for ‘donkey’ **xar*, i.e. it has arisen from a nominal phrase **terno xār* ‘young donkey’.⁶⁶ Its composite origin is evident in alternation of the base *ternoxār* in the NOM.SG with the base *ternexār-* in the other inflectional forms, which mirrors adjective inflection of the first segment *terno-*: OBL.SG *ternexār-es-*, NOM.PL *ternexār-a*, OBL.PL *ternexār-en-*. Levelled forms, such as NOM.PL *ternoxār-a*, also occur sporadically.

4.1.1.1.2 Abstract nouns in *-(i)be(n)* and *-(i)pe(n)*

The other subclass of zero masculines consists of abstract nouns derived by the inherited nominalisers *-(i)be(n)* and *-(i)pe(n)*. Abstract nouns, whose derivation is discussed in (4.2.2.2), are characterised by their distinctive OBL.SG suffix *-as-* instead of *-es-*, while their OBL.PL suffix is the common *-en-*. Note that the oblique suffixes are attached to the elided nominalisers *-(i)bn-* or *-(i)pn-* in which the vowel /e/ of *-(i)be(n)* and *-(i)pe(n)* is syncopated, e.g. *dživ-ipe(n)* ‘life’ > OBL.SG *dživ-ipn-as-*, OBL.PL *dživ-ipn-en-*, *nasval’ibe(n)* ‘disease’ > OBL.SG *nasval’ibn-as-*, OBL.PL *nasval’ibn-en-*. On the other hand, the oblique forms always

⁶⁵ Cf. also the vocative *de(j)vla*, the diminutive *devlōro* and the adjective derivation *devl’ikano*.

⁶⁶ The segment *-xār* no longer exists as an independent masculine noun. In the current language, ‘donkey’ is referred to either by the Hungarian loanword *samāris* or by the Slavic loanword *oslos*. Note that there is a distinct feminine noun *xār* ‘pit, large hole’, which is unrelated to the erstwhile masculine designation for donkey.

maintain the nasal, which is frequently apocoped in the NOM.SG forms, leading to the alternation of, for example, *dživipen* ~ *dživipe* and *nasval'iben* ~ *nasval'ibe* (see 4.2.2.2 for more details). The NOM.PL suffix *-a*, identical to that of other zero masculines, is attached either to the non-elided nominaliser, as in *dživ-ipen-a*, *nasval'-iben-a* (in Sereďnie), or to the nominaliser that is even more reduced than in the oblique forms, with only the initial segment *-(i)b-/-(i)p-* kept, i.e. *dživip-a*, *nasval'-ib-a* (attested in both Uzhhorod varieties). The latter NOM.PL forms indicate an incipient morphological reanalysis of the nominaliser *-ibe(n)-∅* > *-ib-e(n)* [NMLS-NOM.SG] and, on this basis, *-ib-a* [NMLS-NOM.PL]. Yet there is one more strategy: viz. the NOM.PL is homonymous with the NOM.SG; cf. *but gul'ipe(n)* ‘lots of sweets’, *savore nasval'ibe(n)* (Khudlovo *savore nasval'ipen*) ‘all diseases’, etc. This third option, which has been documented in all varieties, leads to a single zero-marked nominative form in both singular and plural and to the overt marking of mere oblique forms. It may be related to the fact that plural forms of abstract nouns are rather rare and most abstract nouns only occur in the singular with no plural forms at all.

4.1.1.1.1.3 Zero masculines ending in [aj]

Several nouns that end in [aj] in the NOM.SG occur in two bases in paradigms: one base with [aj] in the NOM.SG and all plural forms, the other with no [aj] in the OBL.SG. Such nouns are similar to abstract nouns in having the OBL.SG marking in *-as-*: *xulaj* ‘landlord, owner’, OBL.SG *xul-as-*, NOM.PL *xulaj-a*, *rašaj* ‘priest’, OBL.SG *raš-as-*, NOM.PL *rašaj-a*. However, the regular OBL.SG forms *xulaj-es-* and *rašaj-es-* optionally occur as well (see (3) and (4) from different speakers in Radvanka). Another intriguing feature of this subclass is that the accusative form may be identical to the zero-marked nominative, while the overt oblique marking is obligatory in the oblique stem; see 4.1.1 above.

- (3) *me* *phuč'om* *le* *raš-as-tar* (UzhhR)^{etr}
 I ask.AOR.1SG ART priest-OBL.SG.M-ABL
 ‘I asked the priest.’
- (4) *naši* *phenes* *le* *rašaj-es-ke*
 cannot say.PRS.2SG ART priest-OBL.SG.M-ABL
av *ade* (UzhhR)
 come[IMP.2SG] here
 ‘You may not say to the priest, “Come here!”.’

The noun *ňilaj* ‘summer’ is attested to belong to this subclass only in Khudlovo (OBL.SG *ňil-as-*), while in all remaining varieties, it is declined as the basic zero masculines (OBL.SG *ňilaj-es-*). The latter also holds true for monosyllabic nouns in [aj], such as *graj* ‘horse’ > OBL.SG *graj-es*, *naj* ‘nail (of a digit)’ > OBL.SG *naj-es*, *raj* ‘lord’ > OBL.SG *raj-es*.

The inherited noun for ‘gold’, which has a form *somnakaj* or *sovnakaj* in many Romani dialects, displays morphological diversity within Eastern Uzh Romani. Only in Uzhhorod does the noun occur in the conservative form *somnakaj* in the NOM.SG with the OBL.SG form *somnak-as-*, being declined as *rašaj*. However, it has no plural forms. In Perechyn, Khudlovo and Sereďnie, the form with no [aj] occurs in the NOM.SG: *somnak* with the documented OBL.SG forms *somnak-as-* in Perechyn and xenoclitic-like *somnak-os-* in Sereďnie. A plural form is attested only in Sereďnie as *somnak-a* (NOM.PL) in the meaning ‘jewellery’. In Radvanka, a Slovak loanword *zlatos* (cf. Slovak *zlato*) is also commonly used.

4.1.1.1.2 Oikoclitic *o-* and *i-*masculines

There are two noun classes of masculine nouns that have overt nominative singular marking: one class comprises nouns marked by the suffix *-o*, hence *o*-masculines, the other consists of a single masculine noun marked by the suffix *-i*. The *o*-masculines may further be divided into two subclasses, depending on their NOM.PL marking.

Almost all *o*-masculines, with a single exception, have a NOM.PL suffix *-e*, which does not occur in other nouns. These *o*-masculines comprise many inherited nouns, such as *cijl-o* ‘stick’, *džamutr-o* ‘son-in-law’, *gāďž-o* ‘non-Rom’ (in Uzhhorod and Khudlovo also *gom-o*, in Radvanka and Sereďnie *govr-o*), *govn-o* ‘sack’, *khosn-o* ‘kerchief’, *mār-o* ‘bread’, *pindr-o* ‘foot’, *rakl-o* ‘non-Romani boy’, *sastr-o* ‘father-in-law’, *šejr-o* ‘head’, etc., including some pre-Greek loanwords, such as *kirv-o* ‘godfather’ and *rukon-o* (Perechyn *rokon-o*) ‘dog’.

The other subclass of *o*-masculines is represented by a single Indo-Aryan noun *angušt-o* ‘finger’, which differs from the other *o*-masculines by its NOM.PL suffix *-a* in *angušt-a*, instead of *-e*. In addition, this subclass may include the oikoclitic diminutive masculines in *-ōr-*, e.g. *čhav-ōr-o* ‘little boy’, NOM.PL *čhav-ōr-a* ‘children’, *mār-ōr-o* ‘little bread’, NOM.PL *mār-ōr-a*, as well as the formally similar substantivised adjective *korkōr-o* ‘alone’, NOM.PL *korkōr-a*, although affiliation with the subclass of *kirv-o* occurs as well (*čhavōr-e*, *korkōr-e*). See also 4.2.1.1.

The single member of the *i*-masculine class is Indo-Aryan *pāñ-i* ‘water’.⁶⁷ Except for the NOM.SG, all case suffixes of *pāñ-i* are identical to those of the basic zero masculines (see Table 25 above).

4.1.1.1.3 Inflection of *čha* ‘son, Romani boy’

The noun *čha* ‘son, Romani boy’ has a peculiar inflection in Eastern Uzh Romani: OBL.SG *čha-s*, NOM.PL *čhav-e*, OBL.PL *čhav-en-*. Two synchronic bases may be distinguished in this noun: the singular base *čha-*, with zero marking in the nominative and the suffix *-s-* in the oblique, and the plural base *čhav-*, which principally has the *o*-masculine inflection. Historically, this noun of Indo-Aryan origin was an *o*-masculine (cf. NOM.SG form *čhav-o* in other Romani dialects). It follows that the plural forms *čhave* and *čhaven* are conservative, while the historical singular forms **čhavo* and **čhaves* have been reduced to *čha* and *čas*.⁶⁸

4.1.1.2 Oikoclitic feminine nouns

As with oikoclitic masculines, oikoclitic feminines may be classified into classes on the basis of their NOM.SG marking, which is either zero, hence zero feminines, or *-i*, hence *i*-feminines. Some further subclassification may be made with respect to the absence or presence of stem modification (palatalisation) triggered by suffixation in zero feminines, and with respect to the absence or presence of the stem marker in plural forms of *i*-feminines. The remaining case suffixes, OBL.SG *-a-*, NOM.PL *-a* and OBL.PL *-en-*, are common to all oikoclitic feminines. See Table 26.

Table 26: Inflection of oikoclitic feminines

CLASS	NOM.SG	OBL.SG	NOM.PL	OBL.PL	MEANING
∅	<i>zumìn</i>	<i>zumìn-a-</i>	<i>zumìn-a</i>	<i>zumìn-en-</i>	soup
	<i>men</i>	<i>meň-a-</i>	<i>meň-a</i>	<i>meň-en-</i>	neck
<i>-i</i>	<i>čhuvr-i</i>	<i>čhuvr-a-</i>	<i>čhuvr-a</i>	<i>čhuvr-en-</i>	knife
	<i>bovr-i</i>	<i>bovr-a-</i>	<i>bovr-ij-a</i>	<i>bovr-ij-en-</i>	daughter-in-law

⁶⁷ The noun *vovd'-i* ‘soul’, whose cognates occur as masculines in other Romani dialects, is attested as a feminine noun in Eastern Uzh Romani. Another sporadic *i*-masculine noun in some (non-Central) dialects is *gom-i* ‘non-Rom’, which exists in Uzhhorod and Khudlovo as an *o*-masculine noun *gom-o* (*gom-i* is its feminine counterpart).

⁶⁸ These reduced forms are shared with Romani dialects in the easternmost parts of Slovakia and in Ukrainian Galicia.

4.1.1.2.1 Oikoclitic zero feminines

The class of zero feminines comprises feminine nouns that have zero marking in the NOM.SG. It includes many inherited feminines of Indo-Aryan origin, such as *baj* ‘sleeve’, *bār* ‘fence’, *čham* ‘cheek’, *čhang* ‘thigh’, *čhib* ‘tongue, language’, *dar* ‘fear’, *džuv* ‘louse’, *likh* ‘nit’, *pušum* ‘flea’, *pheñ* ‘sister’, *phus* ‘culm’ (PL *phusa* ‘straw’), *phuv* ‘land, earth’, *solax* ‘oath’, *suv* ‘needle’, etc., some pre-Greek loanwords, such as *burňik* ‘palm (of hand)’, *čhil'av/thil'av/khil'av* ‘plum’, *khoč* ‘knee’, *pat'iv* ‘respect, honesty’, *sijr* ‘garlic’, *zor* ‘strength’, three Greek loanwords *ārmin* ‘cabbage’, *papin* (in Uzhhorod), *papiň* (in Khudlovo and Serednie) ‘goose’ and *zumin* ‘soup’, and the etymologically unclear item *xolov* ‘trousers’, which has the final /o/ diphthongised in the NOM.PL form *xolovva* [xolovva].

Case suffixes of zero feminines are attached directly to the base, as in NOM.SG *jag* ‘fire’, OBL.SG *jag-a-*, NOM.PL *jag-a*, OBL.PL *jag-en*. The feminine bases that end in /d/, /t/ or /l/ are automatically palatalised before overt case suffixes, e.g. *phurd* ‘bridge’ > NOM.PL *phurd'-a*, *bax(t)*⁶⁹ ‘happiness’ > OBL.SG *baxt'-a-*, *mol* ‘wine’ > OBL.SG *mol'-a-*, etc. The only variation occurs with respect to bases ending in a nasal /n/, which are split in their behaviour, as indicated in Table 26 above. There is a single noun that is subject to palatalisation in all varieties: *men* ‘neck’ (OBL.SG *meň-a-*, NOM.PL *meň-a*, OBL.PL *meň-en-*), and two Greek-origin nouns that are not: *ārmin* ‘cabbage, sauerkraut’ (OBL.SG/NOM.PL *ārmin-a*, OBL.PL *ārmin-en-*) and *zumin* ‘soup’ (OBL.SG/NOM.PL *zumin-a-*, OBL.PL *zumin-en-*). Another Greek loanword, that for ‘goose’, is subject to variation: it is unpalatalised in Uzhhorod (NOM.SG *papin*, OBL.SG NOM.PL *papin-a*) and palatalised in Khudlovo and Serednie, including the NOM.SG form (NOM.SG *papiň*, OBL.SG NOM.PL *papiň-a*).⁷⁰ In Shakhta, a feminine noun *povšin* ‘sand’ also lacks palatalisation (cf. OBL.SG *povšin-a-*), while in the other varieties, this noun occurs as an *i*-feminine (*povš-i*). Other feminine nouns with the final segment *-in*, viz. *āsvin* ‘teardrop’ and *prajtin/prajt'in* ‘leaf’, have peculiar and unstable inflection discussed in 4.1.1.2.3 below. The tree names in *-in*, such as *phabal'-in* ‘apple tree’, which are commonly used only in Khudlovo and Serednie (see 4.2.4), are declined as oikoclitic zero feminines with no palatalisation of the nasal element (NOM.PL *phabal'in-a* ‘apple trees’, Khudlovo *khil'avin-a*, Serednie *thil'avin-a* ‘plum trees’, Khudlovo *ambrol'in-a* ‘pear trees’), except for *akhorin* ‘nut tree’, which is subject to palatalisation (NOM.PL *akhorin'-a*).

⁶⁹ The consonant cluster /xt/ is not permitted in the final position, which is why the NOM.SG of this noun occurs as *bax* and the alveolar /t/ reappears in suffixated forms only. (See 2.1.7 and also 4.1.1.1.1 for examples of the same phenomenon in masculines ending in /st/ a /št/).

⁷⁰ In Perechyn, the Greek-origin etymon has been replaced by a Slavic loanword *huska*.

There are more feminine nouns ending in a nasal that occur with the palatal base /ň/, but these nouns possess the palatal nasal in the NOM.SG as well, e.g. *pheň* ‘sister’, NOM.PL *pheň-a*, etc. In fact, the noun *men*, too, optionally occurs with the palatal nasal in the NOM.SG, i.e. *meň*, as do other feminines with the palatal bases, e.g. *phurd* ~ *phurd’*, *barval* ~ *barval’* ‘wind’, etc. It shows that feminine nouns with the palatal bases before case suffixes tend to undergo paradigmatic levelling to generalise the palatal consonant throughout their paradigm.

As described by Elšík (2000a), Romani originally had two distinct subclasses of zero feminines: a subclass of iotated feminines, which were characterised by insertion of a palatal approximant /j/ between the stem and the suffix, e.g. **suv* ‘needle’ > NOM.PL **suv-j-a*, and a subclass of unmodified feminines, which lacked such a feature, e.g. **džuv* ‘louse’ > NOM.PL **džuv-a*.⁷¹ Such a state of affairs is still continued in a number of Romani dialects to some degree. In Eastern Uzh Romani, as in other North Central dialects, iotation has been lost, so that *suv* and *džuv* no longer differ in their inflection (NOM.PL *suv-a*, *džuv-a*). The only remnant of erstwhile iotation is palatalisation of the stem, which is mostly governed by fonological rules, applied after /d/, /t/ and /l/, and only the noun stems ending in /n/ cannot be predicted in terms of the palatalisation.

Some zero feminines undergo morphophonological changes or other stem modifications in inflection. First, *jakh* ‘eye’, OBL.SG *jakh-a-*, has a lexical allomorph with the long vowel *jākh-* in plural forms, i.e. NOM.PL *jākh-a*, OBL.PL *jākh-en-*. Second, the kinship terms *čhaj* ‘daughter, Romani girl’, *daj* ‘mother’ and *sasuj* ‘mother-in-law’ possess reduced bases *čh-*, *d-* and *sas-* in their oblique singular forms *čh-a-*, *d-a-* and *sas-a-*, but not in the plural forms, i.e. NOM.PL *čhaj-a*, *daj-a*, *sasuj-a*, OBL.PL *čhaj-en-*, *daj-en-*, *sasuj-en-*. In Perechyn, some young speakers also provide evidence of the non-reduced OBL.SG forms *čhaj-a-* and *daj-a-*, indicating the full regularisation of *čhaj* and *daj* in terms of their inflection. Note that these nouns with a reduced base have in common that they end in a palatal approximant and are, therefore, similar to some zero masculines in [aj], which also display base reduction in the OBL.SG (see 4.1.1.1.3). Similar reduction also occurs in another feminine noun ending in /j/, viz. *phābaj* ‘apple’, but here in all cases and not only in the oblique singular: OBL.SG *phāb-a-*, NOM.PL *phāb-a-*, OBL.PL *phāb-en-*. The form *phāba* may even extend to the nominative singular, which then leads to a situation in which it is only the oblique plural form that differs: NOM.SG, OBL.SG, NOM.PL *phāb-a* as against NOM.PL *phāb-en-*.

⁷¹ Distinction between both subclasses goes back to MIA and OIA (and, in turn, to Proto-Indo-European), reflecting distinction between the Middle and Old Indo-Aryan *ī*-stems on the one hand and *ā*-stems on the other hand (Beníšek 2012).

This replacement of the conservative NOM.SG form *phābaj* by *phāba* has been encountered in at least some speakers in all varieties.

4.1.1.2.2 Oikoclitic *i*-feminines

The other oikoclitic feminine class contains inherited Indo-Aryan nouns marked by *-i* in the nominative singular, e.g. *bovr-i* ‘daughter-in-law’, *buvt-i* ‘work’, *čhuvr-i* ‘knife’, *džuvl-i* ‘female’, *pijr-i* ‘pot’, etc. The class also comprises a number of old loanwords, such as *bokel-i* ‘cake’,⁷² *momeľ-i* ‘candle’ and rarer *morčh-i* ‘leather’ (in Uzhhorod) and *vovd-i* ‘soul’ (in Sereďnie) from Armenian, *khoň-i* ‘suet’ from Georgian, *salad-i* ‘fly larva’ of unknown origin, and a number of Greek loanwords, e.g. *angāl-i* ‘arms, armful’ (αγκάλι), *paramis-i* ‘fairy tale’ (παραμύθι), *xovel-i* ‘live coals’ (χόβολη) and *xol-i* ‘anger’ (χολή).⁷³ Inherited feminine derivations in *-ň-*, such as *grašň-i* ‘mare’, *manušň-i* ‘woman’, *rāň-i* ‘lady’, *romň-i* ‘Romani woman; wife’, etc., also belong to this class, as do the feminine counterparts of the oikoclitic *o*-masculines, such as *gādž-i* ‘non-Romani woman’ (cf. *gādž-o* ‘non-Romani man’), *kirv-i* ‘godmother (in relation to the parents of a godchild)’ (cf. *kirv-o* ‘godfather’), *rakl-i* ‘non-Romani girl’ (cf. *rakl-o* ‘non Romani boy’), *rukoň-i* ‘bitch’ (cf. *rukon-o* ‘dog’), and many others (see also 4.2.3.2 and 4.2.2.1). Note that the suffix entails palatalisation of the base consonants /d/, /t/ /n/, /l/ > /dʲ/, /tʲ/, /nʲ/, /lʲ/ and the palatal quality of these stops is kept throughout the declensional paradigm.

While all *i*-feminines form the oblique singular stem simply by the suffix *-a-* (*čhuvr-a-*, *bovr-a-*), there is a certain discrepancy with respect to the plural marking, allowing us to postulate two subclasses within this class. First, the inanimate *i*-feminines, such as *čhuvr-i*, and all *i*-feminines that are at least trisyllabic, such as *manušň-i*, have the plural suffixes *-a-* and *-en-* attached directly to the base consonant: NOM.PL *čhuvr-a*, *manušň-a*, OBL.PL *čhuvr-en-*, *manušň-en-*. Second, the disyllabic *i*-feminines that refer to persons, such as *bovr-i* and *gādž-i*, display an additional segment *-ij-* added between the nominal base and the plural suffix: NOM.PL *bovr-ij-a*, *gādž-ij-a*, OBL.PL *bovr-ij-en-*, *gādž-ij-en-*. However, in some animate *i*-feminines that have the palatal base consonant, such as *romň-i*, the two types of declension are documented as alternating: NOM.PL *romň-ij-a* ~ *romň-a*, OBL.PL *romň-ij-en-* ~ *romň-en-*, often depending on particular idiolects. The identical plural suffixes *-ija* and *-ijen* also occur in one of the classes of xenoclitic feminines (see 4.1.1.4). Historically, nouns of

⁷² Replaced by a dialectal Slavic loanword *meľina* in Shakhta.

⁷³ See Boretzky (1995a) and (2012) for more details about the majority of these loanwords in a general Romani perspective.

both subclasses go back to *i*-feminines, in which the NOM.SG suffix *-i* was replaced by iotation in all non-nominative forms (cf. Elšík 2000a: 14–15), e.g. *čhur-*i* > *čhur-*j-a*, *bor-*i* > *bor-*j-a*. What happened not only in Eastern Uzh Romani, but in North Central Romani in general, was, on the one hand, the complete loss of iotation, as in čhuvr-*a*, and, on the other hand, the separation of the *i* from the base by the intruding vowel /i/, as in bovr-*ij-a*.

The class of *i*-feminines also contains several nouns that display morphological innovations from the historical perspective. The noun *rāt'-i* ‘evening, night’ has developed through substantivisation of the adverb *rāt'i* ‘at night’ (< Proto-Romani **rat-i* night-LOC). A relic of the old zero feminine noun **rat* has been maintained in a frozen compound *jepaž-rat* ‘midnight’, but it might also manifest itself in the oblique singular form *rat'-a-* (cf. INST *rat'-a-ha* ‘through the night’, ABL *rat'-a-tar* ‘from the night’), which has a short vowel, although the NOM.SG form *rāt'-i* invariably has a long vowel. Another noun that has secondarily become an *i*-feminine noun is *māčh-i* (OBL.SG *māčh-a-*) ‘fish’, except in Radvanka, where it has been maintained as an *o*-masculine noun *māčh-o*. Certain feminine nouns display alternation of a zero feminine form with that of an *i*-feminine, even within a single variety, viz. *čejň* ~ *čejň-i* ‘earring’ and *rāň* ~ *rāň-i* ‘twig’.

4.1.1.2.3 Inflection of *āsv-/āsm-* ‘teardrop’ and *prajt-/prajt'-* ‘leaf’

Two feminine nouns meaning ‘teardrop’ and ‘leaf’ are attested in a variety of irregular inflectional patterns. In their most conservative forms, both end in a segment *-in* in the NOM.SG, while this segment is dropped in the other cases, e.g. Shakhta and Perechyn *āsvin* ‘teardrop’, NOM.PL *āsv-a*, Shakhta *prajtin* ‘leaf’, NOM.PL *prajt-a*, Serednie *prajtin*, NOM.PL *prajt'a*.⁷⁴ Inflection is that of zero feminines, i.e. OBL.SG *āsv-a-*, *prajt-a-/prajt'-a-*, OBL.PL *āsv-en-*, *prajt-en-/prajt'-en-*. Deletion of *-in* in all cases but the NOM.SG makes these two nouns different from other zero feminines ending in *-in*, such as *zumin*, which keep this segment throughout their paradigm (see above).

Both nouns are also documented in innovative inflectional patterns. In all varieties, the nominative plural form *āsva* commonly extends to the singular, at the expense of *āsvin*, which then gives rise to a situation described above for *phāba*, viz. the occurrence of a single form (*āsva*) in the nominative of both number categories, singular and plural. This innovative inflection also typifies the phonological variant *āsma* in Radvanka: NOM.SG, OBL.SG, NOM.PL *āsm-a* versus NOM.PL *āsm-en-*. A further step is a complete shift to the xenoclitic declension

⁷⁴ For the phonological variants *prajtin* ~ *prajtin*, see 2.4.5.2.

in which *āsv-a* occurs in the singular only, while in the plural, the nominative form *āsv-i* arises (see 4.1.1.4), which is attested in Khudlovo.

The xenoclitic declension has also been documented for the word for ‘leaf’ in Radvanka, while another pattern has developed in Perechyn and Khudlovo, viz. a shift of *prajtin* to the *i*-feminines. The latter development then leads to forms with the nominative suffixes representing the opposite number categories to those of Radvanka. This is illustrated in the following Table 27, which compares the nominative forms of the word for ‘leaf’ documented in individual varieties.

Table 27: Inflection of *prajt-/prajt'*- ‘leaf’

	SG	PL	FEMININE CLASS
Shakhta	<i>prajtin</i>	<i>prajta</i>	zero
Radvanka	<i>prajta</i>	<i>prajti</i>	xenoclitic
Perechyn	<i>prajti</i>	<i>prajta</i>	<i>i</i> -
Khudlovo	<i>prajti</i>	<i>prajta</i>	<i>i</i> -
Serednie	<i>prajtin</i>	<i>prajta</i>	zero

4.1.1.3 Xenoclitic masculine nouns

In a superficial examination, the xenoclitic masculine nouns have one of the following nominative singular suffixes: *-os*, *-as*, *-is*, *-us* or *-s*, which are also identical to the oblique singular suffixes. They all have in common that they end in a sibilant /s/, which raises the possibility to segment these suffixes even further and to consider their vocalic part as a classificatory marker with *-s* being the common nominative and oblique singular marker for all xenoclitic masculines (see also Elšík 2000a: 18–19). This analysis means that one of the inflectional classes lacks any overt marker and is consequently considered a class of zero masculines (see Table 28).⁷⁵

⁷⁵ Some of the noun examples in Table 28 are typical of some varieties, while rare or absent in others. The words *cimboras* and *ujcus* are typical items of *gāvutune* varieties, which hardly ever occur in Uzhhorod. There, the same inflection occurs with the Uzhhorod nouns *somsijdas* ‘neighbour’ and *d'idus* ‘grandfather’, a word synonymous to *papus*.

Table 28: Inflection of xenoclitic masculines

MARKER		NOUN EXAMPLE			
CLASS	NOM.PL	NOM/OBL.SG	NOM.PL	OBL.PL	MEANING
-o-	-a	<i>barāt-o-s</i>	<i>barāt-a</i>	<i>barāt-en-</i>	friend
	-i	<i>fovr-o-s</i>	<i>fovr-i</i>	<i>fovr-en-</i>	town
-a-	-a	<i>cimbor-a-s</i>	<i>cimbor-a</i>	<i>cimbor-en-</i>	friend
	-i	<i>sluh-a-s</i>	<i>sluh-i</i>	<i>sluh-en-</i>	servant
-i-	-a	<i>sapuñ-i-s</i>	<i>sapuñ-a</i>	<i>sapuñ-en-</i>	soap
-u-	-i	<i>ujc-u-s</i>	<i>ujc-i</i>	<i>ujc-en-</i>	uncle
-∅-	-ja	<i>papu-s</i>	<i>papu-ja</i>	<i>papu-jen-</i>	grandfather
		<i>mozi-s</i>	<i>mozi-ja</i>	<i>mozi-jen-</i>	film
	-va	<i>tanitov-s</i>	<i>tanitov-va</i>	<i>tanitov-ven-</i>	teacher
		<i>kijev-s</i>	N/A	N/A	Kyiv

Note that the classificatory vowel is absent in all plural forms. Two nominative suffixes occur in the plural of xenoclitic masculines: *-a* and *-i*, plus *-ja*, which is a phonologically conditioned allomorph of *-a*. The oblique plural suffix is *-en*, like in oikoclitic nouns, with a phonologically conditioned allomorph *-jen*.

1.1.1.1.1 Xenoclitic *o*- and *a*-masculines

Nouns that end in *-os* (*o*-masculines) and *-as* (*a*-masculines) may be separated into two subclasses each, depending on whether their nominative plural marker is *-a* or *-i*. The *o*-masculines are in Table 28 are exemplified by a Hungarian loanword *barāt-o-s* ‘friend’ (< Hungarian *barát*) and a Greek loanword *fovr-o-s* ‘town’⁷⁶ (< Greek *φόρος/φόρον* ‘market place’ < Latin *forum*; Boretzky 2013: 407). Another Greek loanword *petal-o-s* (PL *petal-a*) ‘horseshoe’ (< Greek *πέταλο*), known only by some elder speakers, is declined as *barāt-o-s*. The *o*-masculines mostly comprise loanwords that end either in a consonant in the source language or in the vowel /o/, such as *piv-o-s* (PL *piv-i*) ‘beer’ from Slavic *pivo*.

The NOM.PL of some of the *o*-masculines varies, e.g. *baron-o-s* ‘community speaker’, PL *baron-a* or *baron-i*, even within a single variety. The *o*-masculines also include the abstract nouns in *-(V)šāg-* (see 4.2.2.2.3), which are mostly attested with the plural marking *-a*, e.g.

⁷⁶Across Eastern Uzh Romani, the noun *fovr-os* is commonly used in a specific meaning to refer to the city of Uzhhorod, but, in certain contexts, it may also be used in a more general meaning ‘(any) town’, which is the context where the plural forms occur.

liv-išāg-o-s ‘gunfire, shooting > PL *liv-išāg-a*, but also sporadically occur with the plural marker *-i* (*liv-išāg-i*).

The *a*-masculines in Table 28 are exemplified by another Hungarian loanword for friend *cimbor-a-s* (cf. Hungarian *cimbor*)⁷⁷ and by a Slavic loanword *sluh-a-s* (cf. Slovak *sluha*). The *a*-masculines consist of borrowed nouns that end in the vowel /a/ in the source language, rarely nouns ending in a consonant, which may lead to alternation of the *a*-masculine inflection with that of the *o*-masculines, e.g. both *somsijd-a-s* and *somsijd-o-s* (PL *somsijd-a*) ‘neighbour’, from Hungarian *szomszéd*, have been documented in Uzhhorod. There are no *a*-masculines of Greek origin in Eastern Uzh Romani.⁷⁸

4.1.1.3.2 Xenoclitic *i*- and *u*-masculines

Nouns that end in *-is* (*i*-masculines) have their nominative plural marking in *-a*, while those ending in *-us* (*u*-masculines) have their nominative plural marker *-i*, with no further subclass differentiation. The *i*-masculines, exemplified in Table 28 by a Greek loanword *sapuñ-i-s* ‘soap’ (< Greek *σαπούνι*), are quite numerous. Like the *o*-masculines, they comprise many nouns ending in a consonant in the source language, as well as agentive masculine nouns (see 4.2.3.1), such as *lavut-ār-i-s* (PL *lavut-ār-a*) ‘musician’ and *čovr-āš-i-s* (PL *čovr-āš-a*) ‘thief’.

The *u*-masculines, in contrast, are very rare. In addition to the dialectal Slavic loanword *ujc-u-s* ‘uncle’ (cf. Slovak *ujec* ‘mother’s brother’) in the *gāvutune* varieties, this class also comprises a Slavic loanword *d’id-u-s* (PL *d’id-i*) ‘grandfather’, an infrequent lexical variant of the Greek loanword *papus*. The word *papus* itself is often taken as a representative of the *u(s)*-masculines in Romani descriptions, but here it is classified as a zero masculine noun due to its idiosyncratic inflection in Eastern Uzh Romani (see below).

4.1.1.3.3 Xenoclitic zero masculines

An extraordinary class of xenoclitic masculines, which has developed specifically in Eastern Uzh Romani, consists of nouns that have the nominative/oblique singular suffix *-s* added to the nominal base. It is this class where the Greek loanword *papus*, i.e. *papu-s*, ‘grandfather’, from Greek *παππούς*, belongs to in Eastern Uzh Romani. In most other North Central Romani dialects, the noun for grandfather may be segmentable as *pap-us*, displaying the nominative singular suffix *-us*, because of the plural forms NOM *pap-i* and OBL *pap-en-*, which are also

⁷⁷ The word *cimbor* also exists as a Hungarian loanword in local Ukrainian (Rusyn) in Transcarpathia, so that it may have been introduced into Eastern Uzh Romani via Slavic dialects rather than directly from Hungarian.

⁷⁸ The noun *xar’as* ‘blacksmith’, known from other North Central Romani dialects, is missing in Eastern Uzh Romani.

reconstructed for Late Proto-Romani (Elšík 2000a: 18; Elšík and Matras 2006: 72). In Eastern Uzh Romani, however, the respective plural forms are NOM *papu-ja* and OBL *papu-jen-*, which indicates a vocalic nominal base *papu-* to which the case suffixes are attached. Otherwise, if we classified *papus* as an *u*-masculine, i.e. if we segmented *pap-u-s*, we would have to assume the classificatory marker *-u-* in plural forms *pap-u-ja* and *pap-u-jen-* as well, and this would pose an anomalous analysis with respect to other xenoclitic masculines, in which the classificatory vowel is absent in plural forms. The segmentation *papu-s* is also a more economical solution as it allows for associating the noun with several other nouns, such as *mozi-s* (< Hungarian *mozi*), with the identical case suffixes: NOM.SG and OBL.SG *-s*, NOM.PL *-ja* (in *mozi-ja*, *papu-ja*) and OBL.PL *-jen-* (in *mozi-jen-*, *papu-jen-*). The palatal approximant in the plural suffixes is clearly a glide inserted to prevent a hiatus between the vocalic base (*mozi-*, *papu-*) and the regular plural suffixes *-a* and *-en-*. In other words, *-ja* and *-jen-* are phonologically conditioned allomorphs of *-a* and *-en-* respectively. There are more nouns that behave exactly as *mozis*, all being loanwords which end in /i/ in the source language, such as *taksis* (PL *taksija*) ‘taxi(cab)’ (and ‘car’ in Khudlovo and Sereďnie) and *bāčis* (PL *bāčija*) ‘uncle’, from Hungarian *bácsi*, in Uzhhorod.

The other subclass of xenoclitic zero masculines comprises nouns whose nominal base ends in /v/. In nearly all cases, this /v/ is preceded by a vowel /o/, and the entire sequence *-ov-* is phonetically realised as a diphthong-like segment [ou], rarely even as a long monophthong [o:], before the nominative/oblique singular suffix *-s* (see also 2.2.2.3). Almost all nouns of this type are Hungarian loanwords that end in long /ó/ in Hungarian, such as *tanitovs* ‘teacher’ (< Hungarian *tanító*), *birovsv* ‘a community elder’ (< *bíró* ‘judge’), *čikovsv* ‘foal’ (< Hungarian *csikó*), *furovsv* ‘borer (drilling tool)’ (< *fúró*), etc. The plural suffixes *-a* and *-en* are attached to the nominal base with the help of the labiodental fricative /v/, leading to further allomorphs of the nominative and oblique plural suffixes *-va* and *-ven*, cf. NOM.PL *tanitov-va* [tanitouvva ~ tanito:va], OBL.PL *tanitov-ven* [tanitouvven ~ tanito:ven]. This subclass also includes locality names of Slavic origin that end in *-ov(o)* in Slavic languages, such as *xudlovsv* ‘Khudlovo’ (cf. Ukrainian *Худльово*), *livovsv* ‘Lviv’ (cf. Russian *Львов*), *raxovsv* ‘Rakhiv’ (dialectal Ukrainian *Рахово*, Hungarian *Rahó*), etc. The locality designation is also the domain where a vocalic

segment other than /o/ may occur before the base consonant /v/ with this class, as in *kijevs* ‘Kyiv’ (cf. Russian *Киев*).⁷⁹

As mentioned in (4.1.1), the oblique singular suffix of all masculine nouns has an allomorph in which the sibilant segment of the suffix is deleted before the instrumental suffix *-ha*. In all xenoclitic masculines, the oblique singular marker *-s-* is consequently replaced by zero in the instrumental according to the analysis adopted here, and *-ha* is attached to the classificatory marker, e.g. *barāt-o-Ø-ha* [brother-CLASS-OBL.SG.M-INST] ‘with a brother’. In the zero masculines, this leads to a situation in which the instrumental suffix is affixed directly to the nominal base, e.g. *papu-Ø-ha* [grandfather-OBL.SG.M-INST] ‘with a grandfather’, *mozi-Ø-ha* [film-OBL.SG.M-INST] ‘with a film’, *tanitov-Ø-ha* [teacher-OBL.SG.M-INST] ‘with a teacher’, *furov-Ø-ha* [borer-OBL.SG.M-INST] ‘with a borer’, etc.

4.1.1.3.4 Non-integrated masculine loanwords

Some masculine nouns borrowed from current or recent contact languages are not integrated in the nominative, provided that they end in a consonant in the source language. In other words, they lack the xenoclitic nominative suffix *-s*, e.g. *pojizd* ‘train’ (< Ukrainian *noižd*), *sombat* ‘Saturday’ (< Hungarian *szombat*). Only in the non-nominative cases marked by the Layer II suffixes, such loanwords are integrated into the xenoclitic *o*-masculines, e.g. *pojizd-o-Ø-ha* [train-CLASS-OBL.SG-INST] ‘by train’, *sombat-o-s-ker-o* [Saturday-CLASS-OBL.SG-GEN-NOM.SG.M] ‘of Saturday’].

Even some less frequent inherited nouns sporadically occur with the same inflection, i.e. they end in a consonant in the nominative singular but are inflected as xenoclitic *o*-masculines in the Layer II cases. For example, in Shakhta an Indo-Aryan noun *šax* ‘cabbage soup’ (< OIA *śāka-* ‘vegetable’) and a Greek-origin noun *riňing* ‘file (technical tool)’ (< Greek *ρίνη*; see Boretzky 2012a: 20) have the xenoclitic OBL.SG marking attested as *šax-o-s-* and *riňing-o-s-* respectively and the xenoclitic marking occurs in the plural as well, i.e. NOM.PL *šax-i* and *riňing-i*.⁸⁰

Furthermore, personal names that end in a consonant are invariably inflected as non-integrated xenoclitic masculines, such as *ruslan-Ø* ‘Ruslan’, in the oblique, before Layer II

⁷⁹ The locality names do not have plural forms and, besides the nominative, they normally occur only in the locative (e.g. *xud'lovste* ‘in Khudlovo’, *kijevste* ‘in Kyiv’), the ablative (*xud'lovstar* ‘from Khudlovo’), and the genitive (as in the noun phrase *xud'lovskere roma* ‘the Roma of Khudlovo’).

⁸⁰ In Serednie, the noun meaning ‘file’ has a form *riňin* and is inflected as an oikoclitic zero masculine (OBL.SG *riňin-es-*, NOM.PL *riňin-a*).

suffixes, *ruslan-o-s-* (e.g. DAT *ruslanoske* ‘to Ruslan’). Examples with the personal names also provide evidence that such loanwords remain non-integrated even in the accusative, i.e. in those contexts in which the oblique marking independent of the Layer II suffixes would otherwise be expected. See the following examples and note the different case marking of the article determining the non-integrated proper noun:

- (5) *o* *artur* *khejre* (Per)
 ART.NOM Arthur[NOM/ACC] home
 ‘Arthur is at home.’
- (6) *vičín* *le* *artur* (Per)
 call[IMP.2SG] ART.OBL Arthur[NOM/ACC]
 ‘Call Arthur.’
- (7) *a* *le* *artur* *nāne ?* (Per)
 and ART.OBL Arthur[NOM/ACC] NEG.COP.PRS.3
 ‘And Arthur doesn’t have [it]?’

as against:

- (8) *phučēha* *le* *artur-o-s-tar* (Per)
 ask.FUT.2SG ART.OBL Arthur-CLASS-OBL.SG.M-ABL
 ‘You will ask Arthur.’

Personal names that end in a vowel in the source language are consistently integrated through the NOM/OBL.SG suffix *-s* in all occurrences, e.g. *deñi-s* ‘Deni’, *ernöv-s* (< Hungarian *Ernö*) ‘Ernest’, *loña-s* ‘Lionia’, *mirku-s* ‘Mirku’, *vas’á-s* ‘Vasia’, etc.

4.1.1.4 Xenoclitic feminine nouns

Feminine nouns of the xenoclitic compartment are nearly homogeneous in their inflection, in contrast to the masculines. All xenoclitic feminines are marked by *-a* in the nominative and oblique singular, and *-a* may therefore be considered a marker of their class. They may, however, differ in their plural marking; see Table 29.

Table 29: Inflection of xenoclitic feminines

MARKER		NOUN EXAMPLE			
CLASS	NOM.PL	NOM/OBL.SG	NOM.PL	OBL.PL	MEANING
<i>-a</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>bab-a</i>	<i>bab-i</i>	<i>bab-en-</i>	grandmother
	<i>-ija</i>	<i>rokl’-a</i>	<i>rokl’-ija</i>	<i>rokl’-ijen-</i>	skirt

‘Towel, give me food!’

However, the vocative plural seems to be in decline and is often replaced by the nominative, as in the elicited example (11) from Khudlovo, compared with its Serednie equivalent in (10) with the vocative marking. In general, the singular forms of the vocative are more stable than the plural forms.

(10) *pheň-ale, pijen !* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 sister-VOC.PL drink.IMP.2PL

as against:

(11) *pheň-a, pijen !* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 sister-NOM.PL drink.IMP.2PL
 ‘Sisters, drink!’

The vocative suffixes are analogical to other Layer I case suffixes in that they are cumulative markers which mark the gender and number in addition to the vocative case. They are partly different for the oikoclitic and xenoclitic nouns and will be discussed in connection with each compartment separately.

4.1.2.1 Vocative of oikoclitic nouns

Table 30 presents vocative forms of the basic oikoclitic noun classes. The zero masculines are split in their vocative singular marking, showing two different suffixes, both of which are exemplified.

Table 30: Vocative forms of oikoclitic nouns

CLASS	NOM.SG	VOC.SG	VOC.PL	MEANING
M -∅	<i>rom</i>	<i>rom-eja</i>	<i>rom-ale</i>	Rom, husband
	<i>phral</i>	<i>phral-a</i>	<i>phral-ale</i>	brother
M -o	<i>kirv-o</i>	<i>kirv-eja</i>	<i>kirv-ale</i>	godfather
F -∅	<i>pheň</i>	<i>pheň-e</i>	<i>pheň-ale</i>	sister
F -i	<i>bovr-i</i>	<i>bovr-ije</i>	<i>bovr-ale</i> <i>bovr-ij-ale</i>	daughter-in-law

As is shown in Table 30, masculine vocatives are marked either by *-eja* (*o*-masculines and some zero masculines) or by *-a* (some zero masculines) in the singular. Feminine

vocatives are marked either by *-e* (zero feminines) or by *-ije* (*i*-feminines). The identical suffixes also occur with the substantivised adjectives converted into nouns; cf. *phuvr-o* M ‘old’ > ‘old man’, VOC.SG *phuvr-eja*, VOC.PL *phuvr-ale*, *phuvr-i* F ‘old’ > ‘old woman’, VOC.SG *phuvr-ije*. Nouns converted from zero adjectives, such as *god’aver* ‘clever’, have vocative forms identical to the nominative ones.

The zero masculines in [aj], such as *xulaj* ‘master’ and *rašaj* ‘priest’, rarely occur in vocative forms. Forms recorded during elicitation comprise those with both vocative masculine suffixes, such as *xulaj-eja* in Shakhta and *xulaj-a* in Serednie, and even with *-e*, such as *xulaj-e* in Radvanka.

The plural vocative of all nouns is marked by the suffix *-ale*. The *i*-feminines that insert *-ij-* in the plural nominative and oblique forms, e.g. NOM.SG *bovr-i* > NOM.PL *bovr-ij-a*, optionally do this in the vocative plural as well, cf. *bovr-ij-ale* alongside *bovr-ale*. However, the vocative plural is retreating in Eastern Uzh Romani, especially in Uzhhorod and Perechyn, and the nominative plural forms, such as *phral-a*,⁸³ *pheñ-a* and *bovr-ij-a*, commonly occur in the vocative function. This also holds true for the nouns converted from derived adjectives in *-al-*, such as *baxt-al-e* PL ‘happy (people)’ and *muj-al-e* ‘policemen’, which remain in these nominative forms in addressing, instead of regular vocatives **baxt-al-ale* and **muj-al-ale*.

In connection with vocatives, mention must be made of a very common address term of peer-aged and younger males *more*. In contrast to the forms given in Table 30, *more* is rather a particle than a noun; it cannot be segmented and has no nominative counterpart, although it often functions as a vocative counterpart of *čha* ‘boy’ (see the next paragraph). It originates from the Greek *μωρέ* (originally ‘fool’), and its cognates are common in other Romani dialects, as well as in Balkan languages (Boretzky 2012a: 19).

An intriguing situation exists in relation to vocative forms of *čha* ‘son, Romani boy’ and *čhaj* ‘daughter, Romani girl’, i.e. in terms of addressing sons/boys and daughters/girls.⁸⁴ Here, two pragmatical levels should be distinguished: (i) addressing a boy/girl of more or less equal status or from the same peer group; and (ii) addressing a younger boy/girl by an elder person from a different age group. The common vocative form of males of equal status is the

⁸³ Note that the NOM.PL form *phral-a* is identical to the VOC.SG *phral-a*, which means that *phrala* may occur in the singular address as well as in the plural address.

⁸⁴ In Romani, one’s offsprings are referred to in the same way as young persons expressed by English *boy* and *girl*. In other words, *čha* means both ‘son’ and ‘(any) Romani boy’, like *čhaj* means ‘daughter’ and ‘(any) Romani girl’. Therefore, all the vocative terms used in addressing children are used irrespective of the actual kinship relation, i.e. even when the addressee and the addresser are not kins.

aforementioned *more*, while females of equal status are addressed by the regular vocative form of *čhaj*, i.e. *čhaj-e*. Both may also be used by elder persons, i.e. by persons in an unequal position, especially in unaffectionate address. Furthermore, there are more affectionate vocative phrases used exclusively by elder persons in addressing considerably younger males and females, viz. *mro čho* (from **mro čhavo*, literally ‘my son’), for younger males, and *mri čhaj*, literally ‘my daughter’, for younger females. Besides, their respective Hungarian counterparts *fijam* (< Hungarian *fiam* ‘my son’) and *jāňom* (< Hungarian *lányom*, non-standard *lyányom*) are used by some speakers in Uzhhorod and Perechyn. As for the plural, the regular forms *čhav-ale* ‘Boys!’ (cf. NOM.PL *čhav-e*) and *čhaj-ale* ‘Girls!’ exist. It follows that *čha* ‘son, Romani boy’ has no morphological vocative singular form since it is blocked by the presence of *more*, but it has a vocative plural. One might consider the unique form *čho* as a distinct vocative of *čha*, but note that (i) *čho* does not exist independently without *mro*, and (ii) the nominative marking of the dependent possessive pronoun *mro*, as well as its feminine counterpart *mri čhaj*, indicate that the following head *čho* is rather a nominative morphosyntactically. See the following Table 31, in which all address terms of sons/boys and daughters/girls discussed are summarised.

Table 31: Vocative forms of *čha* ‘son, boy’ and *čhaj* ‘daughter, girl’

NOMINATIVE SINGULAR	VOCATIVE SINGULAR			VOCATIVE PLURAL	MEANING
	EQUAL RELATION	ELDER TO YOUNGER			
		NATIVE	HUNGARIAN		
<i>čha</i>	<i>more</i>	<i>mro čho</i>	<i>fijam</i>	<i>čhav-ale</i>	boy (son)
<i>čhaj</i>	<i>čhaj-e</i>	<i>mri čhaj</i>	<i>jāňom</i>	<i>čhaj-ale</i>	girl (daughter)

Children are also commonly addressed by borrowed forms, irrespective of their gender, such as *lal’u* or *d’ermekem* (from Hungarian *gyermekem* ‘my child’), the latter being common mainly in Radvanka. The same situation exists in terms of addressing parents by children. There are no vocative forms of *daj* ‘mother’ and *dad* ‘father’ in any Eastern Uzh variety. Instead, parents are addressed by the affectionate vocative forms *mamo* and *apo* of the borrowed kinship terms *mama* ‘mummy’ (from Slavic) and *apos* ‘daddy’ (from Hungarian, but also in local Slavic). Both *mama* and *apos* are fully-fledged xenoclitic nouns used as childish and familiar terms.

The word for ‘God’, *dejl*, has the vocative form *devl-a* or *dejvl-a*, in which the labiodental fricative of the old nominative form **devel* reoccurs. The Slavic vocative form *bože* is commonly used as well.

The vocative forms are common with the derived diminutive nouns, e.g. *čhav-ōr-o* ‘little boy’, VOC.SG *čhav-ōr-eja*, VOC.PL *čhav-ōr-ale* (‘children’); *pheñ-ōr-i* ‘little sister’, VOC.SG *pheñ-ōr-ije*, VOC.PL *pheñ-ōr-ale*; *devl-ōr-o* ‘God’ (affectionately), VOC *devl-ōr-eja*. The special address term *more* has an irregular diminutive form *morečku*, which is used in the affectionate address of little male children. The form *morečku* contains a Slavic diminutive marker *-Včk-* followed by the Slavic vocative suffix *-u*. It replicates the local Slavic diminutive vocatives, such as *Божечку* (*Božečku*), a diminutive counterpart of the basic vocative form *Боже* (*Bože*) ‘God’ in dialectal Ukrainian (Rusyn) (cf. the identical structure in both pairs, *more* ~ *morečku* and *Bože* ~ *Božečku*).

4.1.2.2 Vocative of xenoclitic nouns

The following Table 32 presents vocative forms of the xenoclitic noun classes. Some classes contain nouns that may display various vocative suffixes.

Table 32: Vocative forms of xenoclitic nouns

CLASS	NOM.SG	VOC.SG	VOC.PL	MEANING
M -o-	<i>barāt-o-s</i>	<i>barāt-o-na</i>	<i>barāt-ale</i>	friend
	<i>ap-o-s</i>	<i>ap-o</i>	N/A	daddy
M -a-	<i>cimbor-a-s</i>	<i>cimbor-o</i>	<i>cimbor-ale</i>	friend
	<i>sluh-a-s</i>	<i>sluh-ona</i>	<i>sluh-ale</i>	servant
M -i-	<i>lavutār-i-s</i>	<i>lavutār-i-na</i>	<i>lavutār-ale</i>	musician
M -u-	<i>ujc-u-s</i>	<i>ujc-u</i>	<i>ujc-ale</i>	uncle
M -∅-	<i>papu-s</i>	<i>papu</i>	N/A	grandfather
	<i>bāči-s</i>	<i>bāči</i>	N/A	uncle
F -a	<i>bab-a</i>	<i>bab-o</i>	<i>bab-ale</i>	grandmother
	<i>mam-a</i>	<i>mam-o</i>	N/A	mummy
	<i>ceťk-a</i>	<i>ceťk-o</i>	<i>ceťk-ale</i>	aunt
	<i>nejn-a</i>	<i>nejn-o</i>	N/A	aunt

As follows from Table 32, the vocative singular markers are different from those of the oikoclitic nouns. The most common is *-o*, which marks the VOC.SG of some *o-* and *a-*masculines and of all xenoclitic feminines. The least common VOC.SG marker is *-u*, which exists with *u-*masculines only. In an alternative analysis, one could argue that the VOC.SG of

the xenoclitic *u*-masculines is marked by the classificatory suffix and has no overt VOC.SG marking, which is the actual situation of the xenoclitic zero masculines, such as NOM.SG *papu-s*, VOC.SG *papu*. Finally, there is a VOC.SG suffix *-na* applicable to most *o*-masculines and to all *i*-masculines, added to the respective classificatory marker. The same suffix is found with some *a*-masculines, but, instead of the regular **-a-na*, we find a suffix *-ona* analogous to that of *o*-masculines.

The vocative plural of xenoclitic nouns does not differ from that of the oikoclitic nouns as the VOC.PL suffix *-ale* is common for both compartments. However, the plural vocatives of xenoclitic nouns are only sporadically attested, and the nominative plural forms are much more common in addressing than the vocatives in *-ale*. While some xenoclitic nouns are documented in both vocative and nominative plural forms in addressing, e.g. VOC.PL *barāt-ale* ~ NOM.PL *barāt-a*, some xenoclitic nouns occur only in their nominative forms in the plural, e.g. *papu-ja* ‘grandfathers’.

In addition to the specific xenoclitic suffixes, the oikoclitic vocative suffixes *-eja* (M) and *-ije* (F) are optionally used with xenoclitic nouns as well. More specifically, the noun *barāt-o-s* is in Uzhorod and Perechyn attested in a vocative form *barāt-eja* alongside *barāt-o-na*, while a fairy-tale related by a speaker from Sereďnie provides evidence of a vocative form *pāc-ije* of an inanimate Hungarian feminine loanword *pāc-a* ‘staff, club’.

Like the oikoclitic diminutives, the xenoclitic diminutives also participate in the vocative morphology, showing the VOC.SG suffix *-na*, e.g. *holub-o-s* ‘pigeon’, diminutive *holub-o-c-i-s*, VOC *holub-o-c-i-na*; *komār-i-s* ‘mosquito’, diminutive *komār-i-c-i-s*, VOC *komār-i-c-i-na*. The vocative of the xenoclitic feminines is marked by *-o* like that of the non-diminutive counterparts: *mačk-a* ‘cat’, diminutive *mačk-ic-a*, VOC *mačk-ic-o*. Vocative forms of the xenoclitic diminutives are quite common in spontaneous speech, but, again, in the singular only.

Masculine personal names occur in their base form in the vocative, e.g. NOM *miki-s*, VOC *miki* ‘Miki’, NOM *l'oňa-s*, VOC *l'oňa* ‘Lionia’, NOM *mirku-s*, VOC *mirku*, and this also holds true for names ending in a consonant, such as *artur* ‘Artur’, *david* ‘David’ and *ruslan* ‘Ruslan’, which have zero marking in both nominative and vocative (see 4.1.1.3.4). Feminine personal names have the regular vocative suffix *-o*: NOM *ev-a*, VOC *ev-o* ‘Eve’, NOM *magd-a*, VOC *magd-o* ‘Magda’, NOM *soň-a*, VOC *soň-o* ‘Sonia’, etc.

4.1.3 Layer II case suffixes

Layer II case markers are unstressed agglutinative suffixes that are attached to the Layer I oblique stem. They are invariant across all noun classes, including both compartments. Having their origins in erstwhile postpositions (cf. Friedman 1991; Matras 1997), their cognates are found in other New Indo-Aryan languages and their ancestors may be traced back to at least Middle Indo-Aryan (cf. Beníšek 2009).

Every Layer II suffix occurs in two allomorphs: one beginning in a voiceless stop or /h/, the other in a voiced stop or /c/. Application of both variants is phonologically determined. The set of voiced variants is applied to the oblique stem ending in the nasal /n/, e.g. *phral-en-ge* [brother-OBL.PL-DAT] ‘for the brothers’, while the voiceless variants are applied elsewhere, e.g. DAT *phral-es-ke* [brother-OBL.SG.M-DAT] ‘for the brother’, *pheň-a-ke* [sister-OBL.SG.F-DAT] ‘for the sister’. Since the distribution of both types of oblique stems largely follows the singular – plural distinction, one may be tempted to regard the case suffixes as variants conditioned by the number categories, but a pronominal form *man-ge* I:OBL-DAT ‘for me’ excludes such an analysis.

In Table 33, all Layer II case suffixes in Eastern Uzh Romani are presented, alongside an example paradigm of the noun *rom* ‘Rom, husband’. The designations adopted for the case suffixes are based upon the general practice in Romani linguistics, established since Sampson (1926); see also Matras (2002).⁸⁵ The Layer II locative case is also included, although it no longer represents a productive inflectional category for nouns in Eastern Uzh Romani (see discussion below).

Table 33: Layer II case markers

CASE	SUFFIX	<i>rom</i> SG	<i>rom</i> PL
DATIVE	<i>-ke/-ge</i>	<i>rom-es-ke</i>	<i>rom-en-ge</i>
LOCATIVE	<i>-te/(*-de)</i>	<i>rom-es-te</i>	<i>(*rom-en-de)</i>
ABLATIVE	<i>-tar/-dar</i>	<i>rom-es-tar</i>	<i>rom-en-dar</i>
INSTRUMENTAL	<i>-ha/-ca</i>	<i>rom-e-ha</i>	<i>rom-en-ca</i>
GENITIVE	<i>-ker-/ger-</i>	<i>rom-es-ker-</i>	<i>rom-en-ger-</i>

Forms of all case suffixes are shared with the other North Central dialects, although in some other dialects, but not in Eastern Uzh Romani, the genitive suffixes may occur in elided

⁸⁵ Some deviations may still occur. For example, Elšík and Matras (2006) prefer the term ‘sociative’ over ‘instrumental’.

forms *-kr-/gr-*. At the same time, most suffixes maintain their Late Proto-Romani forms (cf. Matras 2002: 88; Elšík and Matras 2006: 73). The only exception is the form of the Proto-Romani instrumental/sociative suffix **-sa*, which in the entire North Central branch underwent debuccalisation to *-ha* in the intervocalic position and affrication to *-ca* after nasal stems.

As indicated above, the locative is no longer a productive case category in Eastern Uzh Romani. It represents a productive case only for pronouns, for which it mainly functions as a general prepositional case (see 11.1.1.6 and 11.2). In nouns, it is restricted rather to some lexicalised and adverbialised forms, plus it functions in marking localisation of the proper locality names, such as town and villages, e.g. *ungvāra-te* [Uzhhorod-LOC] ‘in/to Uzhhorod’. Moreover, all attested occurrences of locative nouns are singular forms and their locative suffix therefore occurs in the voiceless variant *-te*, while the voiced variant *-de* can only be inferred from the pronominal declension (e.g. *amen-de* we-LOC). That is why the plural locative **romende* is given the asterisk in Table 33 as it represents a reconstructed form. In any case, most nouns no longer have locative marking, including in the singular (see 11.1.1.6 for more details).

The instrumental suffix *-ha* stands out among all suffixes in that it is attached to the vocalic oblique stem, which lacks the sibilant element, e.g. OBL *rom-es-*, INST *rom-e-ha*. This results in a situation where *-ha* is suffixed to the classificatory marker in the xenoclitic masculine inflection; cf. for ‘soap’ OBL *sapuň-i-s-*, INST *sapuň-i-ha*, or even to the plain base in xenoclitic zero masculines, cf. for ‘teacher’ *tanitov-s-*, INST *tanitov-ha*.

The most complex Layer II case category in Romani in general is the genitive, which combines properties of a noun case with those of adjectives. The genitive suffix marks the adnominal possessor (see 11.1.1.7), and the possessor agrees with its head by a process that is generally referred to as ‘Suffixaufnahme’ (see 11.1). In other words, the genitive suffix *-ker/-ger-* is followed by the adjectival suffixes to express agreement with the head modified by the genitive noun, and the genitive nouns therefore resemble adjectival modifiers. The adjective inflection of genitive forms is that of the oikoclitic vocalic adjectives (5.1.1.1). See the following genitive phrases (for the form of the genitive suffix *-kor-* in the first example, see discussion below)

- (12) *mijre dad-es-kor-o* *phral* (Khu)
 my father-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.SG.M brother[NOM.SG.M]
 ‘brother.NOM of my father’

- (13) *mijre dad-es-ker-e* *phral-es* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 my father-OBL.SG.M-GEN-OBL.SG.M brother-ACC.SG.M
 ‘brother.ACC of my father’
- (14) *mijre dad-es-ker-i* *daj* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 my father-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.SG.F mother[NOM.SG.F]
 ‘mother.NOM of my father’
- (15) *mijre dad-es-ker-a* *d-a* (Khu)^{etr}
 my father-OBL.SG.M-GEN-OBL.SG.F mother-ACC.SG.M
 ‘mother.ACC of my father’
- (16) *mije dad-es-ker-e* *barāt-a* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 my father-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.PL friend-NOM.PL
 ‘friends.NOM of my father’
- (17) *mijre dad-es-ker-e* *barāt-en* (Khu)^{etr}
 my father-OBL.SG.M-GEN-OBL.PL friend-ACC.PL
 ‘friends.ACC of my father’

The vocalic part of the genitive suffix *-ker-/ger-* may assimilate to the NOM.SG.M agreement suffix *-o*, resulting in forms *-kor-o/-gor-o*, e.g. *rom-es-kor-o* [husband-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.SG.M], *rom-en-gor-o* [husband-OBL.PL-GEN-NOM.SG.M] (see also (12) above). Such assimilation is documented in all Eastern Uzh varieties, and its occurrence is probably an idiolectal feature: some speakers seem to prefer the assimilated form, while other speakers use the non-assimilated form exclusively. Still, certain dialectal tendencies can be observed. On the basis of our data, the assimilated form is very common in all *gāvutune* varieties, i.e. in Perechyn, Khudlovo and Serechnie, and rare in both Uzhhorod varieties, where the non-assimilated forms such as *romeskerō/romengerō* prevail. In Perechyn, moreover, sporadic assimilation to the OBL.SG.F agreement suffix *-a* is also attested, i.e. *-kara-/gar-a* as in *berš-en-gar-a* [year-OBL.PL-GEN-OBL.SG.F] ‘of years’. Assimilation to the NOM.SG.F agreement suffix *-i*, i.e. **-kir-i*, never occurs, and the genitive noun always ends in *-ker-i* in the nominative feminine agreement (*romeskeri, romengeri*).

4.2 Noun derivation

Noun derivation in Eastern Uzh Romani comprises suffixal morphology used in deriving nouns either from other nouns or from other word classes, i.e. from adjectives, adverbs and verbs. The following derivational strategies and their morphological properties are discussed in the sections to follow: formation of diminutive nouns; various kinds of nominalisation,

such as conversion of adjectives into nouns and formation of abstract nouns; agentive and feminine derivation; and the somewhat more marginal formation of some tree names.

4.2.1 Diminutive nouns

Diminutives represent a very productive derivational category in Eastern Uzh Romani. They may be formed from virtually any underived noun, including recent and current loanwords, as well as from agentive and feminine derivations, but not from abstract nouns. In line with the general compartmentalisation of nouns, different morphological strategies apply in deriving diminutives from oikoclitic and xenoclitic nouns. Inflection of diminutives generally conforms to the inflection of primary nouns, but certain inflectional peculiarities occur, in particular with respect to the xenoclitic diminutives.

The basic function of diminutives is to express small size, small quantity or littleness of the referent, e.g. *čhuvri* ‘knife’ > *čhuvrōri* ‘little knife, penknife’, *kher* ‘house’ > *kherōro* ‘little house’, *skamin* ‘table’ > *skaminōro* ‘small table, stool’, *butros* ‘furniture’ > *butrocis* ‘little furniture’, *pivos* ‘beer’ > *pivocis* ‘a little drop of beer’, *tāboris* ‘Romani settlement’ > *tāboricis* ‘little Romani settlement’, etc. A fundamental and less predictable semantic difference between the primary noun and its diminutive counterpart is rare, but it occurs with respect to *čhon* ‘month’ (rarely ‘moon’) vs. DIMIN *čhonōro* ‘moon’ (never *‘month’). Diminutives of names of animals are commonly used in reference to young animals, e.g. *bakro* ‘sheep’ > *bakrōro* ‘lamb’, *rukono* (Perechyn *rokono*) ‘dog’ > *rukonōro* (*rokonōro*) ‘puppy’, *koza* ‘goat’ > *kozica* ‘kid (animal)’, *mačka* ‘cat’ > *mačkica* ‘kitten’, Uzhhorod *bālo* ‘pig’ > *bālōro* ‘piglet’ (elsewhere *bal’ičho* > *bal’ičhōro*), etc. In a similar manner, *čhavōro* and *čhajōri*, based upon *čha* ‘son, boy’ (PL *čhave*) and *čhaj* ‘girl’ respectively, are used in reference to little pre-teen children. The other function of diminutives is to express an affectionate, compassionate and empathetic emotion in relation to the referent, such as the common affectionate diminutives of kinship terms *dajōri* from *daj* ‘mother’ and *dadōro* from *dad* ‘father’, but also *devlōro* from *dejl* ‘God’, etc. In a contrary manner, certain other diminutives are used as mock words to ridicule their referents. For example, *papucis*, a diminutive form of *papus* ‘grandfather’, is ridiculously employed in reference to a little boy who pretends to behave as an adult.

In addition to the internal diminutive strategies, there are a number of local Slavic diminutive nouns borrowed together with their non-diminutive counterparts. Some common examples of such borrowed pairs include *rika* ‘river’ ~ *rička* ‘rivulet, small river’ (cf.

Ukrainian *pika*, *пічка*) and *kurtka* ‘jacket’ ~ *kurtočka* ‘small jacket’ (Ukrainian/Russian *куртка*, *курточка*).

4.2.1.1 Oikoclitic diminutives in *-ōr-*

Diminutives of oikoclitic nouns are formed by the inherited suffix *-ōr-*, whose cognates are also common in other Romani dialects (< *-oŕ-; cf. Matras 2002: 75). The identical suffix is also used in forming diminutive adjectives (see 5.2.1.1), as well as in diminutive formations of adverbs, numerals and some non-numerical quantifiers.

The diminutive suffix *-ōr-* is added to the noun base and is obligatorily followed by the overt inflectional suffixes: *phral* M ‘brother’ > *phral-ōr-o*, *mār-o* M ‘bread’ > *mār-ōr-o*, *angušt-o* M ‘finger’ > *angušt-ōr-o*, *pāñ-i* M ‘water’ > *pāñ-ōr-i*, *pheñ* F ‘sister’ > *pheñ-ōr-i*, *rakl’-i* F ‘non-Romani girl’ > *rakl’-ōr-i*. The long vowel /ā/ of the base form is kept in the diminutive form, e.g. *kān* ‘ear’ > *kān-ōr-o*, PL *jākh-a* ‘ears’ > *jākh-ōr-a* but *jakh* ‘eye’ > *jakh-ōr-i*. Cf., however, SG *gav*, PL *gāv-a* as against diminutive SG *gav-ōr-o*, PL *gav-ōr-a*. Palatalisation of the feminine base in /d, t, n, l/ takes place before the diminutive suffix provided that palatalisation is applied in non-diminutive inflection: *men* ‘neck’ > *meñ-ōr-i* (cf. NOM.PL *meñ-a*), *mol* ‘wine’ > *mol’-ōr-i* (cf. NOM.PL *mol’-a*), *phurd* ‘bridge’ > *phurd’-ōr-i* (cf. NOM.PL *phurd’-a*), but *ārmin* ‘cabbage’ > *ārmin-ōr-i* (cf. NOM.PL *ārmin-a*), *zumin* ‘soup’ > *zumin-ōr-i* (cf. NOM.PL *zumin-a*).

Irregular formation with respect to the nominative base occurs with *čha* ‘son, Romani boy’ > *čhav-ōr-o* and *dejl* ‘God’ > *devl-ōr-o*, where the more conservative bases *čhav-* and *devl-* occur in the diminutive formations (cf. also NOM.PL *čhav-e* ‘boys’ and OBL.SG *de(j)vl-es-* for God’).

The feminine nouns with reduced non-nominative and non-singular bases often show the reduced bases in the diminutive as well (see below about their optional xenoclitic diminutive morphology): *phāb-aj* ‘apple’ > *phāb-ōr-i* (cf. OBL.SG/NOM.PL *phāb-a-*), Shakhta *āsv-in* ‘teardrop’ > *āsv-ōr-i* (cf. OBL.SG/NOM.PL *āsv-a-*), Shakhta *prajt-in* ‘leaf’ > *prajt-ōr-i* (cf. OBL.SG/NOM.PL *prajt-a-*), but, in contrast, Sereďnie *prajt’in* (OBL.SG/NOM.PL *prajt’-a-*) > *prajt’in-ōr-i*. Diminutives of the kinship terms *čhaj* ‘daughter, Romani girl’, *daj* ‘mother’ and *sasuj* ‘mother-in-law’, which have reduced bases in the OBL.SG only (see 4.1.1.2.1), are based on the non-reduced nominative forms: *čhaj-ōr-i*, *daj-ōr-i*, *sasuj-ōr-i*.

The common nominative plural suffix of all diminutive nouns is *-a*: *phral-ōr-a*, *mār-ōr-a*, *pheñ-ōr-a*, *rakl’-ōr-a*. The *o*-masculines also display the plural suffix *-e* as an option, i.e. *čhav-ōr-e* alongside *čhav-ōr-a*, often within a single variety and depending on the

particular speaker. The oblique suffixes are identical to the non-diminutive counterparts: OBL.SG.M *-es-* (*phral-ōr-es-*), OBL.SG.F *-a-* (*pheñ-ōr-a-*), OBL.PL *-en-* (*phral-ōr-en-*, *pheñ-ōr-en-*).

4.2.1.2 Xenoclitic diminutives in *-(i)c-*

Diminutives of xenoclitic nouns show a somewhat more intricate morphological structure than those of the oikoclitic nouns. The diminutive marker occurs in two forms, *-c-* or *-ic-*, whose distribution will be described below. The suffix is probably descended from Greek (see Boretzky 2012a: 53).

The basic layout of the xenoclitic diminutive morphology is indicated in Table 34. Nouns selected to demonstrate the xenoclitic diminutives are based upon attested forms and may partially differ from the noun examples in the discussion of the primary xenoclitic inflection in 4.1.1.3 and 4.1.1.4.

Table 34: Derivation and inflection of xenoclitic diminutive nouns

PRIMARY CLASS	PRIMARY	DIMINUTIVE		PRIMARY MEANING
	NOM.SG	NOM.SG	NOM.PL	
<i>o</i> -masculines	<i>cakl-o-s</i>	<i>cakl-o-c-i-s</i>	<i>cakl-ic-i</i>	‘bottle’
	<i>barāt-o-s</i>	<i>barāt-o-c-i-s</i>	<i>barāt-ic-a</i>	‘friend’
<i>a</i> -masculines	<i>sluh-a-s</i>	<i>sluh-o-c-i-s</i>	<i>sluh-ic-i</i>	‘servant’
	<i>cimbor-a-s</i>	<i>cimbor-o-c-i-s</i>	<i>cimbor-ic-a</i>	‘friend’
<i>i</i> -masculines	<i>pohār-i-s</i>	<i>pohār-i-c-i-s</i>	<i>pohār-ic-a</i>	‘drinking glass’
<i>u</i> -masculines	<i>ujc-u-s</i>	<i>ujc-u-c-i-s</i>	<i>ujc-ic-i</i>	‘uncle’
zero masculines	<i>papu-s</i>	<i>papu-c-i-s</i>	<i>papu-c-a</i>	‘grandfather’
	<i>mozi-s</i>	<i>mozi-c-i-s</i>	<i>mozi-c-a</i>	‘cinema, film’
	<i>kančov-s</i>	<i>kančov-c-i-s</i>	<i>kančov-c-a</i>	‘tea-pot’
feminines	<i>mačk-a</i>	<i>mačk-ic-a</i>	<i>mačk-ic-i</i>	‘cat’

As shown in Table 34, the monoconsonantal diminutive suffix *-c-* occurs in all masculine nouns in the singular, but only in the zero masculines in the plural. In the singular, *-c-* is attached to the classificatory marker of the primary bases: *cakl-o-s* ‘bottle’ > *cakl-o-c-*, *barāt-o-s* ‘friend’ > *barāt-o-c-*, *pohār-i-s* ‘drinking glass’ > *pohār-i-c-*, etc., and to the nominal base in the zero masculines, as in *kančov-s* ‘tea-pot’ > *kančov-c-*. The xenoclitic *a*-masculines, however, behave like underlying *o*-masculines in the diminutives: *sluh-a-s* ‘servant’ > *sluh-o-c-* instead of **sluh-a-c-* and *cimbor-a-s* (in Khudlovo and Serednie) ‘friend’

> *cimbor-o-c-* instead of **cimbor-a-c-*. The other suffix *-ic-* occurs in the plural of all masculine nouns except of the zero masculines: *cakl-ic-*, *barāt-ic-*, *sluh-ic-*, *cimbor-ic-*, *pohār-ic-*, and with all xenoclitic feminines: *mačk-a* ‘cat’ > *mačk-ic-*.

The diminutive marker *-(i)c-* is followed by inflectional suffixes. The masculine nouns in the singular contain the specific diminutive classificatory marker *-i-* followed by the nominative singular suffix *-s*: *cakl-o-c-i-s* ‘little bottle’, *barāt-o-c-i-s* ‘little friend’, *sluh-o-c-i-s* ‘little servant’, *cimbor-o-c-i-s* ‘little friend’, *pohār-i-c-i-s* ‘little drinking glass’, *kančov-c-i-s* ‘little tea-pot’. The plural suffix of masculine diminutives reflects that of the primary nouns: *cakl-ic-i* as *cakl-i*, *barāt-ic-a* as *barāt-a*, *sluh-ic-i* as *sluh-i*, *cimbor-ic-a* as *cimbor-a*, *pohār-ic-a* as *pohār-a*, etc. The plural diminutives of the zero masculines contain only the vocalic segment of the plural suffix: *mozi-c-a* (cf. NOM.PL *mozi-ja* ‘cinemas’) and *kančov-c-a* (cf. NOM.PL *kančov-va* ‘tea-pots’). The feminine diminutives are inflected like most other xenoclitic feminines: NOM.SG *mačk-ic-a* ‘little cat, kitten’, NOM.PL *mačk-ic-i*. The diminutive derived from the primary noun *rokl'-a*, which has an extended suffix *-ija* in the plural (see 4.1.1.4), is inflected like the xenoclitic feminine diminutives: NOM.SG *rokl'-ic-a*, NOM.PL *rokl'-ic-i*. In the non-nominative cases, all xenoclitic diminutives are inflected as primary xenoclitic nouns. Their OBL.SG marking is identical to the NOM.SG marking, while the OBL.PL suffix *-en-* is added to the plural diminutive bases, as in *cakl-ic-en-*, *kančov-c-en-*, *mačk-ic-en-*, etc. The xenoclitic diminutives also commonly occur in the vocative singular, which is discussed in 4.1.2.2.

The xenoclitic diminutives are very productive for the current loanwords. Virtually any borrowed noun may be diminutivised by the strategies outlined in the previous paragraphs. Sporadically, the xenoclitic diminutive morphology even occurs with some primary oikoclitic nouns, such as *rašaj* ‘priest’ has an attested xenoclitic diminutive form *rašaj-o-c-i-s* (PL *rašaj-ic-i*), as if the underlying base were *rašaj-o-s*.

4.2.2 Nominalisation

4.2.2.1 Conversion of adjectives

One of the productive means of noun formation is the conversion of adjectives into nouns with no special derivational marking. Some semantic shifts may occur as a result of the conversion process, as in *bāro* ‘big’ > ‘adult’, *gāvutuno* ‘rural’ > ‘villager, peasant’, *xurde* PL ‘minor’ > ‘change (about money)’, *muvlo* ‘dead’ > ‘ghost’, *romano* (Radvanka also *romaduno*) ‘Gypsy, Romani’ > ‘Romani man’ (F *romaňi*, *romaduňi* ‘Romani woman’), etc.

‘child benefits’ (cf. *čhave* ‘children’), which is a loan translation of local Slavic forms for child benefits that literally mean ‘children’s’.

The nominative inflection of the oikoclitic vocalic adjectives does not differ from that of the oikoclitic vocalic nouns (*o*- and *i*-masculines), so this does not pose any issue for the conversion. However, there is a difference in the nominative inflection of xenoclitic adjectives and nouns, and the converted xenoclitic adjectives often retain their adjectival inflection in the nominative. For example, the noun phrases *kresno dad* ‘godfather in relation to the godchild’ and *kresno daj* ‘godmother in relation to the godchild’ (cf. Slovak *krstný otec*, *krstná matka*, Ukrainian *хресний батько*, *хресна мати*) may be reduced to plain *kresno*, in which the former dependent adjective becomes the head noun; still it maintains its adjective form *kresno* in the nominative. On the other hand, converted oikoclitic zero adjectives are sometimes documented with noun suffixes. The plural form of the converted comparative adjective *phureder* ‘elder person’ is attested as *phureder-a* ‘elder people’, analogous to the plural forms of the oikoclitic zero masculines, such as *phral* ‘brother’ > PL *phral-a*, while it has a zero-marked form *phureder* as an attribute of a plural noun. In the non-nominative cases, the oikoclitic noun case suffixes are added to the adjectival base, i.e. OBL.SG.M *kresnes-*, OBL.SG.F *kresna-*, OBL.PL *kresnen-*.

The qualitative adjectives converted into nouns may also be diminutivised. In such cases, the strategies for deriving the noun diminutives, and not the adjective diminutives, are employed. For example, the xenoclitic adjective *maživo* ‘pampered, spoilt (about children)’ has a regular diminutive form *maživōro* (see 5.2.1.1), but if it is converted into a noun, it occurs in a nominal xenoclitic diminutive form *maživocis* (see 4.2.1.2).

4.2.2.2 Abstract nouns

In addition to conversion of adjectives, nominalisation is commonly achieved by suffixation. Nominalisers that derive abstract and some concrete nouns from adjectives and verbs, more sporadically from adverbs and other nouns, are *-(i)be(n)*, *-(i)pe(n)* and *-(V)šāg-*. The suffixes *-(i)ben* and *-(i)pen* are inherited, common in other Romani dialects as well (cf. Boretzky and Iгла 2004: 69–70). In Eastern Uzh Romani, they may exhibit apocope of the final nasal, leading to *-(i)be* and *-(i)pe*, but in this respect strong variation exists: some speakers use the conservative non-apocopated suffixes, some speakers use the innovated apocopated suffixes, while many other speakers oscillate between the two. Based on my data, apocope is most common in Perechyn and Sereďnie, while in Khudlovo and in both Uzhhorod varieties, there is variation depending on particular speakers. Similar variation in reduction of

the final nasal in the nominalisers has been observed in Western Uzh varieties in Slovakia, even though the innovation generally seems to affect fewer varieties there.

The allomorphs *-be(n)* and *-pe(n)* with no /i/ only occur if the suffix is attached to a vocalic verb base in /a/, such as *asa-* ‘to laugh’ > *asa-be(n)* ‘laughter’. Otherwise, the suffixes are attached to a consonantal base and their variants with the vowel /i/ are applied, e.g. *zdrav-o* ‘healthy’ > *zdrav-ipe(n)* ‘health’. For the vowel segment of the suffix *-(V)šāg-*, see below.

As for inflection, nouns derived by *-(i)be(n)* and *-(i)pe(n)* display specific oikoclitic inflection, discussed in 4.1.1.1.2, while the nouns marked by the Hungarian-derived suffix *-(V)šāg-* are xenoclitic *o*-nouns (4.1.1.3.1).

As shown by Schmid (1963, 1968; see also Beníšek 2010), the two inherited suffixes *-(i)ben* and *-(i)pen* originate from two different OIA sources. While *-(i)ben* can be traced back to the necessity participle/gerundive marker *-(i)tavya-*, *-(i)pen* continues the OIA (Vedic) deadjectival nominaliser *-tvana-*. In line with their origin, *-(i)ben* was formerly a deverbal nominaliser in Romani, as it is still in a number of dialects, while *-(i)pen* was the deadjectival nominaliser (cf. Matras 2002: 74–75). It would follow then that the borrowed suffix *-(i)šāg-* should be reserved for the most recent loanwords. However, although there is still a tendency towards this derivational pattern in most Eastern Uzh Romani varieties, it is far from consistent. We encounter the formerly deverbal nominaliser *-(i)be(n)* in deadjectival nouns, the formerly deadjectival nominaliser *-(i)pe(n)* in deverbal nouns, the borrowed nominaliser *-(V)šāg-* with inherited bases, the inherited nominalisers *-(i)be(n)* and *-(i)pe(n)* with borrowed bases. The occurrence of the suffixes is also subject to dialectal variation. The Khudlovo variety especially behaves most differently and stands against all other varieties in that the suffix *-(i)be(n)* is retreating in favour of *-(i)pe(n)*, which assumes its functions. In Uzhhorod, in contrast, *-(i)be(n)* seems to gain ground at the expense of *-(i)pe(n)* in deadjectival nouns, while for deverbal nouns the development might be opposite, in favour of *-(i)pe(n)*. There is also variation among speakers of a single variety, and even alternation in an idiolect of a single speaker. Some abstract nouns are attested with all three suffixes: for example, alongside the common *terñipe(n)* ‘youth’ (from *terno* ‘young’), the forms *terñiben* in Radvanka and *terñišāgos* in Khudlovo have been documented as well. Still, many abstract nouns are stable and consistently display one of the three suffixes across the dialect region. See the following sections for more details.

4.2.2.2.1 Abstract nouns in *-(i)be(n)*

The suffix *-(i)be(n)* is still common in deverbal nouns in all varieties, excluding Khudlovo, e.g. *bešibe(n)* ‘sitting’ (*beš-* ‘sit’), *kamibe(n)* ‘love; debt’ (*kam-* ‘to love, to want; to owe’), *koškeribe(n)* ‘curse, insult word’ (*košker-* ‘to curse’), *khel’ibe(n)* ‘dance’ (*khel-* ‘to dance’), *rovibe(n)* ‘weeping, tears’ (*rov-* ‘to weep’), *sovibe(n)* ‘sleep, slumber’ (*sov-* ‘to sleep’), *vakeribe(n)* ‘narration, speaking, talk’ (*vaker-* ‘to speak, to talk’). The nouns derived from the vocalic *a*-verbs optionally insert *-v-* between the root and the nominaliser, as in *xavibe(n)* ‘(way of) eating’ (*xa-* ‘to eat’), but not in *asabe(n)* ‘laugh’ (*asa-* ‘to laugh’) and *ladžabe(n)* ‘shame’ (*ladža-* ‘to feel shame’). Both *pa’abe(n)* and *pa’avibe(n)* ‘belief’ (*pa’a-* ‘to believe’) are attested. Nominalisation is also documented for iterative verbs in *-ker-*, e.g. *phirkeribe(n)* ‘travelling, walking up and down’ (< *phir-ker-* ‘to travel, to go repeatedly’), and rarely for verbs marked by an aktionsart prefix, such as *dopa’avibe(n)* ‘trust’ (*do-pa’a-* ‘to trust’).

There are also some denominal and many deadjectival nouns in *-ibe(n)*. Common examples are *čāčibe(n)* ‘truth’ (rare *čāčo* ‘truth’), *lāčhibe(n)* ‘goodness, kindness’ (*lāčho* ‘good’), *nasval’ibe(n)* ‘illness’ (*nasvalo* ‘ill’) and *šukaribe(n)* ‘beauty’ (*šukār* ‘beautiful’), while *kučibe(n)* ‘expensiveness, high prices’ (*kuč* ‘expensive’) occurs only in Uzhhorod (Serednie *kučipe(n)*) and *tuñibe(n)* ‘cheapness’ from a borrowed adjective *tuño* ‘cheap’ seems to occur only in Shakhta (Radvanka, Serednie *tuñipe(n)*). In Uzhhorod, many deadjectival nouns are attested with both *-ibe(n)* and *-ipe(n)*, even from a single speaker. For example, both *bāribe(n)* and *bāripe(n)* ‘greatness, pride, adulthood’ (*bāro* ‘big, adult’) were recorded from a single speaker in Radvanka, while *ta’iipe(n)* and *tā’iibe(n)* ‘warmth’ (*tāto* ‘warm’) were documented in spontaneous speech of a single speaker in Shakhta,⁸⁷ which might be indicative of an ongoing replacement of *-ipe(n)* by *-ibe(n)* in the deadjectival nominalisation.

4.2.2.2.2 Abstract nouns in *-ipe(n)*

The suffix *-(i)pe(n)* is a conservative deadjectival nominaliser, cf. common *barval’ipe(n)* ‘wealth’ (*barvalo* ‘wealthy, rich’), *gul’ipe(n)* ‘candy’ (*gulo* ‘sweet’), *kerad’ipe(n)* ‘heat, hot weather’ (*kerado* ‘hot’), *koripe(n)* ‘blindness’ (*koro* ‘blind’), *žuvžipe(n)* ‘cleanness’ (*žuvžo* ‘clean, pure’), borrowed bases included, as in common *zdravipe(n)* ‘health’ (*zdravo* ‘healthy’), Radvanka *drahipe(n)* ‘expensiveness, high prices’, Shakhta *podl’ipe(n)* ‘evil, wickedness’ (*podlo* ‘evil, wicked’), Radvanka and Serednie *tuñipe(n)* ‘cheapness’ (*tuño* ‘cheap’). Some abstract nouns in *-ipe(n)* are fossilised relics of derivation from adjectives that

⁸⁷ Note that the innovative form *tā’iibe(n)* maintains the long vowel of the base adjective *tāto*, while the conservative form *ta’iipe(n)* has a short vowel pointing to an earlier fossilised derivation.

have already been lost, e.g. *sasipe(n)*, synonymous to *zdravipe(n)* ‘health’, derives from an inherited adjective **sasto* ‘healthy’ (via **sastipen*), which has been replaced by the Slavic loanword *zdravo* in the current language.

Furthermore, the suffix *-ipe(n)* is common in abstract nouns derived from the perfective verb stems. The perfective stem plays a significant role in forming participles, which are verbal adjectives, so that the nouns based on such stems may also be regarded as deadjectival, e.g. *čhan'ipe(n)* ‘vomiting’ (*čhand-*, PFV *čhanl-* ‘to vomit’), *khuvd'ipen* ‘weaving’ (*khuv-*, PFV *khuvd-* ‘to weave’), *phan'ipe(n)* ‘closing’ (*phand-*, PFV *phanl-* ‘to close’), *rozgejl'ipe(n)* ‘break-up, disintegration’ (*roz-dža-*, PFV *roz-gejl-* ‘to break up’), *thod'ipe(n)* ‘establishment’ (*thov-*, PFV *thod-* ‘to put, to establish’), but compare, in contrast, Serednie *kiñibe(n)* ‘clothing’ (*kid-*, PFV *kin(d)-* ‘to gather; to dress’) with *-ibe(n)*. Nouns derived from middle verbs are also usually derived by this form, such as *khaml'ipe(n)* ‘perspiration’ (*khaml'uv-* ‘to perspire’), *pašl'ipe(n)* ‘lying’ (*pašl'uv-* ‘to be lying’), *terd'ipe(n)* ‘standing’ (*terd'uv-* ‘to stand’) and *zisal'ipe(n)* ‘faint(ing)’ (*zisal'uv-* ‘to faint’). However, a form *pašl'ibe(n)* occurs in both Uzhhorod varieties and in Perechyn *pašl'ibe* and *terd'ibe* have been encountered.

The suffix *-ipe(n)* also occurs in some deverbal abstract nouns. Alongside the common *dživipe(n)* ‘life’ (*dživ-* ‘to live’), *khandipe(n)*⁸⁸ ‘stink’ (*khand-* ‘to stink’), and *mangavipe(n)* ‘betrothal’ (*mangav-* ‘to get engaged to’), which occur in other North Central dialects as well, there are dozens of deverbal nouns in *-ipe(n)* attested in Shakhta, such as *lidžavipe(n)* ‘carrying’ (*lidža-* ‘to carry off’), *phuteripe(n)* ‘opening’ (*phuter-* ‘to open’), and even some nouns based upon borrowed verbs, such as *kezdiñipe(n)* ‘beginning’ (*kezdin-* ‘to begin’ from Hungarian).

The suffix *-ipe(n)* also occurs in abstract nouns derived from both inherited and borrowed nouns, as in *kirvipe(n)* ‘relation between parents of a child and his or her godparents’ (*kirvo* ‘godfather’), *muršipe(n)* ‘masculinity’ (*murš* ‘male’) and *krāl'ipe(n)* ‘kingdom’ (*krāl'is* ‘king’ from West Slavic) respectively.

The Khudlovo variety, as already mentioned above, differs the most from the other varieties since there the suffix *-ipe(n)* is used at the expense of *-ibe(n)* in most documented abstract nouns. In Khudlovo, *-ipe(n)* is common in those deadjectival nouns that consistently occur with *-ibe(n)* in the other varieties, as in *čāčipe(n)*, *lāčhipe(n)*, *nasval'ipe(n)* and

⁸⁸ The form *khandipen* is also noteworthy with respect to the absence of palatalisation of the alveolar stop before the nominaliser.

šukaripe(n). More significantly, the suffix extends to the deverbal nominalisation in Khudlovo, as evidenced by *bešipe(n)*, *bikiņipe(n)* ‘selling’ (*bikin-* ‘to sell’), *kamipe(n)*, *kheļipe(n)*, *rovipe(n)*, *vakeripe(n)*, etc. On the contrary, *-(i)be(n)* still occurs in *asabe(n)*.

4.2.2.2.3 Abstract nouns in *-(V)šāg-*

The third nominaliser is *-(V)šāg-*. It is extracted from directly borrowed Hungarian loanwords, which can still be found, such as *mulatšāgos* ‘marry-making, revelry’ (< Hungarian *mulatság*; cf. also *mulatin-* ‘to celebrate, to make merry’ < Hungarian *mulat*) and Uzhhorod *tāršašāgos* ‘company’ (< Hungarian *társaság*).

In internally derived abstract nouns, *-(V)šāg-* is most productive in deriving nouns from borrowed verbs. The vowel quality in *-Všāg-* is determined by the vowel quality of the source loan-verb integration suffix, which is usually *-in-* (see 3.2.3), so the suffix has the most common form *-išāg-*, as in *dumišāgos* ‘thinking’ (*dumin-* ‘to think’), *lecišāgos* ‘flying’ (*lecin-* ‘to fly’), *modlišāgos* ‘praying’ (*modlin-* ‘to pray’), *pisišāgos* ‘writing’ (*pisin-* ‘to write’), which contain Slavic-origin bases, and *rāzišāgos* ‘shaking, trembling’ (*rāzin-* ‘to shake’) and *rugišāgos* ‘kicking’ (*rugin-* ‘to kick’), which contain bases of Hungarian origin. Another abstract noun in *-išāg-* is *poťišāgos* ‘paying, payment’, which is based on the inherited *poťin-* ‘to pay’, but has nominalisation analogous to that of the borrowed verbs in *-in-*. Exceptions are common *pārušāgos* ‘burial’, because of the base verb *pārun-* ‘to bury’, and Uzhhorod *ciganšāgos* ‘lie, falsehood’ (*cigāñin-/cigāl’in-* ‘to lie’), in which the suffix *-šāg-* lacks any vowel.

Less commonly, the suffix occurs in nouns derived from inherited verbs, even though for all such nouns an alternative form with *-(i)be(n)* or *-(i)pe(n)* has been attested as well, e.g. Perechyn *čovrišāgos* ‘theft’ (*čovr-* ‘to steal’), Sereďnie *gil’avišāgos* ‘singing’ (*gil’av-* ‘to sing’), Shakhta *pjišāgos* ‘drinking’ (*pji-* ‘to drink’). Some deverbal nouns in *-išāg-* are based on perfective stems of inherited verbs, e.g. Shakhta *lemad’išāgos* ‘hitting, punching’ (*lem-*, PFV *lemad-*, ‘to hit’).

As a deadjectival nominaliser, *-išāg-* is rarer than both *-ipe(n)* and *-ibe(n)*, but still attested, as in *dzivišāgos* ‘wildness, naughtiness’ (*dzivo* ‘wild’), *podlišāgos* ‘evil’ (*podlo* ‘evil’), *radišāgos* ‘joy, pleasure’ (*rado* ‘glad’), *slabišāgos* ‘weakness’ (*slabo* ‘weak’), *šmelišāgos* ‘courageousness’ (*šmelo* ‘courageous’), and it even holds true for nouns derived from inherited adjectives, such as Shakhta *korišāgos* ‘blindness’ (*koro* ‘blind’) and Khudlovo *terņišāgos* ‘youth’ (*terno* ‘young’).

Denominal nouns in *-išāg-* also occur, from both inherited and borrowed nouns, cf. Shakhta *kirvišāgos* ‘relation between parents of a child and his or her godparents’ (*kirvo* ‘godfather’), *lubñišāgos* ‘prostitution’ (*lubñi* ‘whore’), Serednie *krāl’išāgos* ‘kingdom’ (*krāl’is* ‘king’). Once again, nouns in *-ipe(n)* and/or *-ibe(n)* are also attested for such denominal nouns.

A deadverbial noun *pāšišāgos* ‘nearness’ (*pāšes* ‘near(by)’) was recorded in Shakhta.

4.2.2.2.4 Summary of abstract nominalisers

The following Table 35 summarises the morphological and dialectal distribution of the nominalisers in abstract nouns within the dialect region.

Table 35: Distribution of the abstract nominalisers *-ibe(n)*, *-ipe(n)* and *-Všāg-*

SUFFIX	BASE	MOST VARIETIES	KHUDLOVO
<i>-ibe(n)</i>	inherited verbs	common	rare
	N, ADJ	lexically restricted	no
<i>-ipe(n)</i>	inherited verbs	rare	common
	N, ADJ	common	common
<i>-Všāg-</i>	inherited verbs	less common	
	borrowed verbs in <i>-in-</i>	common	
	N, ADJ	less common	

4.2.2.3 De-infinitival noun *texan* ‘food’

A unique case of a de-infinitival nominalisation is *texan* ‘food, meal’. It has developed through morphologisation of an infinitive phrase *te xan* ‘to eat’, which consists of the non-factual complementiser *te* plus the 2/3PL verb form *xan* generalised in non-finite complement clauses (see 3.4.3 and 13.2.1). The widespread Romani noun *xaben* ‘food’ is missing in Eastern Uzh Romani.⁸⁹ In terms of inflection, *texan* is an oikoclitic zero masculine (OBL.SG *texan-es-*, NOM.PL *texan-a*, OBL.PL *texan-en-*).

⁸⁹ There occurs a nominalisation *xavibe(n)* in the meaning ‘a way of eating’ in Eastern Uzh Romani, but this abstract noun cannot refer to the food as some sort of substance. In Western Uzh Romani, the word for ‘food’ is also *texan*, but *xaben* is still rarely attested.

4.2.3 Agentive and feminine derivation

4.2.3.1 Agentive nouns

Agentive nouns, which express professions and agents of permanent or regular activities, can be derived by the suffixes *-ār-*, *-āš-* and *-oš-*. All inflect as the xenoclitic *i*-nouns.

The suffix *-ār-*, which is of older Slavic or Romanian origin, is shared with other Romani dialects (cf. Matras 2002: 76). It derives agentive nouns from both oikoclitic and xenoclitic nouns, such as *lubñi* ‘whore’ > *lubñāris* ‘whoremonger, womaniser’, *rukono* ‘dog’ > *rukoñāris* ‘dog-fancier’, *lavuta* ‘violin’ > *lavutāris* ‘violinist; musician’, *skl’epa* ‘shop’ > *skl’epāris* ‘shop assistant’, *škola* ‘school’ > *škol’āris* ‘pupil’. Note that the suffix entails palatalisation of the preceding nasal and lateral consonant in *rukoñāris* and *škol’āris*, but not that of the alveolar stop /t/ in *lavutāris*.

The suffixes *-āš-* and *-oš-* have been borrowed from Hungarian (cf. Hungarian *munka* ‘work’ > *munkás* ‘worker’; *tánc* ‘dance’ > *táncos* ‘dancer’). In Eastern Uzh Romani, they mainly occur with recently borrowed nominal bases, such as *košāris* ‘basket’ (from Hungarian *kosár*) > *košārošis* ‘basket-weaver’, *kurva* ‘whore’ (also in Slavic and Hungarian) > *kurvāšis* ‘whoremonger’ (synonymous to *lubñi* > *lubñāris*), *turma* ‘prison’ (from Ukrainian *тюрма*) > *turmāšis* ‘prisoner’, *žeba* ‘pocket’ (from Hungarian *zseb*) > *žebāšis* ‘pickpocket’. Interestingly, both suffixes also occur in deverbal nouns, including in some inherited ones. Examples are a common noun *čovrāšis* ‘thief’, from the verb *čovr-* ‘to steal’, and *khaňarošis* ‘one who often farts, afflicted by farts’, which is derived from the verb *khaňar-* ‘to fart’ and was recorded in Shakhta.

Finally, *buvt’ārošis* ‘hard worker’ (*buvt’i* ‘work’), which contains both agentive suffixes *-ār-* and *-oš-*, occurs in the data from Khudlovo.

4.2.3.2 Feminine derivation

Animate feminine nouns may be formed from their masculine counterparts in several ways. First, there are adjective-like pairs of oikoclitic nouns of opposite genders in which the masculine noun is inflected as the vocalic *o*-masculines and the feminine noun behaves as the vocalic *i*-feminines, e.g. M *džano* ~ F *džani* ‘person’, *kirvo* ~ *kirvi* ‘godparent’, *pirano* ~ *piraňi* ‘lover (boyfriend ~ girlfriend)’, *raklo* ~ *rakl’i* ‘non-Romani child’, *romano* ~ *romaňi* ‘Rom, Gypsy’, *rukono* ~ *rukoňi* ‘dog (dog ~ bitch)’. Other examples come from various names for the non-Roma, such as common *gādžo* M ~ *gādži* F and cryptic *gomo* ~ *gomi* (in Uzhhorod and Khudlovo) and *govro* ~ *govri* (in Radvanka and Sereďnie). This process also involves

cases that are not synchronically transparent in outcomes of the historical derivation, e.g. *čha* ‘boy, son’ ~ *čhaj* ‘girl, daughter’ (from **čhavo* ~ **čhavi* respectively).

The other strategy is a genuine derivation of feminine nouns from their masculine counterparts by a derivational suffix. The oldest feminine derivational suffix of Indo-Aryan origin is *-ň-* (< *-n-*). Feminine nouns in *-ň-* are inflected as the oikoclitic *i*-nouns. They are few in number and are limited to pre-Greek bases, e.g. *guruv* ‘bull’ > *guruvňi/gurumňi* ‘cow’, *manuš* ‘human’ > *manušňi* ‘female human’, *raj* ‘lord, official’ > *rāňi* ‘lady’, *rom* ‘Rom; husband’ > *romňi* ‘Romani woman; wife’, *xulaj* ‘master, owner’ > *xulaňi*, and also *graj* ‘horse’ > *grašňi* ‘mare’ (from the old base **grast*). The suffix is also seemingly present in *kaxňi* ‘hen’ and *lubňi* ‘whore’, which lack their masculine counterparts (‘rooster’ is *kohutos* from Slavic). Strangely enough, *-ň-* also appears to be present in the word for ‘ring’, which is *angrušňi* in Uzhhorod and Perechyn and *angrusňi* in Khudlovo and Sereďnie. It is obvious that in *angrušňi/angrusňi*, the suffix *-ň-* must have penetrated an earlier form *angrusi*, which is common in Western Uzh Romani and reflects the regular sound development from the Proto-Romani **angrusti* (see 2.4.3).

The derivational suffixes of xenoclitic feminine nouns are *-kiň-* and *-k-* of Slavic origin. The suffix *-kiň-* is rarer and sometimes entails alteration of the base, e.g. *čexos* ‘Czech/Slovak’ > *češkiňa*, *krāl’is* ‘king’ > *krāl’kiňa* ‘queen’ (only in Sereďnie), *ňemcos* ‘German’ > *ňemkiňa*, *rusos* ‘Russian’ > *ruskiňa*, *šovgoris* ‘brother-in-law’ > *šovgorkiňa* ‘sister-in-law’, *ungros* ‘Hungarian’ > *ungrickiňa* and also *vloxos* ‘Vlax Rom, a Rom from a different subethnic group’ > *vlaxiňa*. The most common and productive feminine suffix is otherwise *-k-*, as in *barātos* ‘friend’ > *barātka*, Khudlovo and Sereďnie *cimboras* ‘friend’ > *cimborka*, common *čovrāšis* ‘thief’ > *čovrāška*, *lavutāris* ‘violinist, musician’ > *lavutārka*, *žebāšis* ‘pickpocket’ > *žebāška*, Uzhhorod *nāsos* ‘co-parent-in-law’ > *nāska*, Uzhhorod and Sereďnie *tanitovs* ‘teacher’ > *tanitovka*, Perechyn and Khudlovo *čitel’is* ‘teacher’ > *čitel’ka*, etc. In Uzhhorod, the suffix also seems to be present in an Indo-Aryan feminine noun *čurka* ‘plait, pigtail’, from OIA *cūḍā-* ‘topknot on head’ (CDIAL 4883), cf. *čún’ra*, *čurni*, *čoři*, etc. in other Romani dialects (e.g. Boretzky and Igla 1994: 54).⁹⁰

Many feminine nouns are expressed by entirely different roots, such as inherited *phral* ‘brother’ ~ *pheň* ‘sister’ (also *dvojuridno phral* ~ *dvojuridno pheň* ‘cousin’) and borrowed *mama* ‘mother’ ~ *apos* ‘father’, or the feminine derivation is that of the donor language, such

⁹⁰ In the other varieties, this etymon has already been replaced by Slavic loanwords: *kosa* in Perechyn (cf. Ukrainian, Russian *коса*) and the non-integrated *varkoč* in Khudlovo and Sereďnie (cf. Polish *warkocz*).

as *kozlos* ~ *koza* ‘goat’ (cf. Ukrainian *козел* ~ *коза*), *krāl’is* ‘king’ ~ *krāl’ovna* ‘queen’ (cf. Slovak *král* > *kráľovná*).

4.2.4 Names of fruit trees in *-in* and *-uň*

In Khudlovo and Serednie, and rarely in Uzhhorod, several names of fruit trees are derived from the names of fruits. Two suffixes occur in such derivations: *-in* and *-uň*.

The suffix *-in* is of Armenian origin (Boretzky 1995a: 145) and is known from other Romani dialects. It is not productive and only occurs in several feminine nouns, such as *akhorin* ‘nut tree’ (*akhor* ‘nut’), *phabal’in* ‘apple tree’ (*phābaj* ‘apple’), Uzhhorod *čhil’avin*, Khudlovo *khi’avin*, Serednie *t’hil’avin* ‘plum tree’ (*čhil’av*, *khi’av*, *t’hil’av* ‘plum’; see 2.1.2), Khudlovo *ambrol’in* ‘pear tree’ (*ambrol* ‘pear’).⁹¹ These tree names are vital in Khudlovo and Serednie, while in Uzhhorod, they are obsolete and familiar to elder speakers. In Perechyn, the tree names in *-in* are no longer used at all, and periphrases of the type ‘apple’s tree’ are used instead.

The other suffix *-uň* occurs in Khudlovo and Serednie in feminine nouns *drākhuň* ‘vineyard’ (cf. *drākha* PL ‘grape’) and *pendexuň* ‘hazelnut tree’ (*pendex* ‘hazelnut’). In Khudlovo, a noteworthy apple tree name *phabol’uňin*, which seems to contain both *-uň-* and *-in*, is attested along with the aforementioned *phabal’in*. In Uzhhorod and Perechyn, no derivations in *-uň* exist.

⁹¹ The Iranian loanword *ambrol* in the meaning ‘pear’ is present only in Khudlovo, while it has shifted its meaning to ‘greengage’ in Serednie and no longer exists in Uzhhorod and Perechyn. Outside Khudlovo, ‘pear’, as well as ‘pear tree’, are expressed by a Slavic loanword *hruška*.

5 ADJECTIVES

This chapter describes the morphology of adjectives. Like the preceding chapter on nouns, it is organised into two subchapters that discuss the adjective inflection and the adjective derivation.

5.1 Adjective inflection

Eastern Uzh Romani has characteristics of adjective inflection common in other Romani dialects (cf. Matras 2002: 94–95; Boretzky and Igla 2004: 112–113). Most adjectives inflect for gender, number and case. There are two gender categories in the singular, masculine and feminine, while the gender distinction is neutralised in the plural. In contrast to nouns, there are only two cases in adjectives, nominative and oblique, the latter occurring in modifiers of nouns in any non-nominative case (see 11.1 for more details).

As in nouns, a distinctive characteristic of a large proportion of Romani dialects is a compartmentalisation of adjectives on the basis of their inflection, which almost always overlaps with their origin (cf. Elšík and Matras 2006: 324–333). The oikoclitic or thematic compartment, whose inflection is of Indo-Aryan origin, comprises adjectives inherited from Proto-Romani; that is, indigenous adjectives of Indo-Aryan origin and some older loanwords from Asian languages, plus secondary adjectives derived by the majority of derivational affixes (see 5.2.2). The xenoclitic or athematic compartment, whose inflection partly draws on Greek sources, consists of borrowed adjectives mainly of Hungarian and Slavic origin and some secondary adjectives derived by borrowed derivational markers (see 5.2.3). Within each compartment, further inflectional classes may be distinguished. In the oikoclitic compartment, there are two distinct classes of vocalic and zero adjectives. In the xenoclitic compartment, there is an ongoing development of differentiation of adjectives in *-Vk-*, including derived adjectives in *-ik-*, from other borrowed adjectives, whose inflection partly tends to shift to the oikoclitic inflection. Some borrowed adjectives may possess special integration suffixes.

5.1.1 Oikoclitic adjective compartment

5.1.1.1 Vocalic adjectives

The absolute majority of non-borrowed adjectives are inflected as vocalic adjectives, which are named after their vocalic suffixes in the nominative and oblique cases. Table 36 shows the vocalic adjective inflection of *bār-o* ‘big, grown up’, *cikn-o* ‘small’ and *lovl-o* ‘red’.

Table 36: Inflection of oikoclitic vocalic adjectives

	NOM				OBL			
	SUFFIX	‘big’	‘small’	‘red’	SUFFIX	‘big’	‘small’	‘red’
SG.M	-o	<i>bār-o</i>	<i>cikn-o</i>	<i>lovl-o</i>	-e	<i>bār-e</i>	<i>cikn-e</i>	<i>lovl-e</i>
SG.F	-i	<i>bār-i</i>	<i>cikñ-i</i>	<i>lovl'-i</i>	-a	<i>bār-a</i>	<i>cikñ-a</i>	<i>lovl'-a</i>
PL.M/F	-e	<i>bār-e</i>	<i>cikn-e</i>	<i>lovl-e</i>	-e	<i>bār-e</i>	<i>cikn-e</i>	<i>lovl-e</i>

In Eastern Uzh Romani, as elsewhere in Central Romani, the oikoclitic vocalic inflection maintains the adjectival inflection of inherited adjectives in Proto-Romani (cf. Elšík 2000a: 25; Elšík and Matras 2006: 74). This is characterised by a set of suffixes similar to, and etymologically related to, to the Layer I oikoclitic inflection of vocalic nouns with distinct forms for the masculine and feminine in the singular and no gender distinction in the plural of either case. The final consonants /d/, /t/, /n/ and /l/ of adjective bases are obligatorily changed to their palatal counterparts /d'/, /t'/, /ñ/ and /l'/ before the feminine endings *-i* and *-a*. If there are two lateral consonants in a base, regressive assimilation leads to palatalisation of both.

Diminutive adjectives in *-ōr-* and *korkōro* ‘alone’ have the inflection of vocalic adjectives, but the NOM.PL is marked either by *-e* (*cikn-ōr-e*, *korkōr-e*) or by *-a* (*cikn-ōr-a*, *korkōr-a*). Palatalisation of alveolar and lateral consonants in feminine forms takes place before the diminutive marker, as in NOM *cikñ-ōr-i* and OBL *cikñ-ōr-a*.

5.1.1.2 Zero adjectives

Zero adjectives comprise several adjectives that have zero nominative marking, such as *džung* ‘filthy, nasty’, *god'aver* ‘clever, wise’, *xovr* ‘deep’, *kuč* ‘expensive’ and *šukār* ‘pretty, beautiful’, plus comparative and superlative adjectives ending in *-eder*. All these adjectives are mostly indeclinable, always in the nominative and usually in the oblique as well, although they may optionally take on oblique suffixes, e.g. *šukār-Ø romñ-a-tar* ~ *šukār-a romñ-a-tar* [beautiful-OBL.SG.F wife-OBL.SG.F-ABL] ‘from a pretty wife’. The adjective *god'aver*, along with all monosyllabic zero adjectives, is always indeclinable. See Table 37.

Table 37: Inflection of oikoclitic zero adjectives

	NOM			OBL		
	SUFFIX	‘beautiful’	‘clever’	SUFFIX	‘beautiful’	‘clever’
SG.M	-Ø	<i>šukār</i>	<i>god'aver</i>	-e/-Ø	<i>šukār(-e)</i>	<i>god'aver</i>
SG.F	-Ø	<i>šukār</i>	<i>god'aver</i>	-a/-Ø	<i>šukār(-a)</i>	<i>god'aver</i>
PL.M/F	-Ø	<i>šukār</i>	<i>god'aver</i>	-e/-Ø	<i>šukār(-e)</i>	<i>god'aver</i>

See 6.5.1 for inflection of the adjectival determiner *āver* ‘(an)other’.

5.1.2 Xenoclitic adjective compartment

5.1.2.1 Integration of borrowed adjectives

Most adjective loans of Hungarian zero adjectives contain a special integration marker *-n-* inserted between the borrowed base and inflectional endings; see, for example, Hungarian *kész* > Romani *kijs-n-o* ‘prepared, ready’, *derék* > *derijk-n-o* ‘brawny, strapping’, *lázás* > *lāzaš-n-o* ‘feverish’, *saját* > *šajāt-n-o* ‘own’. Similar integration can also be observed in *saban-o* ‘allowed, permitted’, which is from the Hungarian *szabad* and must have therefore developed via **sabad-n-o* with regular assimilation of the consonant cluster /dn/ (see 2.4.3). Still, the nasal integration is in all varieties missing in *kijk-o* ‘blue’, instead of **kijk-n-o*, from Hungarian *kék*, and in a Khudlovo and Serednie adjective *rešt-o* ‘lazy, instead of **rešt-n-o*, from Hungarian *rest*.⁹²

Hungarian-origin adjectives that end in a vowel in Hungarian lack any special integration marker, e.g. Hungarian *ritka* > Romani *ritk-o* ‘rare, sparse’ *sárga* > *šārg-o* ‘yellow’, as do loans of Slavic adjectives, e.g. Slovak *zdrav-ý* > *zdrav-o* ‘healthy’, *strašn-ý* (Russian *страшн-ый*, Ukrainian *страшн-ий*) > *strašn-o* ‘awful, terrible’, Ukrainian *свіж-ий* > *sviž-o* ‘fresh’, Russian *спокойн-ый* > *spokojn-o* ‘calm, serene, tranquil’.

5.1.2.2 Xenoclitic adjective inflection

Late Proto-Romani had a special set of Greek-derived nominative suffixes of borrowed adjectives with no gender differentiation: *-o* in the singular and *-a* in the plural. The oblique suffixes were identical to those of oikoclitic inflection but with an extension *-on-* being added between the adjective base and the oblique markers. This xenoclitic or athematic inflection for borrowed adjectives remained productive even in the following period after the contact with Greek had been severed, even though some Romani dialects since abandoned this specific type of inflection (cf. Bakker 1997; Elšík 2000a: 25; Matras 2002: 95–96; Elšík and Matras 2006: 73–74).

⁹² Only a Slavic loanword *l'ňivo* occurs in Uzhhorod and Perechyn for the meaning ‘lazy’.

Eastern Uzh Romani partly retains the xenoclitic inflection of adjective loans. Still, the gradual abandonment of the xenoclitic inflection is taking place even there. This abandonment mainly affects the oblique extension *-on-*, e.g. *zdrav-on-a* [healthy-EXT-OBL.SG.F] ~ *zdrav-a* [healthy-OBL.SG.F], and in some varieties also the nominative plural *-a*, which is often replaced by the oikoclitic *-e*; *zdrav-a* ~ *zdrav-e* [healthy-NOM.PL] (see below). Another development is an ongoing generalisation of the respective singular and plural suffixes *-o* and *-a* in both the nominative and the oblique, which is documented in the inflection of secondary (derived) adjectives in *-ik-*. Generally speaking, there is a split in the inflection of derived adjectives in *-ik-* on the one hand and of all the other xenoclitic adjectives on the other hand.

Secondary adjectives in *-ik-* maintain in all varieties the intact xenoclitic inflection in the nominative, e.g. *ungr-ik-o* ‘Hungarian’ (*ungr-os* noun): SG *ungriko* (both M and F), PL *ungrika*; *rus-ik-o* ‘East Slavic, Russian’ (*rus-os* noun): SG *rusiko*, PL *rusika*. In the oblique case, however, the extension *-on-* is often missing: thus OBL.SG.M *ungrik-e* alongside *ungrik-on-e*. Moreover, the nominative endings are attested to enter into the oblique inflection of *ik-* adjectives, e.g. *ungrik-a čhaha* ~ *ungrik-o čhaha* [Hungarian-OBL.SG.F girl.INST.SG.F] ‘with a Hungarian (Romani) girl’; or *šātor-ik-a roma* PL ‘itinerant Gypsies’ (cf. *šātra* ‘tent’; Hungarian *sátor*): INST *šātorik-e romenca* alongside *šātorik-a romenca* ‘with itinerant Gypsies’. It means that *-o* and *-a* might become the respective singular and plural suffixes of the secondary *ik-* adjectives with no case distinction, although diffusion of these suffixes into the oblique inflection is still under way.⁹³ Similar to *ik-* adjectives are borrowed adjectives whose base ends in *-Vk-*, which also generally retain the xenoclitic inflection in the nominative, perhaps analogous to the formally similar *ik-* adjectives, e.g. SG *jednak-o* ‘identical’, PL *jednak-a* (cf. also the generic determiner *šel’ijak-o* ‘various’, PL *šel’ijak-a*, discussed in 6.4.2).

Contrary to the secondary adjectives in *-ik-*, primary, i.e. underived, adjective loans partly tend to encroach upon the oikoclitic inflection. While the singular suffix *-o* is stable for both masculine and feminine and is only rarely replaced by the oikoclitic *-i* in the feminine agreement, the plural suffix *-a* is commonly replaced by the oikoclitic ending *-e*. We can thus distinguish a conservative pattern of xenoclitic inflection — which is typical of Serednie, of old and middle-aged speakers in Khudlovo, and of some old speakers in Uzhhorod and Perechyn — from an innovative pattern typical of young and many middle-aged speakers in all varieties save Serednie. The oblique extension *-on-* is optional, and inflectional forms

⁹³ Such alternating pairs of oblique adjectives have been documented even in individual idiolects.

with *-on-*, as well as without it, are recorded to occur even in individual idiolects. As an example, see inflection of the loan adjective *zdravo* ‘healthy’ in Table 38.

Table 38: Inflection of *zdravo* ‘healthy’

	NOM		OBL
	conservative pattern	innovative pattern	
SG.M	<i>zdrav-o</i>	<i>zdrav-o</i>	<i>zdrav-(on-)e</i>
SG.F	<i>zdrav-o</i>	<i>zdrav-o</i>	<i>zdrav-(on-)a</i>
PL.M/F	<i>zdrav-a</i>	<i>zdrav-e</i>	<i>zdrav-(on-)e</i>

The same inflection as that of *zdrav-o*, i.e. singular marking by *-o* and plural marking by either *-a* or *-e*, not only characterises the primary adjectives of Slavic and Hungarian origin, but also the secondary adjectives derived by *-Vš-n-* (see 5.2.3.2) and the ordinal numerals in *-t-o* (8.1.2). It may also be encountered in some participles (see 3.4.1.1).

5.2 Adjective derivation

Adjectives may be primary, i.e. underived, lacking any synchronically transparent derivational markers, or secondary, i.e. derived, containing overt derivational markers. The adjective derivation is almost always suffixal, while adjective prefixes are rare. Secondary adjectives may be derived from other adjectives, as well as from other word classes (nouns, verbs, adverbs). Adjectival participles and genitive formations also fulfil the function of forming adjectives, but they represent inflectional rather than derivational categories and are discussed elsewhere in 3.4.1 and 11.1.1.7 respectively.

In what follows, I will describe the derivation of adjectives from other adjectives first, followed by a discussion of various strategies for deriving secondary adjectives from the other word classes, i.e. from nouns, verbs and adverbs. While every set of deadjectival adjectives has a clearly defined meaning (e.g. diminutive, attenuative, etc.), the other derivational suffixes tend to be multi-purpose. Still, most secondary adjectives of a single set can be classified as either qualitative adjectives, which describe a quality of the modified noun, or relational adjectives, which relate the modified noun to the item expressed by the adjective root. There are also spatial and temporal adjectives, which situate the modified noun in the space or time context.

All adjectives are cited in their nominative singular masculine agreement forms (marked by *-o*).

5.2.1 Deadjectival derivation

Deadjectival adjectives comprise categories of diminutive, attenuative, iterative, privative and negative adjectives.

5.2.1.1 Diminutive adjectives

The diminutive adjectives are formed by *-ōr-*, that is, by a suffix identical to the diminutive marker of oikoclitic nouns (see 4.2.1.1). They typically express a smaller or reduced size of the modified noun, or a positive emotional attitude of the speaker. In Eastern Uzh Romani, the diminutive marker *-ōr-* is productive and can be applied to adjectives borrowed from current contact languages as well: *ciknōro* ‘tiny’ (or *cikōro* mostly in baby-talk)⁹⁴ (*cikno* ‘small’), *maživōro* ‘cutely pampered’ (*maživo* ‘pampered, spoilt’, about children), *phuvrōro* ‘beautifully old’ (*phuvro* ‘old’), *spokojnōro* ‘pretty calm’ (*spokojno* ‘calm, tranquil’; cf. Russian *спокойный*), *ternōro* ‘pretty young’ (*terno* ‘young’), *zdravōro* ‘pretty healthy’ (*zdravo* ‘healthy’). A noteworthy participial diminutive adjective *xol’amenōro* ‘cutely angered’ (*xol’ame(n)* ‘angered’), used in reference to little children, is attested in Perechyn.

5.2.1.2 Attenuative adjectives

The attenuative adjectives express a partial or incomplete measure of the quality of their adjectival base (cf. English *yellowish*). In all Eastern Uzh varieties, the derivational suffix of most attenuative adjectives is *-ovist-*, which can be applied to both inherited and borrowed bases of some qualitative adjectives. The attenuative adjectives are a partly productive category with adjectives of qualities typically associated with inanimate referents, such as colour and taste, as in *gulovisto* ‘sweetish’ (*gulo* ‘sweet’), *jālovisto* ‘rawish’ (*jālo* ‘raw’), *kālovisto* ‘blackish’ (*kālo* ‘black’), *kerkovisto* ‘bitterish’ (*kerko* ‘bitter’), *kirnovisto* ‘partially rotten’ (*kirno* ‘rotten’), *lovlovisto* ‘redish’ (*lovlo* ‘red’), *šārgovisto* ‘yellowish’ (*šārgo* ‘yellow’), *šutlovisto* ‘sourish’ (*šutlo* ‘sour’), *tātovisto* ‘warmish’ (*tāto* ‘warm’). They are not used with animate adjectives; for example, it is not possible to form an attenuative adjective from *dilino* ‘fool’ and animate adjectives can instead be attenuated by a periphrasis (e.g. *kapka dilino* ‘a bit fool’). The attenuative adjectives in *-ovist-* have the xenoclitic inflection; see *gulovist-o zumin* [sweetish-NOM.SG.F soup.NOM.SG.F] ‘sweetish soup’.

Furthermore, there is a unique attenuative derivation *nangvalo/langvalo* (the latter in Uzhhorod) ‘semi-nude’ from the adjective *nango* (Uzhhorod *lango*) ‘naked, nude’. The

⁹⁴ In related Western Uzh Romani dialects of Pavlovce nad Uhom and Sobrance, the irregular form *cikōro* with no nasal is the common diminutive form of *cikno*.

adjective *nangvalo/langvalo* is derived by the suffix *-val-*, which otherwise occurs in some denominal qualitative adjectives (see 5.2.2.2).

5.2.1.3 Iterative adjective

The only commonly used iterative adjective is *nasvalkerdo* ‘frequently/repeatedly ill’ (*nasvalo* ‘ill’). It is marked by *-kerd-*, which is reminiscent of oikoclitic participles of verbal iteratives in *-ker-* (see 3.5.1.4 and 3.4.1.1).

5.2.1.4 Privative and negative adjectives

The privative and negative adjectives are the only adjectives formed by prefixation. The privative adjectives are marked by the prefix *bi-*, which is homonymous and perhaps related to the privative preposition *bi* (see 11.2.3). The adjectives in *bi-* are not numerous and their derivation is not productive: *bibaxtalo* ‘unlucky, causing disaster’ (*baxtalo* ‘lucky’), *bigulo* ‘sweetless’ (*gulo* ‘sweet’), *bilondo* ‘saltless’ (*londo* ‘salty’), *bipaivalo* ‘dishonest’ (*paivalo* ‘honest, virtuous’); see also *bižuvžo* ‘impure’ (*žuvžo* ‘clean, pure’), usually substantivised in the meaning ‘ritually impure power, devil’.⁹⁵

The negative adjectives are marked by a prefix *na-* (cf. the verbal negator *na*; 12.4). It sporadically occurs in Slavic-based adjectives and in negative forms of xenoclitic participles, which indicates its partial productivity: *načāčuno* ‘unreal, false’ (*čāčuno* ‘real, true’), *nalāčho* ‘not good, bad’ (*lāčho* ‘good’), *našukār* ‘unsightly’ (*šukār* ‘beautiful’), *nauxame(n)* ‘uncombed’ (*uxame(n)* ‘combed’), *navlāsno* ‘step-’ (*vlāsno* ‘own’; cf. Ukrainian *власний*, Slovak *vlastný*).

All privative and negative adjectives are inflected like their primary adjective bases.

5.2.2 Denominal, deverbal, and deadverbial oikoclitic derivation

The oikoclitic derivational operations mostly continue strategies inherited from the Proto-Romani period and are shared with other Romani dialects. Most of them are non-productive, sometimes represented by several more or less lexicalised adjectives, or their productivity is largely restrained.

5.2.2.1 Qualitative adjectives in *-al-* (*-āl-*)

The secondary qualitative adjectives of inherited bases are commonly derived by *-al-* or by its long variant *-āl-*. The long variant *-āl-* occurs in the expressive *džungālo* ‘ugly, vulgar’ (*džung*

⁹⁵ The prefix *bi-* is also used as a marker of deprivation in nouns, as in *bijākhengero* ‘having no eyes’ (*jakh*, PL *jākha* ‘eye’); see 11.1.1.7 for more details.

‘filth’) and in *zorālo* ‘powerful, solid’ (*zor* ‘power’), but only the short variant of the suffix occurs elsewhere.

The adjectives in *-al-* may qualify the modified noun with respect to its physical or psychological state or its manner trait, e.g. *baxtalo* ‘happy, lucky’ (*bax(t)* ‘happiness, luck’), *bokhalo* ‘hungry’ (*bokh* ‘hunger’), *čhibalo* ‘cheeky, impudent’ (*čhib* ‘tongue, language’), *pa’ivalo* ‘honest, virtuous’ (*pa’iv* ‘honesty, virtue’), *šilalo* ‘cold’ (*šil* ‘cold’). The long root vowel of a nominal base is usually shortened in the respective adjective derivations, see *dzaralo* ‘hairy’ from *dzār* ‘hair’ (especially pubic hair and never referring to the head).

The suffix *-al-* also forms adjectives that indicate weather or some kind of contamination, e.g. *brišindalo* ‘rainy’ (*brišind* ‘rain’), *čikalo* ‘muddy, full of mud’ (*čik* ‘mud’), *khulalo* ‘dirtied or covered by faeces, shitty’ (*khul* ‘excrement’), *l’imalo* ‘snotty, runny-nosed’ (*l’im* ‘snot’), *melalo* ‘dirty’ (*mel* ‘dirt’), or a disease state, particularly that caused by parasites, as in *džovalo* ‘infested by lice’ (*džuv* ‘louse’), *geralo* ‘scabby, scabietic’ (*ger* ‘scabies’), *pušumalo* ‘infested by fleas’ (*pušum* ‘flea’), *phukñalo* ‘skin-diseased’ (*phukñi* ‘blister, smallpox’), *phumbalo* ‘pusy, purulent’ (*phumb* ‘pus’).

Sporadically, it may form adjectives relating to animals, such as *rukonalo* ‘dog’s’ (*rukono* ‘dog’) and rarer *gurumñalo* ‘beef, cow’s’ (*gurumñi* ‘cow’).

In addition, there are several lexicalised and sometimes substantivised adjectives in *-al-*, which are used in specialised contexts only. Examples are *jagalo* ‘fiery’ (*jag* ‘fire’), occurring in the phrase *jagalo pāñi*, which refers to water into which burnt matches are thrown and is used to cure evil eye, *jakhalo* ‘evil-eyed, afflicted by evil eye’ (*jakh* ‘eye’), and substantivised *mujale* ‘the police’ (*muj* ‘mouth’), which is used, in particular, in the *gāvutune* varieties.

Although the adjectives in *-al-* are relatively numerous, and the suffix itself appears to be multivocal, it does not seem to be productive with borrowed bases.

5.2.2.2 Qualitative adjectives in *-val-*

A derivational marker similar to *-al-* is *-val-*, which forms adjectives from body part (or liquid) names. The adjectives in *-val-* ascribe significant or palpable features of such a body part to the modified noun, such as *dandvalo* ‘big-toothed’ (*dand* ‘tooth’), *nakhvalo* ‘big-nosed’ (*nakh* ‘nose’), *pervalo* ‘paunchy, pot-bellied’ (*per* ‘belly’), *ratvalo* ‘bloody, bloodstained’ (*rat* ‘blood’), *vuštvalo* ‘big-lipped’ (*vuš(t)* ‘lip’). See also 5.2.1.2 above for *-val-* in an deadjectival adjective *nangvalo* or *langvalo* ‘semi-nude’.

5.2.2.3 Qualitative, spatial, and other adjectives in *-un-*

Another suffix of qualitative adjectives is *-un-*, which forms adjectives from nouns of substances, to indicate that the referent of the modified noun is made from or consisting of such a substance, e.g. *baruno* ‘made of stone’ (*bar* ‘stone’), *kaštuno* ‘made of wood’ (*kaš(t)* ‘wood’), *patavuno* ‘made of rags’ (*patav* ‘rag’), *sapuno* ‘made of snakes’ (e.g. *sapune kamašl’i* ‘shoes made of snakes’), *somnakuno* ‘golden’ (*somnak(aj)* ‘gold’), *trastuno* ‘made of iron’ (*tras(t)* ‘iron’). This derivation also includes fossilised adjectives whose nominal bases have already been lost as independent nouns, viz. *rupuno* ‘made of silver’ (**rup*), which has been converted into the noun ‘silver’ as well, and the rare *phāruno* ‘silken’ (**phār*; now *šovkos* ‘silk’) attested only in Shakhta.

In this function, the suffix *-un-* seems to be especially productive in Perechyn, where adjectives in *-un-* based on borrowed bases also commonly occur, such as *pāperuno* ‘made of paper’ (*pāperis* ‘paper’), *zgluno* ‘made of glass’ (cf. Ukrainian *скло* ‘a piece of glass’), *zolutuno* ‘golden’ (cf. Ukrainian, Russian *золото* ‘gold’).

Apart from the adjectives of substances, other common denominal adjectives in *-un-* include Uzhhorod *čāčuno* ‘real, true’ (*čāčo* ‘truth’), *jepašuno* ‘half’ (*jepaš* ‘half’), *masuno* ‘consisting of meat, fleshy’ (*mas* ‘meat’), *vešuno* ‘residing in forest, sylvan’ (*veš* ‘forest’), and a qualitative adjective *khanduno* ‘stinking, smelly’, which is probably descended from a historical noun **khand* (< OIA *gandha-* ‘smell’; cf. the verb *khand-* ‘to stink’ in Eastern Uzh Romani).

The second function of *-un-* is to derive spatial adjectives from spatial adverbs or from prepositions grammaticalised from former adverbs, such as *andruno* ‘inner’ (cf. *andre* ‘inside; in(to)’), *angluno* ‘front, anterior’ (cf. *angal* ‘in front of’; *anglal* ‘in/to the front’), *avruno* ‘outer’ (cf. *avri* ‘outside’), *maškaruno* ‘middle’ (cf. *maškar* ‘in the middle of’), *opruno* ‘upper’ (cf. *opre* ‘above’), *paluno* ‘back, rear’ (cf. *pal* ‘behind’; *palal* ‘in/to the back’), *teluno* ‘lower’ (cf. *tel* ‘under’, *tejle* ‘below’).

The element *-un-* is also contained in some deverbal adjectives based on historical participial stems, such as *čovrduno* ‘stolen’, derived from the erstwhile participle **čovrd-* (now *čovrn-*; see 3.2.2.1.1.2) of the verb *čovr-* ‘to steal’, and also in the lexicalised and substantivised *kurduno* ‘policeman’ in Uzhhorod (PL *kurdune* ‘the police’, F *kurduňi* ‘police station’; from the transitive verb *kur-* ‘to have sexual intercourse with’).

There are at least two other secondary adjectives containing an element *-dun-*, both based on the same root *rom*, viz. *romňaduno* ‘female’ (common, for example, in a phrase *romňadune holmi* ‘woman dress’; from *romňi* ‘wife’); and *romaduno* in Radvanka, which has

a strict ethnic meaning ‘relating to Roma, Gypsy, Romani’ and is synonymous to *romano* (see below). The adjective *romňaduno* in the meaning ‘relating to women, female’ is attested in other Eastern North Central dialects, especially in the Zemplín and Uzh regions. With respect to the forms *čovrduno* and *kurduno* discussed in the previous paragraph, it probably represents a historical deverbal adjective derived from the now-lost denominal verb **romňav-* ‘to effeminate, to unman’, i.e. a vestige of a complex derivational development noun *romňi* > verb **romňav-*,⁹⁶ perfective stem **romňad-* > adjective *romňaduno*. As for *romaduno*, it is much more limited in its contiguous dialectological distribution within the Uzh region: alongside Radvanka it occurs in only a few Western Uzh varieties centred around Pavlovce nad Uhom, which seems to be the initial core of the development of this adjective and the place from which it has diffused into surrounding varieties, including Radvanka.⁹⁷ This also indicates that the adjective *romaduno* must be a later development and was perhaps triggered by analogy to *romňaduno*, i.e. *rom-Ø* > *rom-Ø-adun-o* after *rom-ň-i* > *rom-ň-adun-o*, although the strict ethnic meaning of *romaduno*, which is absent in *romňaduno*, is remarkable.

Other suffixes that seem to contain *-un-* are *-tun-* in a temporal adjective *čirlatuno* ‘ancient, erstwhile’, based on the adverb *čirla* ‘long ago’, and *-utun-* in *gāvutuno* ‘rural’ from the noun *gav* (PL *gāva*) ‘village’.

5.2.2.4 Relational adjectives in *-an-* and *-ikan-*

Relational adjectives are mostly derived by suffixes *-an-* and *-ikan-*. The vowel of the nominal base is usually shortened in the derived adjectives.

The suffix *-an-* is not productive. It occurs in a handful of adjectives that mostly refer to animals, viz. *bakrano* ‘ovine, relating to sheep’ (*bakro* ‘sheep’), Uzhhorod *balano* ‘pork, relating to pigs’ (*bālo* ‘pig’), *guruvano* ‘beef’ (*guruv* ‘bull’), *mulano* ‘contaminated by the dead’ (*muvlo* ‘dead’), but also in the culturally fundamental ethnic adjective *romano* ‘relating to Roma, Romani, Gypsy’ (*rom* ‘Rom, Gypsy’).⁹⁸

⁹⁶ A similar denominal derivation occurs in *gil’i* ‘song’ > *gil’av-* ‘to sing’ (3.5.2.3).

⁹⁷ That the variety of Pavlovce nad Uhom is the centre of diffusion of this adjective is supported by the fact that it is the only variety where *romaduno* seems to have completely replaced the old adjective *romano*. See also the corresponding adverb *romadunes* ‘in Romani’ in the Pavlovce variety instead of *romanes*. In Radvanka, both adverbial formations *romadunes* and *romanes* occur.

⁹⁸ The noun *pirano* ‘beloved, lover’ is probably another historical adjective in *-an-* (< **piro*; cf. OIA *priya-* ‘dear’).

The second derivational marker *-ikan-* seems to be a compound suffix that involves the *-an-* (cf. Sampson 1926 I: 84 for a similar suffix in Welsh Romani). Adjectives in *-ikan-* are also based on animate nouns, in particular on nouns referring to humans, such as *čhajikano* ‘relating to girls, girl’s’ (*čhaj* ‘girl, daughter’), *čhavorikano* ‘relating to children, children’s’ (*čhavōro* ‘child’), *devlikano* ‘divine, relating to God’ (cf. *devlikañi daj* ‘Virgin Mary’) (*dejl*, OBL *de(j)vl-* ‘God’), *džuvlikano* ‘female, womanly’ (*džuvli* ‘woman’), *gādžikano* ‘relating to non-Roma, Gaje’s’ (*gādžo* ‘non-Rom’), *muršikano* ‘male, men’s’ (*murš* ‘male, man’), *rajikano* ‘relating to masters, lordly’ (*raj* ‘master, lord’).

Adjectives referring to animals are rarer but also occur, as in Radvanka *balikano* ‘pork, relating to pigs’ (*bālo* ‘pig’),⁹⁹ Serednie *baličhikano* ‘pork, relating to pigs’ (*baličho* ‘pig’),¹⁰⁰ common *grajikano* ‘relating to horses’ (*graj* ‘horse’), *kozikano* ‘relating to goats’ (*koza* ‘goat’). Note the last adjective is based on a Slavic loanword *koza*, which indicates certain productivity of the suffix for borrowed bases.

Some adjectives in *-ikan-* seem to be based on adjective bases, which are, however, often used as converted nouns, e.g. *muvl’ikano* ‘contaminated by the dead’ (*muvlo* adjective ‘dead’ → noun ‘dead person, ghost’), *terņikano* ‘relating to young people, modern’ or ‘relating to bride’ (*terno* ‘young’ → ‘young person’; *terņi* F ‘bride’).

Finally, there are unique derivations in *-ikan-*, which are based on the inanimate noun *fovros* ‘town’ (usually referring to ‘Uzhhorod’ in the local context): *fovrikano* in Uzhhorod and *fovrot’ikano* in Khudlovo and Serednie ‘urban, relating to the city of Uzhhorod’ (e.g. Uzhhorod *fovrikane roma*, Khudlovo and Serednie *fovrot’ikane roma* ‘Uzhhorod Roma’).

5.2.2.5 Temporal and other adjectives in *-utn-*

The derivational suffix *-utn-* occurs in temporal adjectives derived from adverbs or from nouns that serve as bases of temporal adverbs, viz. *adād’ivesutno* ‘today(’s)’ (*adād’ive* ‘today’), *ijdžutno* ‘yesterday(’s)’ (*ijdž* ‘yesterday’), *jevendutno* ‘taking place in the winter, wintry’ (*jevend* ‘winter’), *ñilajutno* ‘summer(ly)’ (*ñilaj* ‘summer’), *rat’utno* ‘night, nocturnal’ (*rāti* ‘night; at night’), *tajsutno* ‘tomorrow(’s)’ (*tajsa* ‘tomorrow’), *tosārutno* ‘morning(’s)’ (*tosāra* ‘morning’). Note that in *adād’ivesutno* the historical final sibilant of **adād’ives* (< *adā d’ives* ‘this day’) resurfaces.

Furthermore, *-utn-* occurs in a few mostly denominal adjectives of local or other meanings, such as *āgorutno* ‘marginal, peripheral’ (*āgor* ‘end, margin’), *kherutno* ‘domestic,

⁹⁹ The noun *bālo* occurs in Uzhhorod and Perechyn.

¹⁰⁰ The noun *baličho* occurs mainly in Khudlovo and Serednie, rarely elsewhere.

home-made' (*kher* 'house'), *pāšutno* 'near(by)' (*pāšes* 'near'), *pherasutno* 'joking' (*pheras* 'joke') and *čāčutno* 'true, real' in Serednie.

5.2.2.6 Deverbal psych adjectives in *-kutn-* and *-gutn-*

The segment *-utn-* discussed in the previous section also seems to be contained in a non-productive suffix *-kutn-* in Uzhhorod and Perechyn and *-gutn-* in Khudlovo and Serednie. Both variants occur only in deverbal adjectives, some of which are commonly used as converted nouns. They are typical of adjectives based on transitive verb bases that end in /r/, such as *ašarkutno* (*ašargutno*) 'boastful' (*ašar-* 'to praise'; REFL 'to boast'), *māťarkutno* (*māťargutno*) substantivised 'drunkard' (*māťar-* 'to make drunk'), *prindžarkutno* (*prindžargutno*) substantivised 'acquaintance' (*prindžar-* 'to know sb., to recognise'), and of adjectives from some vocalic psych verbs, e.g. *daravkutno* (*daravgutno*) 'fearful, cowardly' (*dara-* 'to fear'), *ladžavkutno* (*ladžavgutno*) 'bashful, shy' (*ladža-* 'to be bashful'). Note that such adjectives usually contain an extension /v/ before the adjective suffix, but, in Perechyn, the suffix *-kutn-* is attested to be directly attached to the base in *-a*, as in *darakutno*, and with a nasal extension, as in *ladžankutno*.

5.2.2.7 Historical compounds with *nang-*

Two adjectives have developed by compounding with *nango* 'nude, naked'. First, *šernango* 'bareheaded' is a compound with the first element being *šero 'head' (now *šejro*). Second, there is an adjective for 'barefoot', which has developed from a compound with *pindro* 'foot' (< *pinro) and occurs in a variety of forms, such as *pindranglo* (Uzhhorod, Khudlovo), *pin(d)granglo* (everywhere except in Shakhta) and even *pringranglo* (Radvanka). Note that all these forms share a common termination in *-anglo*. Derivational strategies in these forms are not synchronically transparent and such compounds should rather be considered as primary adjectives in the contemporary language.¹⁰¹

5.2.3 Denominal xenoclitic derivation

Xenoclitic adjective derivation may be based on nouns only. It comprises two derivational operations, both being extremely common and productive.

¹⁰¹ There are more cases of such opaque derivations, which seem to represent historical secondary adjectives. For example, the adjective *londo* 'salty' formally as well as semantically relates to the noun *lon* 'salt', as *šutlo* (Radvanka *šuklo*) 'acid' does to *šut* 'vinegar', but there are no other denominal adjectives in *-d-* or *-l-* respectively.

5.2.3.1 Relational adjectives in *-ik-*

Relational adjectives from xenoclitic nouns are productively derived by the suffix *-ik-*, which originates in a Greek suffix *-iko* and is functionally paralleled by *-itik-* (or *-itk-*) in other Romani dialects (< Greek *-itiko*; cf. Boretzky and Iгла 2004: 116). In Eastern Uzh Romani, the suffix may trigger optional palatalisation of the preceding consonant of the adjective base, but most forms with such palatalisation have a non-palatalised variant attested as well, e.g. *barān-ik-o* ~ *barāñ-ik-o* ‘ovine, relating to sheep’ (*barānos* ‘ram, sheep’), *slovāk-ik-o* ~ *slovāt'-ik-o* ‘Slovak’ (*slovākos* ‘Slovak’).

The suffix *-ik-* is especially productive in forming relational adjectives from ethnic or subethnic names, rarely also from place names, e.g. *čexiko* ‘Czech, Slovak’ (*čexos* noun), *močāriko* ‘relating to the Roma from Mochara’ (*močāra* the name of the traditional Romani settlement in northern Uzhhorod; from Hungarian *mocsár* ‘swamp’), *ňemciko* ‘German’ (*ňemcos* noun), *rusiko* ‘East Slavic, Russian’ (*rusos* noun), *ukrajinciko* ‘Ukrainian’ (*ukrajincos* noun), *ungriko* ‘Hungarian’ (*ungros* noun), *uzbekiko* ‘Uzbek’ (*uzbekos* noun), *vlixiko* ‘relating to Vlach or generally foreign Roma’ (*vlixos* noun).

The derivation is not limited to ethnic names, however, and may pertain to other groups of people defined by profession or other characteristic, rarely even to animals or to particular events, as in *bijaviko* ‘nuptial, relating to wedding’ (from the oikoclitic noun *bijav* ‘wedding’), *doxtoriko* ‘relating to physicians’ (*doxtoris* ‘physician’), *d'ilkošiko* ‘murderous’ (*d'ilkosiš* ‘murderer’; cf. Hungarian *gyilkos*), *rabiko* ‘relating to slaves’ (as in *rabiko buvt'i* ‘slave work’; *rabos* ‘slave’), *šātoriko* ‘itinerant’ (*šātorika roma* ‘itinerant Gypsies’; *šātra* ‘tent’, cf. Hungarian *sátor*), *tāboriko* ‘relating to the Roma from a particular Romani settlement’ (*tāboris* ‘Romani settlement’), *t'urmāšiko* ‘relating to prisoners’ (as in *t'urmāšiko gil'i* ‘prison song’; cf. *t'urmāšis* prisoner), *zajāciko* ‘relating to hares’ (*zajācos* ‘hare’).

In Uzhhorod, the suffix is also attested in qualitative adjectives of substances, thus constituting a xenoclitic counterpart to the suffix *-un-*, as in *al'umiņiko* ‘made of aluminium, aluminous’, *betoniko/betoņiko* ‘made of beton’ (*betonos* ‘beton’), *gumiko* ‘rubber’ (*guma*), *plasmašiko* ‘plastic’ (*plasmašos*), etc. In Serednie, *-ik-*adjectives derived from the names of trees are documented, e.g. *breziko* ‘birch’ (*breza* ‘birch tree’), *dubiko* ‘oak’ (*dubos* ‘oak tree’, in Uzhhorod and Perechyn ‘tree’ in general).

5.2.3.2 Qualitative adjectives in *-Všn-*

The other productive derivation of xenoclitic adjectives is that of forming qualitative adjectives with the help of a suffix *-Všn-*, where *V* stands for either *-ā-* or *-o-*,

i.e. *-āšn-* or *-ošn-*. The adjectives in *-Všn-* indicate that the modified noun possesses properties referred to by the adjective base. The suffix consists of the Hungarian derivational suffix *-s-* and the adjective integration marker *-n-* (see 5.1.2.1) and is extracted from direct Hungarian loanwords, which are otherwise still quite common, such as *bijnošno* ‘sinful’, from the Hungarian adjective *bűnös* (< Hungarian noun *bűn*, also reflected in a Eastern Uzh Romani loanword *bijnos* ‘sin’). In Hungarian loanwords, other vowel qualities of the suffix *-Všn-* may occur, as in *kijpešno* ‘able, capable’ (from Hungarian *képes*) and *somjašno* ‘thirsty’ (from Hungarian *szomjas*), both attested from Hungarian L2 speakers in Uzhhorod, but these forms of the suffix, i.e. *-ešn-* and *-ašn-* respectively, do not occur in the internally derived forms. This sometimes leads to alternation of a direct Hungarian loan adjective with an internally derived form. For example, the adjective for ‘feverish’ in Uzhhorod is either *lāzaš-n-o*, which is a direct loanword from the Hungarian *lázás*, or *lāz-ošn-o*, which reflects the internal Romani derivation from the plural noun *lāzi* ‘temperature’ (< Hungarian noun *láz*).¹⁰²

The adjectives in *-Všn-* are best attested in Uzhhorod (Shakhta), so that the following discussion pertains to properties of these adjectives in this variety, unless otherwise stated. Distribution of *-āšn-* versus *-ošn-* in adjectives attested in Shakhta generally conforms to phonological properties of the nominal bases. First, it seems to be governed by the form of the ending of the noun on which the adjective is based. Thus, the *os*-nouns tend to give rise to *ošn*-adjectives, as in *lejš-os* ‘ice’ > *lejš-ošn-o* ‘icy’, while the *a*-nouns often give rise to *āšn*-adjectives, as in *pen-a* ‘foam’ > *pen-āšn-o* ‘foam(y)’. Second, there is a strong dissimilative tendency in the adjective suffix with respect to the vowel quality of the preceding root vowel. The noun *hnoj-os* ‘manure, pus’ has its adjective counterpart in *hnoj-āšn-o* ‘purulent’ rather than **hnojošno*, even though the adjective derives from an *os*-noun. The adjectives *buvť-āšn-o* ‘hard-working’ and *pāñ-ošn-o* ‘waterly, soaked’ are derived from nouns that end in *-i* (*buvťi* ‘work’ and *pāñi* ‘water’ respectively) and they still display different vowel qualities in the adjective suffix (*-āšn-* and *-ošn-* respectively); that is to say, the vowel of the adjective suffix that is more dissimilar to the preceding root vowel is selected to avoid **buvťošno* or **pāñāšno*.

Adjectives in *-Všn-* may be formed from both oikoclitic and xenoclitic nouns, irrespective of their origin.¹⁰³ Alongside the aforementioned *buvťāšno* and *pāñošno*, another

¹⁰² Another example of an internally derived adjective, which contains a Hungarian base, is the ordinal numeral *ezerošno* ‘thousandth’ from the noun *ezeros* ‘thousand’ borrowed from the Hungarian *ezer*.

¹⁰³ All examples of adjectives in this paragraph come from the Shakhta variety.

example of an adjective that is derived from an oikoclitic noun is *xejvāšno* ‘leaky, holey’ (*xejv* ‘hole’), while *sapuňāšno* ‘soapy, saponaceous’ is from the xenoclitic noun *sapuňis* ‘soap’ of Greek origin. Otherwise, most adjectives in *-Všn-* are derived from Slavic-origin nouns, for which the derivation is highly productive, cf. *bakterijāšno* ‘bacterial’ (*bakterija* ‘bactery’), *gāzošno* ‘gas’ (*gāzos* ‘gas’), *xlorkāšno* ‘chlorinated’ (*xlorka* ‘chlor’), *kuľārošno* ‘bespectacled’ (*kuľāra* PL ‘eyeglasses, spectacles’), *praxošno* ‘dusty’ (*praxos* ‘dust’), *spirtošno* ‘containing pure or highly concentrated alcohol’ (*spirtos* ‘alcohol’), among many others. Note that another adjective derivation *kāvejošno* ‘having properties of coffee’ (*kāvejos* ‘coffee’) is used as the colour adjective ‘brown’ in Shakhta. There are even spontaneously attested adjectives from abstract nouns in *-ipe(n)* and *-ibe(n)*, viz. *dživipnāšno* ‘lively, vital’ (*dživipe(n)* ‘life’), and *sovibnāšno* ‘destined for sleeping’ (as in *sovibnāšno govno* ‘sleeping bag’; *sovibe(n)* ‘life’), but such derivations seem not to be frequent.

Adjectives in *-Všn-* are also common in the other varieties of Eastern Uzh Romani, but their forms in the other varieties, and in particular in Khudlovo and Serednie, may differ from those attested in Shakhta; note, for example, Khudlovo *buvťārošno* ‘hard-working’ (instead of *buvťāšno* discussed above), and *praxāšno* ‘dusty’, which goes against the derivational rules observed for the adjectives in the Shakhta variety.

5.2.4 Summary od adjective derivation

Table 39 on the next page provides a summary of all derivational suffixes of secondary adjectives. The column ‘productivity’ assesses the occurrence of the suffixes with borrowed bases.

Table 39: Derivational suffixes of adjectives

SUFFIX	BASE	MEANING	PRODUCTIVITY
<i>-ōr-</i>	ADJ	diminutive	yes
<i>-ovist-</i>	ADJ	attenuative	limited
<i>-kerd-</i>	ADJ	iterative	no (only in <i>nasvalkerdo</i>)
<i>bi-</i>	ADJ	privative	no
<i>na-</i>	ADJ	negative	limited
<i>-al- (-āl-)</i>	N	qualitative, multi-purpose	no
<i>-val-</i>	N	qualitative, body-parts	no
<i>-un-</i>	N	qualitative, substance	no (limited in <i>Perechyn</i>)
	ADV	spatial	no
<i>-(d)un-</i>	V	relational, lexicalised	no (only in <i>romňaduno</i> and in <i>Radvanka romaduno</i>)
<i>-tun-</i>	ADV	temporal	no (only in <i>čirlatuno</i>)
<i>-utun-</i>	N	relational	no (only in <i>gāvutuno</i>)
<i>-an-</i>	N	relational, animate	no
<i>-ikan-</i>	N (ADJ)	relational, animate	limited
<i>-utn-</i>	N	temporal, multi-purpose	no
	ADV	temporal, rare local	no
<i>-kutn- (-gutn-)</i>	V	psych, manner trait	no
<i>-ik-</i>	N	relational, multi-purpose	yes
<i>-āšn-/-ošn-</i>	N	qualitative, multi-purpose	yes

6 PRONOMINAL FORMS

This chapter encompasses a discussion of forms, morphosyntactic properties and the functions of various pronominal forms. The chapter first describes personal, reflexive and reciprocal pronouns, followed by a detailed overview of interrogative and indefinite pronouns of various morphosyntactic properties (substantival, adjectival, adverbial and periphrastic). Three series of indefinite pronouns, specific, negative and free-choice indefinites, are present in the Eastern Uzh Romani and discussed in detail. The final sections deal with categories of universal and differential pronouns, such as ‘everyone’ and ‘another one’. The demonstrative pronouns are discussed in chapter 7.

6.1 Personal, reflexive and reciprocal pronouns

The following sections provide an overview of personal, reflexive and reciprocal pronouns, which often complement each other in related functions.

6.1.1 Personal pronouns

The overall system, as well as particular forms of personal pronouns, are quite conservative, close to those reconstructed for Proto-Romani (cf. Elšík 2000b; Boretzky and Igla 2004: 88; Elšík and Matras 2006: 76) and virtually identical to those in Western Uzh Romani dialects in Slovakia.

Personal pronouns have the substantival inflection in Romani with irregular formation of their oblique and genitive stems. The regular Layer II case suffixes (see 4.1.3) are applied except the genitive, for which the first- and second-person pronouns have distinct forms. The locative is a productive case in pronouns, for which it serves as a prepositional case. Table 40 provides a survey of all personal pronouns in their nominative, oblique, locative (prepositional) and genitive (possessive) forms in Eastern Uzh Romani. The possessive pronouns are cited in the NOM.SG.M agreement form.

Table 40: Personal pronouns

		SG	PL
FIRST	NOM	<i>me</i>	<i>amen</i>
	OBL	<i>man-</i>	<i>amen-</i>
	LOC	<i>mande (ma)</i>	<i>amende</i>
	GEN	<i>mijro (mro, mrov)</i>	<i>amāro</i>
SECOND	NOM	<i>tu</i>	<i>tumen</i>

SECOND	OBL	<i>tu-</i> (ACC <i>tut</i>)		<i>tumen-</i>
	LOC	<i>tute</i> (<i>tu</i>)		<i>tumende</i>
	GEN	<i>tijro</i> (<i>tro, trov</i>)		<i>tumāro</i>
THIRD		M	F	
	NOM	<i>ov</i>	<i>oj</i>	<i>on</i> (Perechyn also <i>one</i>)
	OBL	<i>les-</i>	<i>la-</i>	<i>len-</i>
	LOC	<i>leste</i>	<i>late</i>	<i>lende</i>
	GEN	<i>leskero</i> (<i>leskoro</i>)	<i>lakero</i> (<i>lakoro</i>)	<i>lengero</i> (<i>lengoro</i>)

6.1.1.1 Non-possessive personal pronouns

The forms of the first- and second-person pronouns are identical to those in other Central dialects. The 1SG pronoun has a root *m-* in the NOM *me* ‘I’ and OBL *m-an-* (ACC *man* ‘me’. DAT *man-ge* ‘to me’, ABL *man-dar* ‘from me’, INST *man-ca* ‘with me’). In prepositional phrases, there is a special case form *ma* in addition to the regular locative *man-de*, e.g. *ke mande ~ ke ma* ‘to me’.

The 2SG pronoun has a root *t-* and an identical form in the nominative and oblique cases: NOM *tu* ‘you’, OBL *tu-* (DAT *tu-ke* ‘to you’, ABL *tu-tar* ‘from you’, INST *tu-ha*, etc.), but a distinct accusative form *tut*. The 2SG pronoun is the only category that has a special accusative form that differs from the oblique stem. As in the 1SG pronoun, two forms of the 2SG pronoun compete in prepositional phrases: the nominative-like form *tu* occurs alongside the regular locative *tu-te*, e.g. *ke tute ~ ke tu* ‘to you’.

The respective first- and second-person plural pronouns have the roots *am-* and *tum-* and identical forms in both nominative and oblique *amen* ‘we’ and *tumen* ‘you.PL’ (ACC *amen* ‘us’, *tumen* ‘you.PL’, DAT *amen-ge* ‘to us’, *tumen-ge* ‘to you.PL’, ABL *amen-dar* ‘from us’, *tumen-dar* ‘from you.PL’, INST *amen-ca* ‘with us’, *tumen-ca* ‘with you.PL’). This lack of paradigmatic differentiation between the nominative and the oblique in the plural pronouns is assumed to have been the original state in Romani (cf. Elšík 2000b; Matras 2002: 99; Boretzky and Iгла 2004: 89; Elšík and Matras 2006: 76) and is one of the conservative features of Central Romani in general.

The nominative third-person pronouns are masculine *ov* ‘he’ and feminine *oj* ‘she’ in the singular and *on* ‘they’ in the plural, which conserve the Proto-Romani set of pronouns in *o-* of demonstrative origin (cf. Elšík 2000b: 73; Matras 2002: 100; Elšík and Matras 2006: 75). As is general in Romani dialects, the oblique stem of the third-person pronouns is based

on the suppletive root *l-* (also of demonstrative origin) with the regular nominal oblique suffixes SG.M *-es-* (e.g. ACC *les* ‘him’), SG.F *-a-* (e.g. ACC *la* ‘her’), and PL *-en-* (e.g. ACC *len* ‘them’).

In Perechyn, the nominative 3PL pronoun also occurs in a disyllabic form *one*, which reminds us of *jone* in Northeastern Romani (e.g. Wentzel 1980; Matras 1999b; Tenser 2005, 2008) and *vone* in the Romani dialects of southeastern Ukraine (Barannikov 1934).¹⁰⁴ Diffusion of the extension /e/ from Northeastern dialects can be ruled out as there is no continuum of such a pronoun from Northeastern Romani to Perechyn: the Central dialects spoken to the north of Transcarpathia in Ukrainian Galicia, which display certain features transitional to Northeastern Romani, have the plural pronoun *jon*. Moreover, *one* in Perechyn only occurs in some young and middle-aged speakers, while old speakers still use the common conservative form *on*, so that *one* is definitely a recent, local innovation. The extension has probably developed through analogy with the plural nouns in *-e*, such as *džan-e* ‘persons’ and *gādž-e* ‘non-Roma’ (see also Boretzky and Igla 2004: 90 for a similar explanation of Northeastern *jone*). A trigger for such an analogy may have been an effort to replicate the complexity of the 3PL pronoun that exists in Slavic in relation to its singular masculine counterpart on the one hand and to the masculine inflection of nouns on the other hand, as indicated by Table 41.¹⁰⁵

Table 41: Analogy of Perechyn third-person pronouns with masculine inflection

	Slovak	Ukrainian	Perechyn Romani
‘he’ ~ ‘they’	<i>on ~ on-i</i>	<i>він¹⁰⁶ ~ вони</i>	<i>ov ~ on-e</i>
‘man’ ~ ‘men’	<i>muž ~ muž-i</i>	<i>чоловік ~ чоловік-и</i>	<i>džan-o ~ džan-e</i>

6.1.1.2 Possessive personal pronouns

The possessive personal pronouns function as genitive forms of personal pronouns. Like other genitives in Romani (see 11.1), they display adjectival agreement with the nominal head they

¹⁰⁴ In contrast to the forms in the non-Central dialects, the final vowel /e/ is not stressed in Perechyn *one*, which has the regular penultimate stress pattern typical of Uzh Romani (see 2.3).

¹⁰⁵ According to Elšík (2000b: 76), *jone* and *vone* in Northeastern and Ukrainian dialects are due to an analogy with the 1PL and 2PL pronouns *ame* and *tume* in the given dialects. In Perechyn, however, the 1PL and 2PL pronouns do not end in *-e*, so this explanation cannot hold.

¹⁰⁶ From older **онъ*; in Transcarpathian dialects (Rusyn) (*в*)*ун*.

modify through a phenomenon known as the *Suffixaufnahme* and are declined as the oikoclitic vocalic adjectives (5.1.1.1).

The first- and second-person pronouns have unique genitive marking in *-ijr-* (usually pronounced with a single long vowel [i:r] or [ɪ:r]) in the singular, i.e. *m-ijr-o* [1SG-GEN-NOM.SG.M] ‘my’, *t-ijr-o* [2SG-GEN-NOM.SG.M] ‘your’, and *-ār-* in the plural, i.e. *am-ār-o* [1PL-GEN-NOM.SG.M] ‘our’ and *tum-ār-o* [2PL-GEN-NOM.SG.M] ‘your’.

The third-person pronouns have regular genitive marking by means of the nominal suffix *-ker-/ger-*, which is attached to the oblique stem of the personal pronouns, i.e. *l-es-ker-o* [3-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.SG.M] ‘his’, *l-a-ker-o* [3-OBL.SG.F-GEN-NOM.SG.M] ‘her’, *l-en-ger-o* [3-OBL.PL-GEN-NOM.SG.M] ‘their’. The genitive suffix is never stressed, and stress falls on the preceding syllable of the oblique stem (see 2.3 for more details). The singular masculine agreement forms in *-ker-o/ger-o* optionally display regressive vowel assimilation, which results in the forms *leskoro*, *lakoro* and *lengoro*. Such a kind of ‘vowel harmony’ is more common in the data from the *gāvutune* dialects than in those from Uzhhorod, where the non-assimilated forms *leskero*, *lakero* and *lengero* are more commonly encountered. In the feminine agreement forms, vowel assimilation of the oblique forms *leskara* and *lengara* is attested in Perechyn, but no assimilation takes place in the nominative, as in *leskeri*, *lakeri* and *lengeri* (no **leskiri* and the like).

In addition to *mijro* ‘my’ and *tijro* ‘your’, there are reduced forms of the 1SG and 2SG possessive pronouns *mro* and *tro*. Such monosyllabic forms are constrained by both semantic and syntactic factors. First, they only occur with kinship terms, such as *mro čha* ‘my son’, *mri čhaj* ‘my daughter’, and with body parts in some fixed phrases and idioms, e.g. in swear idioms *xas mro kār*, literally ‘You eat my penis.’, and *xas mri mindž* ‘You eat my vagina.’ Second, they may occur only in the attributive position and never in the predicative position. Furthermore, if they modify the kinship terms *daj* ‘mother’ or *dad* ‘father’, their final inflectional suffix is lengthened or diphthongised in the nominative forms, as in *mrij daj* [‘mri:.daj] ‘my mother’, *trij daj* [‘tri:.daj] ‘your mother’, *mrov dad* [‘mro:.dat ~ ‘mrou.dat] ‘your father’, *trov dad* [‘tro:.dat ~ ‘trou.dat] ‘your father’, and in the oblique feminine forms, as in DAT *mrā dake* [mra:.’da.ke] ‘to my mother’, *trā dake* [tra:.’da.ke] ‘to your mother’, but not in the oblique masculine, such as *mre dadeske* ‘to my father’, *tre dadeske* ‘to your father’. Note that similar formations headed by the nouns *daj* or *dad* have been described for other Romani dialects (cf. Bodnárová and Wiedner 2015) and might therefore represent a Proto-Romani legacy. See the following examples of spontaneous sentences:

- (1) *the mr-ov dad ade uv'l'la* (UzhhR)
 also my-NOM.-SG.M father[NOM.-SG.M] here be_born.AOR.3SG
 ‘My father was also born here.’
- (2) *tr-ij daj khejre* (UzhhS)
 your-NOM.SG.F mother[NOM.SG.F] at_home
 ‘Your mother is at home.’
- (3) *džas tr-ā dake andre goj?* (UzhhS)
 go.PRS.2SG your-OBL.SG.F mother.DAT in intestine
 ‘Are you going to the gut of your mother?’ (a teasing expression)
- (4) *kāj tr-ov dad?* (Per)
 where your-NOM.-SG.M father[NOM.-SG.M]
 ‘Where is your father?’

6.1.2 Reflexive pronouns

Reflexivity, i.e. referential identity of clause constituents with the subject, is expressed by personal pronouns or by the dedicated reflexive pronoun. The reflexive pronoun is the exclusive means of indicating referential identity with the subject in the third person. It has distinct singular and plural forms with no gender distinction. Since the reflexive pronoun is never used in the subject role, and the reflexive actions have animate agents, there are no nominative forms of the reflexive. See Table 42 for inflection of the reflexive pronoun.

Table 42: Inflection of the reflexive pronoun

	SG	PL
ACC	<i>p-es</i>	<i>p-en</i>
DAT	<i>p-es-ke</i>	<i>p-en-ge</i>
SOC	<i>p-e-ha</i>	<i>p-en-ca</i>
ABL	<i>p-es-tar</i>	<i>p-en-dar</i>
LOC	<i>p-es-te</i>	<i>p-en-de</i>
GEN	<i>p-es-ker-o (p-es-kor-o)</i>	<i>p-en-ger-o (p-en-gor-o)</i>

The reflexive pronoun has the root *p-* and the nominal inflection analogous to that of the third-person pronouns, i.e. *p-es* [REFL-OBL.SG] as *l-es* [3-OBL.SG.M], *p-en* [REFL-OBL.PL] as *l-en* [3-OBL.PL]. As the distinct feminine reflexive is missing, *-es-* has the plain singular reading in the reflexive and may refer to both masculine and feminine subjects.

- (5) *oj p-es dikh'la andro tüvköris* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 she REFL-ACC.SG see.AOR.3SG in mirror
 'She saw herself in the mirror.'
- (6) *on p-en dikhle andro tüvköris* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 they REFL-ACC.PL see.AOR.3PL in mirror
 'They saw themselves in the mirror.'
- (7) *on na kamen ñikas, čak pen kamen* (UzhhS)
 they NEG like.PRS.3PL nobody.ACC only REFL.ACC.PL like.PRS.3PL
 'They do not like anybody, they like only themselves.'

The reflexive pronoun may be marked by any of the Layer II case markers, including the genitive, which expresses the adnominal possessor in a reflexive function. Like other genitive forms, the genitive reflexives take on the adjectival agreement markers and may also be used substantivally in a non-determinative position, as in (10).

- (8) *oj imā sājinlas p-es-ker-e rom-es*
 she already feel_sorry.IPF/POT.3SG REFL-SG-GEN-OBL.SG.Mhusband-ACC.SG.M
the p-es-ker-e čhav-en (Khu)
 and REFL-SG-GEN-OBL.PL child-ACC.PL
 'She already felt sorry for her husband and for her children.'
- (9) *p-en-ge cinen on p-en-ger-e lovv-en-dar* (Khu)
 REFL-PL-DAT buy.PRS.3PL they REFL-PL-GEN-OBL.PL money-OBL.PL-ABL
 'They buy [it] for themselves from their own money.'
- (10) *on p-en-ger-en-dar len* (UzhhS)
 they REFL-PL-GEN-OBL.PL-ABL take.prs.3PL
 'They take [it] from theirs.' (meaning: 'They take [it] from their family.')

In prepositional phrases, the reflexive pronoun has the obligatory locative marking:

- (11) *o roma ča pregal p-en-de*
 ART Rom.PL only for_the_sake_of REFL-PL-LOC
keren (UzhhS)
 do.PRS.3PL
 'The Roma make [it] just for themselves.'
- (12) *lakeri daj ñizvesno, añi na del pal p-es-te*
 her mother missing not_even NEG give.PRS.3SG about REFL-SG-LOC

te džanen (Khu)
 NCOMP know.INF

‘Her mother is missing, [she] even doesn’t let know about herself.’

In the first and second persons, reflexivity is usually achieved by coreferential usage of the non-nominative personal pronouns. See the following Serednie examples from the paradigm elicitation:

First and second persons:

(13) *me man othovās* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 I.NOM I.ACC hide.IPF/POT.1SG

‘I was hiding myself.’

(14) *amen amen othovahas* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 we.NOM we.ACC hide.IPF/POT.1PL

‘We were hiding ourselves.’

(15) *tu tut othovehas* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 you.NOM you.ACC hide.IPF/POT.2SG

‘You were hiding yourself.’

(16) *tumen tumen othovnas* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 you.PL.NOM you.PL.ACC hide.IPF/POT.2PL

‘You were hiding yourselves.’

as against the third person:

(17) *ov pes othovlas* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 he.NOMREFL.ACC.SG hide.IPF/POT.3SG

‘He was hiding himself.’

(18) *on pen othovnas* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 they.NOM REFL.ACC.PL hide.IPF/POT.3PL

‘They were hiding themselves.’

In Perechyn, however, the singular reflexive *pes* extends across all person and number categories in the speech of young and middle-aged speakers, and becomes a general reflexive pronoun. The older generation speakers in Perechyn still maintain the conservative pattern. See the following examples from two Perechyn speakers:

Perechyn speaker *1946:

- (19) *othov tut* (Per)^{LQCR}
 hide[IMP.2SG] you.ACC
 ‘Hide yourself!’
- (20) *othoven tumen* (Per)^{LQCR}
 hide.IMP.2PL you.PL.ACC
 ‘Hide yourselves!’
- (21) *on pen othode* (Per)^{LQCR}
 they.NOM REFL.PL hide.AOR.3PL
 ‘They hid themselves’

as against Perechyn speaker *1993:

- (22) *othov pes* (Per)^{LQCR}
 hide[IMP.2SG] REFL
 ‘Hide yourself!’
- (23) *othoven pes* (Per)^{LQCR}
 hide.IMP.2PL REFL
 ‘Hide yourselves!’
- (24) *one othovenas pes* (Per)^{LQCR}
 they.NOM hide.IPF/POT.3PL REFL
 ‘They were hiding themselves.’

The two systems of expressing reflexivity can be summarised as in the following Table 43. The dedicated reflexive pronouns are in bold.

Table 41: Conservative and innovative patterns of reflexivity

PERSON	CONSERVATIVE PATTERN		INNOVATIVE PATTERN	
	SG	PL	SG	PL
FIRST	<i>man</i>	<i>amen</i>	<i>pes</i>	<i>pes</i>
SECOND	<i>tut</i>	<i>tumen</i>	<i>pes</i>	<i>pes</i>
THIRD	<i>pes</i>	<i>pen</i>	<i>pes</i>	<i>pes</i>

The conservative pattern is typical of Khudlovo and Serednie and of older speakers of the remaining varieties. The innovative pattern is typical of young and middle-aged speakers in Perechyn and of some young speakers in Uzhhorod. In both Uzhhorod varieties, we also encounter transitional systems between these two patterns. For example, several speakers in Shakhta, including one consultant for the LQCR elicitation, use *pes* in the 1SG instead of

the personal pronoun *man*, and optionally in the 3PL alongside the plural reflexive *pen*, but not in the other categories, where the conservative pattern is kept. Therefore, the paradigm may also appear as in Table 44:

Table 44: Alternative pattern of reflexivity in Uzhhorod

PERSON	SG	PL
FIRST	<i>pes</i>	<i>amen</i>
SECOND	<i>tut</i>	<i>tumen</i>
THIRD	<i>pes</i>	<i>pes/pen</i>

It should be pointed out that the singular reflexive *pes*, including its various case forms, recurrently occurs in the 3PL reference, even in those varieties and idiolects in which the distinct plural reflexive *pen* is otherwise kept. In contrast, *pen* never occurs in the singular reference. It indicates that *pes* is functionally less marked than *pen* with regard to expressing the number.

Reflexivisation plays an important role in the productive valency-decreasing operations, as described in 12.3.2.

6.1.3 Reciprocal pronouns

Reciprocity is similar to reflexivity in that it is a kind of coreference but one in which two or more participants act upon each other as both agent and patient (cf. Nedjalkov 2007). In all Eastern Uzh Romani varieties, reciprocity may be expressed either through devices used for reflexivisation (see above) or by a special reciprocal pronoun *jekhāvres* (or *jekāvres* with no aspiration). The reciprocal pronoun *jek(h)āvres* was grammaticalised from the combination of the numeral *jekh* ‘one’ (see 8.1.1) with the differential pronominal adjective *āver* ‘other’, OBL *āvres-* (6.5.1). It has the substantival inflection similar to that of the singular reflexive *pes*.

Table 45: Inflection of the reciprocal pronoun

	SG
ACC	<i>jek(h)āvr-es</i>
DAT	<i>jek(h)āvr-es-ke</i>
SOC	<i>jek(h)āvr-e-ha</i>
ABL	<i>jek(h)āvr-es-tar</i>
LOC	<i>jek(h)āvr-es-te</i>
GEN	<i>jek(h)āvr-es-ker-o</i>

In sentence (25), three semantically reciprocal clauses are juxtaposed. In the first clause, the plural reflexive pronoun *pen* used as the direct object of the verb of volition expresses the contextually disambiguated reciprocal meaning, while the accusative and ablative forms of the reciprocal pronoun occur in the respective second and third clauses.

- (25) *te kamena pen o phrala o pheña vlāsne,*
 if love.FUT.3PL. REFL.PLART brother.PL ART sister.PL own.PL
te pomožinna jekhāvres, na otperna jekhāvrestar,
 if help.FUT.3PL RECP.ACC NEG fall_away.FUT.3PL RECP.ABL
akor ejla len lācho dživipen (Uzhhs)
 then COP.FUT.3SG they.ACC good life
 ‘If they, full brothers and sisters, love each other, if they help each other, [if] they don’t turn away from each other, then they will have a good life.’

In Serednie, and occasionally in Uzhhorod, there is also a ‘strengthened’ form of the reciprocal pronoun *jekjek(h)āvres*, in which the first numeral element is repeated, as in:

- (26) *on igen kamen jekjekhāvres (Ser)^{LQCR}*
 they very love.PRS.3PL RECP.ACC
 ‘They love each other a lot.’
- (27) *on dikhenas jekjekhāvrenge aro jākha (Ser)^{LQCR}*
 they look_at.IPF/POT.3PL RECP.DAT in eye.PL
 ‘They looked at each other into eyes.’

In prepositional phrases, this more complex reciprocal pronoun is usually disrupted by a preposition, e.g. *jek pal jekhāvreste* ‘after each other’, while the simpler variant remains undivided: *pal jekhāvreste*, which indicates a lower degree of grammaticalisation of the form *jekjekhāvres*- in contrast to *jekhāvres*-.

There are a number of verbs that commonly express reciprocity by the reflexive rather than the reciprocal pronoun. Such formally reflexive periphrases may therefore be ambiguous on their own because they may provide reflexive (or just valency-decreasing) or reciprocal readings, and the context must be taken into account for their disambiguation, e.g. *arakh*- ‘to find’, REFL *arakh- p-* ‘to be found’ or ‘to meet (each other)’, *xa-* ‘to eat’, REFL *xal p-* ‘to eat

oneself’ or ‘to brawl, to quarrel violently’ (literally ‘to eat each other’), *xud-* ‘to catch, to get, to begin’, REFL *xud- p-* ‘to get caught’ or ‘to hold each other’, and also *mār-* ‘to beat’, REFL *mār- p-* ‘to beat oneself’ or ‘to beat each other, to fight’, as in the following:

- (28) *duje pheñengere roma mārnas pen* (Per)
 two sister.GEN.PL husband.PL beat.IPF/POT.3PL REFL.PL
 ‘Husbands of two sisters fought each other.’

Even with these verbs, the reciprocal pronoun may still be used in addition to the reflexive pronoun to emphasise the mutuality, as in the final clause of sentence (29).

- (29) *on pes andro kher xan, māren pes andro kher,*
 they REFL in house eat.PRS.3PL beat.PRS.3PL REFL in house
ov la, oj les mārel, no jekhāvres pes
 he she.ACC she he.ACC beat.PRS.3SG PART RECP.ACC REFL
māren (UzhS)
 beat.PRS.3PL
 ‘They brawl in the house, they fight in the house, he [beats] her, she beats him, in short they mutually fight.’

Obligatory reflexive verbs with no reflexive semantics (*reflexive tantum*; see 12.3.2) may also be combined with the reciprocal pronoun. See the following Perechyn sentences with the formally reflexive verb for ‘to quarrel’, *viskidin-*.¹⁰⁷ In sentence (30), the verb is not combined with a reciprocal pronoun (the dative reciprocal pronoun *jekāvreske* is as an argument of the verb *prebačīn-* ‘to forgive’ in the coordinated clause), while in (31), the instrumental reciprocal pronoun overtly expresses the comitative role.

- (30) *ijdž one pes viskidinde,*
 yesterday they REFL quarrel.AOR.3PL
abo pāle jekāvreske prebačinde (Per)^{LQCR}
 but again RECP.DAT forgive.AOR.3PL
 ‘Yesterday, they had a quarrel, but they have forgiven each other again.’

¹⁰⁷ This verb of Hungarian origin (*veszekedik*) also has its phonological variants *vesekedin-* and *veskedin-* in Eastern Uzh Romani.

- (31) *one viskidinenas pes jekāvreha* (Per)^{LQCR}
 they quarrel.IPF/POT.3PL REFL RECP.INST
 ‘They were quarrelling with each other.’

6.2 Interrogative pronouns

The system of interrogative pronouns is to a large degree based on the reconstructed Proto-Romani system (cf. Elšík and Matras 2006: 77) with an interplay of two historical pronominal roots *k-* and *s-* (cf. Matras 20012: 112; Elšík and Matras 2006: 297). The phonological forms of interrogatives reflect some typical North Central innovations, such as nasal apocope in the nominative person interrogative *ko* (*< *kon*),¹⁰⁸ affrication in the time/quantity interrogative *keci*, and presence of aspiration in the place interrogative *khatar*. In Eastern Uzh Romani, there is no dedicated size-interrogative ‘how big’ and no quantity interrogative with the root *-bor*, which exist in some other Romani dialects (cf. Boretzky and Iгла 2004: 104–105; Elšík and Matras 2006: 77, 309).

The following Table 46 provides an overview of interrogative pronouns in Eastern Uzh Romani: the categorial classification is based on the ontological values of interrogatives.

Table 44: Interrogative pronouns

CATEGORY	FORM	MEANING
PERSON	<i>ko</i>	who
THING	<i>so</i>	what
SELECTION	<i>savo</i>	which one (out of many)
QUALITY	<i>savo</i> (Uzhhorod, Perechyn)	what (sort/kind of)
	<i>soza</i> (Khudlovo, Serednie)	
IDENTITY	<i>soza</i>	who/what, which
GOAL	<i>soske</i>	why, what for
CAUSE		why, on what grounds
MANNER	<i>sar</i>	how
PLACE: STATIVE	<i>kāj</i> (<i>kaj</i>) (Khudlovo also <i>kā</i>)	where
PLACE: DIRECTIVE		(to) where, whither

¹⁰⁸ Boretzky and Iгла (2004: 103) and Elšík and Matras (2006: 310) point to the fact that *ko* in Central Romani may be a result of contact-induced contamination of the indigenous form *kon* by almost identical forms in a part of South Slavic (cf. Serbo-Croatian *ko*). Note that *ko* as a pronoun ‘who’ also exists in local Ukrainian (Rusyn) in Transcarpathia (*κo*).

PLACE: SEPARATIVE	<i>khatar</i>	from where, whence
PLACE: PERLATIVE		which way
TIME: SIMULTANEOUS	<i>kana</i>	when
TIME: POSTERIOR	<i>(ot)kanastar/otkedi</i> <i>otkadastar (Ser)</i>	since when
TIME: ANTERIOR	<i>dži kana (Uzhhorod also ži kana)</i>	until/till when
TIME: DURATIVE	<i>keci</i>	how long

The interrogative pronouns are identical in both independent and embedded interrogative clauses (see also 13.2.4), as in:

(32) *keci ade ejha?* (UzhhS)
how_long here COP.FUT.2SG
‘How long will you be here?’

(33) *ko džanel, keci me dživava* (UzhhS)
who know.PRS.3SG how_long I live.FUT.1SG
‘Who knows how long I will live.’

As is common in Romani in general, there are no special relative pronouns, and the relativisers draw upon interrogative pronouns. In Eastern Uzh Romani, the common relativisers are based on *kāj* ‘where’, *so* ‘what’ and the selection interrogative *savo* ‘which one’; see 13.4 for more details.

In what follows, interrogatives will be discussed in more detail.

6.2.1 Substantival and adjectival interrogatives

Substantival and adjectival interrogatives comprise the person and thing interrogatives *ko* and *so*, which exhibit substantival inflection, and *savo* and *soza*, which may be both adjectival forms, as in *savo murš* ‘which man’, DAT *save muršeske* ‘to which man’, and substantival forms, as in *savo* ‘which one’, DAT *saveske* ‘to which one’.

6.2.1.1 Person and thing interrogatives *ko* and *so*

The nominative person interrogative is *k-o* ‘who’, and the nominative thing interrogative is *s-o* ‘what’. Both decline and have substantival inflection with the irregular oblique stem formation *k-as-* for the person interrogative and *s-os-* for the thing interrogative; see Table 47.

Table 47: Inflection of *ko* 'who' and *so* 'what'

	PERSON	THING
NOM	<i>k-o</i>	<i>s-o</i>
ACC	<i>k-as</i>	–
DAT	<i>k-as-ke</i>	<i>s-os-ke</i>
SOC	<i>k-a-ha</i>	<i>s-o-ha</i>
ABL	<i>k-as-tar</i>	<i>s-os-tar</i>
LOC	<i>k-as-te</i>	<i>s-os-te</i>
GEN	<i>k-as-ker-o (k-as-kor-o)</i>	–

Note that the thing interrogative lacks a genitive form, which is blocked by the existence of the interrogative adjectives *savo* and *soza* (see below), and an accusative form, since the thing pronoun inherently refers to an inanimate entity (see 11.1.1.2).

6.2.1.2 Interrogative *savo*

The interrogative *savo* is a conservative interrogative adjective inherited from Proto-Romani and shared with other Romani dialects. Its basic meaning across all Uzh varieties is ‘which one’ (out of many), inquiring about a referent selected from a group of similar entities. Thus, for example, *sav-o pivos* [which-NOM.SG.M beer] means ‘which particular beer selected out of a group of identical or similar beers’. Due to the presence of another interrogative *soza*, which possesses an intrinsic identity value but does not determine a referent selected from a group (see below), I classify *savo* as a selection interrogative rather than as an identity interrogative. It may occur as an adjectival determiner (34) as well as a substantivised form functioning as a nominal head (35).

- (34) *andre savo gav* (Khu)
 in which.SELECTION village
 ‘In which village?’
- (35) *savo andal kola murša*
 which.SELECTION out_of that.SPEC.PL male.PL
tuke pre dzeka? (Ser)^{LQCR}
 you.DAT on mood/liking
 ‘Which one of those guys do you like?’

In Uzhhorod and Perechyn, but not in Khudlovo and Serednie, *savo* is also used as a quality interrogative ‘what kind of’ and a quantity interrogative ‘how many’, which in

order’ (see 8.2.1). Thus, for example, *savo pivos* in Uzhhorod and Perechyn also means ‘what kind of beer’ (pale, dark, Czech, Ukrainian, etc.) as well as ‘how many beer, which beer in order’ (first, second, third, etc.) in addition to the aforementioned meaning. In Khudlovo and Sereďnie, the other interrogative *soza* discussed in the next section is used instead of *savo* in these functions. For an example of the quality interrogative, see also (42) below.

The adjectival interrogative *sav-o* has the oikoclitic adjectival inflection: *sav-o* [which-NOM.SG.M], *sav-i* [which-NOM.SG.F], *sav-e* [which-NOM.PL], [which-OBL.SG.M] or [which-OBL.PL], *sav-a* [which-OBL.SG.F]. In Khudlovo and Sereďnie, the extension suffix *-on-* is optionally inserted into the oblique forms: thus, *sav-on-e* [which-EXT-OBL.SG.M] or [which-EXT-OBL.PL], *sav-on-a* [which-EXT-OBL.SG.F]. If substantivised, *sav-o* is oikoclitic in Uzhhorod and Perechyn, e.g. *sav-en* [which-ACC.PL] ‘which ones (direct object)’, *sav-es-ke* [which-OBL.SG.M-DAT] ‘to which one’, *sav-en-ge* [which-OBL.PL-DAT] ‘to which ones’, *sav-es-tar* [which-OBL.SG.M-ABL] ‘from which one.M’, *sav-a-tar* [which-OBL.SG.F-ABL] ‘from which one.F’, *sav-en-ca* [which-OBL.PL-INST] ‘with which ones’, etc. In Khudlovo and Sereďnie, the substantivised *sav-o* behaves as a xenoclitic adjective in that it contains the inserted extension *-on-* in non-nominative cases, e.g. *sav-on-en* [which-EXT-ACC.PL] ‘which ones (direct object)’, *sav-on-es-ke* [which-EXT-OBL.SG.M-DAT] ‘to which one.M’, *sav-on-a-tar* [which-EXT-OBL.SG.F-ABL] ‘from which one.F’, etc.

The substantival *savo* does not normally assume the locative case if it is combined with a preposition (see 11.2), e.g. Perechyn *ke sav-i* [at/to which-NOM.SG.F] ‘at which one’, but the locative case is rarely attested, as in Shakhta *ke sav-en-de* [at/to which-OBL.PL-LOC] ‘at which ones’.

6.2.1.3 Interrogative *soza*

The other adjectival interrogative ‘which’ is *soza*, which is indeclinable (cf. PL *soza texana* ‘which meals’). It has developed through fusion of the thing interrogative *so* with the Slavic preposition *za*, i.e. it is a semi-loan translation of a Slavic interrogative phrase consisting of ‘what’ and the polysemous preposition *za*, cf. Slovak *čo za*, Russian *что за*, Ukrainian *що (mo) за*, Czech, Polish *co (to) za*, etc. (see (36), (37)). In contrast to Slavic, where the two elements may be separated by another element (e.g. by the neuter demonstrative *to*, as in (37)), the Romani pronoun *soza* is inseparable, and is accordingly deemed a single word.

- (36) *čo za ľudia tu bývajú* (Slovak)
 what PREP people here live.PRS.3PL

- (37) *что то за люди здесь живут* (Russian)
 what DEM PREP people here live.PRS.3PL
 ‘What kind of people live here?’

The basic meaning of *soza* in Eastern Uzh Romani is close to that of the thing interrogative ‘what’ plus the preposition *za* in Slavic: it is used as a special identity interrogative that asks about the basic classification or characterisation of the determined referent. An important property of such a referent is its unfamiliarity to the questioner, and the *soza* is employed to uncover the identity. In this respect, the identity interrogative *soza* differs from the quality interrogative, which determines a referent whose identity is known to the speaker. In contrast to the selection interrogative, which also determines a referent with unknown identity, the referent modified by *soza* does not represent an entity selected from a group of other similar entities, but stands as a single unique entity (meaning that there is no selection). In this respect, *soza* with animate referents is semantically similar to the person interrogative *ko* ‘who’, while it is similar to the thing interrogative *so* when used with inanimate referents. However, it differs from both in its syntactic properties because *ko* and *so* cannot be used as adjectival determiners. In Uzhhorod and Perechyn *soza* is used only in this specific identity meaning:

- (38) *soza manuš avel?* (Uzhhr)
 which.IDENTITY man come.PRS.3SG
 ‘Who is the man coming?’ (Literally: ‘Which man is coming?’ with implication of his unknown identity.)
- (39) *soza zadaña lenge zadiñas ?* (Uzhhs)
 which.IDENTITY task they.DAT assign.AOR.3SG
 ‘What (sort of) task did he give them?’
- (40) *odā soza roza?* (Per)
 DEM which.IDENTITY Rosa
 ‘Who is Rosa?’ (Literally: ‘Which Rosa is it?’ with no implication of selection or existence of more than one Rosa.)
- (41) *esas ade lavutāra, od’a pisinēl*
 COP.PST.3 here musicians there write.PRS.3SG
soza lavutāra (Per)
 which.IDENTITY musicians
 ‘[There] were musicians here, there [he] writes [about] which (class of) musicians.’

- (44) *soske tu mindik phires avri?* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 why you always go_often.PRS.2SG outside
 ‘For which reason do you always go out?’ or ‘For what do you always go out?’

There is also a special form *vasoske*, which is based on the prepositional phrase *važ soske* (for *važ*, see 11.2.2.1). It is not clear to what extent it is still a complex prepositional phrase with mere phonological simplification of the consonant cluster /žs/ > /s/ in the surface pronunciation, or whether it has already been grammaticalised to a single word form. The form *vasoske* frequently occurs in one’s reply to thanking *nāne vasoske* ‘Not at all’.

- (45) *vasoske tu man avka karind'al ?* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 for_what you I.ACC thus punish.AOR.2SG
 ‘For what reason have you punished me in such a way?’

The manner interrogative ‘how’ is invariably *sar*:

- (46) *sar on vakeren?* (UzhhR)
 how they speak.PRS.3PL
 ‘How do they speak?’

There is a two-way distinction in place interrogatives, based on the values of orientation (cf. Elšík and Matras 2006: 271). One form, viz. *kāj*, is used in the stative (‘at which place’) and directive (‘to which place’) meanings; another form, *khatar*, expresses the separative (‘from where, from which place’) and perlative (‘which way, via which place’) meanings.

- (47) *kāj one hine?* (Per)^{LQCR}
 where they COP.PRS.3PL
 ‘Where are they?’

- (48) *o pe'as kāj gej'la?* (Per)
 ART Petia where go.AOR.2SG
 ‘Where did Petia go (to)?’

- (49) *khatar tijre dada?* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 whence your father.PL
 ‘Where are your parents from?’

- (50) *khatar te džan khejre?* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 which_way NCOMP go.INF home
 ‘Which way to go home?’

In Khudlovo, the interrogative *kāj* has the frequent, but still optional, apocopic variant *kā*:

- (51) *kā on hine?* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 where they COP.PRS.3PL
 ‘Where are they?’

The durative temporal interrogative ‘how long’ is *keci* (see (32) and (33) above), which is identical to the quantity interrogative ‘how much/many’ discussed in 8.2.1. Otherwise, the simultaneous temporal interrogatives is *kana* ‘when’ (see (52)), while the posterior interrogative ‘since when’ is expressed either by the ablative *kanastar* (*kana-s-tar* [when-OBL-ABL]), as in (53), or by the complete Slavic loan *otkedi* (cf. Slovak *odkedy*, Polish *od kiedy*, Czech *odkdy*), as in (54) and (56), or yet by the ablative form prefixed by the fused Slavic ablative preposition *od*, i.e. *otkanastar* (55). Apart from the ablative, no other case form of the interrogative *kana* occurs. A hybrid form *otkadastar* was recorded in Serednie (57), in which the temporal root *-kada-* instead of *-kana-* is probably due to contamination by the Slavic counterpart.

- (52) *kana aveha?* (Ser)
 when come.FUT.2SG
 ‘When will you come?’
- (53) *kanastar tu ade džives?* (Per)^{LQCR}
 since_when you here live.PRS.2SG
- (54) *otkedi tu ade džives?* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 since_when you here live.PRS.2SG
 ‘Since when have you (SG) been living here?’
- (55) *otkanastar tumen adej dživen?* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 since_when you.PL here live.PRS.2PL
- (56) *otkedi ade dživen?* (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 since_when here live.PRS.2PL
 ‘Since when have you (PL) been living here?’

- (57) *otkadastar tumen ade dživen?* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 since_when you.PL here live.PRS.2PL
 ‘Since when have you (PL) been living here?’

The anterior meaning ‘till when’ is expressed by *kana* modified by the terminative particle (*d*)*ži*; see 9.6.2 for more details.

6.2.3 Interrogative-based indefinite periphrases

Interrogative pronouns serve as bases for forming indefinite pronouns by prefixation (see 6.3 below). However, interrogatives may also occur in specific periphrastic constructions to express indefiniteness with no prefixation.

First, the plain interrogative pronouns may be reduplicated to express contradiction, as in *kana pro bus kana pejšones* ‘sometimes by bus, sometimes on foot’ and see also the following sentences and sentence (62) below:

- (58) *ko džal, ko na džal,*
 who go.PRS.3SG who NEG go.PRS.3SG
kas hin voľa džal (UzhhR)
 who.ACC COP.PRS.3 will go.PRS.3SG
 ‘Somebody is going, somebody isn’t going. Who has the will, he is going.’
- (59) *andre savore skl’epi hin so kučeder*
 in all shop.PL COP.PRS.3 what expensive.COMPR
so tuñeder (UzhhS)
 what cheap.COMPR
 ‘In all shops, there is something more expensive [and] something cheaper.’
- (60) *ko cinel, ko parovel* (Ser)
 who buy.PRS.3SG who exchange.PRS.3SG
 ‘Somebody buys [it], somebody exchanges [it].’

Second, interrogative pronouns of given ontological categories plus the manner interrogative *sar* ‘how’ express dependence upon circumstances, so that they may be translated as ‘it depends/ it varies (who he is, what it is, where it is, etc.)’:

- (61) *ko sar phenel, na savore jednakones phenen* (UzhhR)
 who how say.PRS.3SG NEG all identically say.PRS.3PL
 ‘It depends on who says [it], not everybody says [it] in an identical way.’

- (62) *kana sar, kana kamel te soven,*
 when how when want.PRS.3SG NCOMP sleep.INF
kana na kamel (Uzhhs)
 when NEG want.PRS.3SG
 ‘It depends on the time, sometimes he wants to sleep, sometimes he doesn’t.’

Finally, there is a special category of paucal expressions that point to another kind of indefiniteness, namely to paucity (cf. English *hardly any-*). These expressions are periphrastic constructions that consist of an interrogative pronoun preceded by *ritkān*, a temporal adverb ‘rarely’ from Hungarian *ritkán*, e.g. *ritkān ko* ‘hardly anybody’. The meaning of these expressions matches the meaning of interrogatives preceded by the paucal quantifier *malo* ‘few’ in North Slavic (cf. Slovak *málo-kto*, Ukrainian *мало хто* ‘hardly anybody’), but in Eastern Uzh Romani the equivalent paucal quantifier *frima* is not employed in such a function (**frima ko*).

- (63) *menk ritkān ko tut dela cigarekl'a* (Uzhhs)
 still rarely who you.ACC give.FUT.3SG cigarette
 ‘Hardly anybody will give you even a cigarette.’
- (64) *ritkān kāj ajso spravedl'ivo, ritkān kāj hin* (Uzhhs)
 rarely where such fair rarely where COP.PRS.3
 ‘Hardly anywhere [there is someone] so fair-minded, hardly anywhere is [he].’
- (65) *ov ritkān kan' arakhel varesij buvtōri* (Ser)
 he rarely when find.PRS.3SG some job.DIM
 ‘Hardly ever he finds some good job.’

A similar meaning may also be conveyed by some derived adverbs, such as *phāres* ‘hard’ (< *phāro* adjective ‘hard’) and *slabones* ‘weakly’ (< *slabo* ‘weak’ of Slavic origin):

- (66) *ode phāres ko pomožinla* (Uzhhs)
 there hard.ADV who help.FUT.3SG
 ‘There hardly anybody will help.’
- (67) *slabones ko phenel* (Uzhhs)
 weak.ADV who say.PRS.3SG
 ‘Hardly anybody says [it].’

6.3 Indefinite pronouns

This section discusses indefinite pronouns in Eastern Uzh Romani, including an outline of their functions. Following the classification of indefinites by Elšík and Matras (2006: 281–294; see also Haspelmath 1997), I distinguish three functional indefinite categories in Eastern Uzh Romani, viz. specific indefinites (‘something’), negative indefinites (‘nothing’) and free-choice indefinites (‘whatever, anything’), all of which share morphological properties. Universal pronouns (‘everything’) will be discussed in a separate section (6.4).

As in other Central Romani dialects, the indefinites are generally based on interrogative pronouns, which express the given ontological category, such as person, thing, manner, time or location, while the indefiniteness function is encoded in derivational prefixes attached to the interrogative bases. All indefiniteness markers have been borrowed from European languages, either from Slavic or from another language (Romanian or Hungarian). Moreover, certain indefinites are represented by direct loanwords.

6.3.1 Specific indefinites

The specific indefinite pronouns are formed through prefixation of interrogative bases by *vare-*. The prefix *vare-*, a loan from the Romanian free-choice marker *oare-*, is also known from some non-Central Romani dialects (cf. Matras 2002: 115; Boretzky and Iгла 2004: 107; Elšík and Matras 2006: 284). See Table 48.

Table 48: Specific indefinite pronouns

CATEGORY	FORM	MEANING
PERSON	<i>vareko</i>	somebody
THING	<i>vareso</i>	something
IDENTITY/SELECTION/ QUALITY	<i>varesavo</i> (Uzhhorod, Perechyn) <i>varesov</i> (Khudlovo, Serednie)	some
IDENTITY/SELECTION	<i>d(z)ekotro</i> (rare)	some (people), certain
MANNER	<i>varesar</i>	somehow
PLACE: STATIVE	<i>varekāj</i>	somewhere
PLACE: DIRECTIVE	(Khudlovo also <i>varekā</i>)	(to) somewhere
PLACE: SEPARATIVE	<i>varekhatar</i>	from somewhere
PLACE: PERLATIVE		(via)
TIME	<i>varekana</i> <i>davarekana</i>	sometimes

6.3.1.1 Substantival and adjectival specific indefinites

Person and thing indefinites conform to the substantival inflection of respective interrogative bases: ‘somebody’ NOM *vare-k-o*, OBL *vare-k-as-*, ‘something’ NOM *vare-s-o*, OBL *vares-o-s-* (see 6.2.1.1).

- (68) *vareko kapka dikhel,*
 someone.NOM a_bit see.PRS.3SG
a vareko vobec na dikhel (Uzhhr)
 and/but someone.NOM not_at_all NEG see.PRS.3SG
 ‘Someone sees a little, while someone doesn’t see at all.’
- (69) *hin varekas motoris, a varekas nāne* (Uzhhr)
 COP.PRS.3 someone.ACC car and/but someone.ACC NEG.COP.PRS.3
 ‘Someone has a car, while someone does not.’
- (70) *phuč menk vareso* (Per)
 ask[IMP.2SG] still something
 ‘Ask something more.’
- (71) *prikale varesoste ov pes pre mande zaruš’la* (Per)^{LQCR}
 for_the_sake_of something.LOC he REFL on I.LOC get_angry.AOR.3SG
 ‘Because of something, he got angry with me.’

Like other indefinite pronouns, the adnominal specific indefinite pronoun is derived from its interrogative counterpart *sav-o* by the prefix *vare-*. While in Uzhhorod and Perechyn the form is the regular *vare-sav-o* with the oikoclitic declension, in Khudlovo and Serednie this indefinite occurs in a contracted form *vare-s-ov* [varesou̯ or vareso:] with the final diphthong or long vowel throughout the paradigm; see Table 49. The contracted form in Khudlovo and Serednie also occurs in substantivised forms, e.g. ACC.PL *vare-s-ejn* direct object ‘some [people]’, INST.SG.F *vare-s-a-ha* ‘with some [woman]’, etc.

Table 49: Inflection of *varesav/varesov* ‘some’

	Uzhhorod, Perechyn		Khudlovo, Serednie	
	NOM	OBL	NOM	OBL
SG.M	<i>varesav-o</i>	<i>varesav-e</i>	<i>vares-ov</i>	<i>vares-ej</i>
SG.F	<i>varesav-i</i>	<i>varesav-a</i>	<i>vares-ij</i>	<i>vares-ā</i>
PL	<i>varesav-e</i>	<i>varesav-e</i>	<i>vares-ej</i>	<i>vares-ej</i>

The indefinite *varesavo/varesov* is used with no differentiation between different ontological categories. In other words, it is used for identity/selection ‘some selected (one)’ as well as for quality ‘of some kind’. The identity interrogative *soza* (6.2.1.3) does not form a base of any specific indefinite (**varesoza*).

- (72) *avlas varesavo barvalo* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 come.AOR.3SG some.NOM.SG.M rich.NOM.SG.M
- (73) *varesavi romni tašl'ilas* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 some.NOM.SG.F woman NOM.SG.F be_drowned.AOR.3SG
 ‘Some woman drowned.’
- (74) *ov muv'la varesave nasval'ibnastar* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 he die.AOR.3SG some.OBL.SG.M illness.ABL
 ‘He died of some illness.’
- (75) *vakerās varesava romñaha* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 speak.IPF/POT.1SG some.OBL.SG.F woman.INST
 ‘I was talking with some woman.’
- (76) *me dikh'om andre skl'epa varesave romñen* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 I see.AOR.1SG in shop some.OBL.PL woman.ACC.PL
 ‘I saw in the shop some women.’
- as against
- (77) *av'la varesov barvalo* (Khu.Ser)^{LQCR}
 come.AOR.3SG some.NOM.SG.M rich.NOM.SG.M
 ‘Some rich (man) has come.’
- (78) *varesij romni tašl'il'a* (Khu.Ser)^{LQCR}
 some.NOM.SG.F woman.NOM.SG.F be_drowned.AOR.3SG
 ‘Some woman drowned.’
- (79) *ov muv'la varesej džung nasval'ipnastar* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 he die.AOR.3SG some.OBL.SG.M bad illness.ABL
 ‘He died of some bad illness.’
- (80) *me džās varesā romñaha* (Khu)^{etr}
 I go.IPF/POT.1SG some.OBL.SG.F woman.INST
 ‘I was going with some woman.’
- (81) *me dikh'om are skl'epa varesej romñen* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 I see.AOR.1SG in shop some.OBL.PL woman.ACC.PL
 ‘I saw in the shop some women.’

In addition, some speakers make use of a completely borrowed identity-selection animate indefinite *dekotro* (cf. Ukrainian *dekompuii*) or *dzekotro* (the latter in Uzhhorod). It is a xenoclitic adjective that refers to selected groups of people in the meaning of ‘certain’. It is mostly attested as a substantivised head with a function similar to that of the specific person indefinite ‘somebody’ in the singular.

- (82) *dzekotro phagerel o lava,* (Uzhhs)
 certain.NOM.SG.M break.PRS.3SG ART word.PL
dzekotro pal peskero vakerel
 certain.NOM.SG.M after REFL.GEN speak.PRS.3SG
 ‘Somebody breaks the words (= speaks poorly), somebody speaks in his own way.’
- (83) *dzekotre avle seredñatar te dživen ade* (Uzhhs)
 certain.NOM.PL come.AOR.3PL Serednie.ABL NCOMP live.INFhere
 ‘Certain people came from Serednie to live here.’
- (84) *dekotra vakeren the adaj* (Khu)
 certain.NOM.PL speak.PRS.3PL also here
 ‘Certain people speak [such a language] even here.’

6.3.1.2 Adverbial specific indefinites

Adverbial specific indefinites are also mostly derived by *vare-*, e.g. *vare-sar* ‘in some way’, *vare-kāj* (Khudlovo also *varekā*) ‘somewhere’, *vare-kana* ‘sometimes’. The latter temporal indefinite optionally contains an additional initial segment /da/, resulting in the form *davarekana*. This ‘strengthened’ form of the prefix *davare-* is probably due to contamination of *vare-* by the Slovak and Ukrainian indefinite prefix *da-* (cf. Kopečný et al. 1980: 151, e.g. Slovak *da-kedy*, dialectal Ukrainian (Rusyn) *da-колу* [INDEFINITE-when] ‘sometimes’). Apart from the temporal indefinite, there are no other ontological categories of indefinites with *davare-*.¹⁰⁹

- (85) *tu varekana dživehas kijeuste?* (UzhhsR.Ser)^{LQCR}
 you sometimes live.IPF/POT.2SG Kyiv.LOC
 ‘Have you ever lived in Kyiv?’

¹⁰⁹ In the Western Uzh Romani variety of Pavlovce nad Uhom, *davare-* is an optional specific marker for indefinite pronouns of other ontological categories as well, e.g. *davareko* ‘somebody’ (alongside *vareko*), *davarekhatar* ‘from somewhere’, etc.

- (86) *tu davarekana dživehas kijevste? (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}*
 you sometimes live.IPF/POT.2SG Kyiv.LOC
 ‘Have you ever lived in Kyiv?’
- (87) *amen starinas amen varesar te zaroden*
 we strive.PRS.1PL we.ACC somehow NCOMP earn.INF
amenge pro dživipe (Per)
 we.DAT on life
 ‘We strive to earn somehow for our life.’
- (88) *pre buvři džala varekāj (Ser)*
 on work go.FUT.3SG somewhere
 ‘He will go to work somewhere.’

For the quantity indefinite ‘several’, see 8.2.1.

6.3.2 Negative indefinites

Table 50 shows the forms of the negative pronouns in Eastern Uzh Romani.

Table 50: Negative indefinite pronouns

CATEGORY	FORM	MEANING
PERSON	<i>ňiko</i>	nobody
THING	<i>ňič</i>	nothing
IDENTITY/SELECTION/ QUALITY	<i>ňisavo</i> (Uzhhorod, Perechyn) <i>ňisov</i> (Khudlovo, Serednie) <i>ňisoza</i> (Serednie)	no, none
MANNER	<i>ňisar</i>	in no way
PLACE: STATIVE	<i>ňikhaj</i>	nowhere
PLACE: DIRECTIVE	(in Khudlovo also <i>ňikhā</i>)	(to) nowhere
PLACE: SEPARATIVE	<i>ňikhatar</i>	from nowhere
PLACE: PERLATIVE		(via) no way
TIME	<i>ňigda</i>	never

Most negative pronouns in Eastern Uzh Romani are derived from interrogative bases through prefixation of *ňi-*, which originates in the Slavic negative marker *ni-* (cf. Kopečný et al. 1980: 487). Only the nominative form of the thing pronoun *ňič* ‘nothing’ and the temporal pronoun *ňigda* ‘never’ are direct loans of Slavic negative pronouns, i.e. underived from the Romani interrogatives. The palatal quality of the nasal in the negative marker, as well as in

both loanwords, rules out their origin in the local Ukrainian (Rusyn) dialects of Transcarpathia, in which the negative prefix contains a non-palatal (alveolar) nasal, viz. *nu-* [nɪ-], as in *нико* [niko] ‘nobody’, *нич* [nitʃ] ‘nothing’, *никакый* [nijakij] ‘no (one)’ (cf. Pugh 2009: 88). Since the Eastern Uzh Romani negative pronouns (apart from *ňisoza*) are shared with North Central dialects of East Slovakia, the prefix *ňi-* must have made its way into Romani before the contact with local Ukrainian, and the same holds true for both *ňič* and *ňigda*, which are almost certainly of dialectal Slovak origin; cf. Slovak *nič* [nitʃ] ‘nothing’, archaic and dialectal Slovak *nikda* [nigda] (Standard Slovak *nikdy* ‘never’).

Importantly, the negative pronoun requires clausal negation, leading to a phenomenon of double negation, as it occurs in Slavic languages (12.4; see also the examples in the following sections).

- (89) *on na pa’an amenge ňič* (UzhhS)
 they NEG believe.PRS.3PL we.DAT nothing
 ‘They don’t believe us anything.’ (Or: ‘They believe us nothing.’)
- (90) *kanāk’ amen nāne ňič* (Khu)
 now we.ACC NEG.COP.PRS.3 nothing
 ‘Now we have nothing.’ (or: ‘Now we don’t have anything.’)

6.3.2.1 Substantival and adjectival negative pronouns

The person negative pronoun *ňiko* ‘nobody’ is derived from the corresponding interrogative *ko* ‘who’, and its inflection follows that of the interrogative counterpart, i.e. NOM *ňi-k-o*, OBL *ňi-k-as-* (e.g. ACC *ňi-k-as*, GEN *ňi-k-as-ker-o*, ABL *ňi-k-as-tar*, INST *ňi-k-a-ha*, etc.). In contrast, the thing negative pronoun *ňič* represents a direct loan in the nominative (see above and examples (89) and (90)), while it is declined as an underlying derived pronoun with the oblique stem *ňi-s-os-* in the non-nominative cases (e.g. DAT *ňi-s-os-ke*, ABL *ňi-s-os-tar*, INST *ňi-s-o-ha*, etc.).

- (91) *ov mange ňisoha na dopomožinel* (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 he I.DAT nothing.INST NEG help.PRS.3SG
 ‘He doesn’t assist me with anything.’
- (92) *ňiko aňi na pisinel l’il* (Per)
 nobody.NOM not_even NEG write.PRS.3SG letter
 ‘Nobody even writes a letter [to me].’

- (93) *me na užarav ņikastar* (Per)
 I NEG wait.PRS.1SG nobody.ABL
 ‘I don’t expect [it] from anybody.’

In prepositional phrases, the negative marker of person and thing pronouns is usually separated from the interrogative base by an adposition, e.g. *ņi pre kaste* [NEG on who.LOC] ‘on nobody’, *ņi vasoske* (< *ņi važ soske*) [NEG for_what.LOC] ‘for/because of nothing’. This separation reflects the pattern in East Slavic languages, cf. Ukrainian *hi-що* [NEG-what] ‘nothing’, but *hi do čogo* [NEG to what.GEN] ‘to nothing’. Non-separated negative pronouns, such as *pre ņisoste* and *pre ņikaste*, which are closer to the West Slavic pattern, are also infrequently attested, in particular in Uzhhorod.

- (94) *oj na dikhelas ņi pre kaste* (UzhR)^{LQCR}
 she NEG look_at.IPF/POT.3SG NEG on who.LOC
 ‘She wasn’t looking at anybody.’
- (95) *kodā phral bešel andre tūrma ņi vasoske* (Khu)
 that.SPEC brother sit.PRS.3SG in prison NEG for_what.DAT
 ‘That brother over there sits in jail for nothing.’ (pointing to a man in a photo)

Like the specific indefinite adjective *varesavo/varesov* ‘some’ (6.3.1.1), the negative adjective ‘no, none’ is derived from the interrogative *savo*, i.e. *ņisavo*, which occurs in an elided form *ņisov* in Khudlovo and Serednie. The declension of both *ņi-sav-o* (in Uzhhorod and Perechyn) and *ņi-s-ov* (in Khudlovo and Serednie) is identical to that of *vare-sav-o* and *vare-s-ov* respectively, i.e. F *ņi-sav-i*, *ņi-s-ij*, PL *ņi-sav-e*, *ņi-s-ej*.

- (96) *man nāne ņisavo fajtos odej* (Per)
 I.ACC NEG.COP.PRS no.NOM.SG.M family.NOM.SG.M there
 ‘I have no family there.’
- (97) *me ņisej lovve na dās* (Ser)
 I no.NOM.PL money.NOM.PL NEG give.IPF/POT.1SG
 ‘I wasn’t giving any money.’

Moreover, the Khudlovo and Serednie quality interrogative *soza* ‘some’ (6.2.1.3) may serve as a basis of another negative pronoun *ņisoza*. As the following two examples coming

from a single speaker and uttered shortly after one another show, *ňisoza* is used optionally to *ňisov*:

- (98) *ta kećivar leske te laćharkerav,*
 so how_many_times he.DAT NCOMP make_bed.PRS.1SG
ňisij hasna! (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 no.NOM.SG.F benefit.NOM.SG.F
 ‘So how many times should I make the bed for him? There is no point [in it]!’

- (99) *ta keci šaj te laćhakeren,*
 so how_long can NCOMP make_bed.INF
tak ňisoza hasna! (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 so no benefit.NOM.SG.F
 ‘So how long could [I] make the bed? After all, there is no point [in it]!’

The negative pronoun *ňisoza* is also attested in marking the negative identity/selection (‘no one’):

- (100) *are kadā gav nāne ňisoza ra’utno bar* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 in this.SPEC village NEG.COP.PRS.3 no night.ADJ bar
 ‘In this village here, there is no night bar.’

In Khudlovo, only *ňisov* is attested as the negative counterpart to the interrogative pronoun of quality *soza*, but this may be due to paucity of data only.

- (101) *no ta buv’i sas ćirla,*
 PART so work.NOM.SG.F COP.PST.3 long_ago
a kanāke soza buv’i ? ňisij! (Khu)
 and/but now which work.NOM.SG.F none.NOM.SG.F
 ‘Well, in the past, there was (a possibility to) work, but nowadays what kind of work [is there]? Of no kind!’

6.3.2.2 Adverbial negative pronouns

Apart from the directly borrowed temporal pronoun *ňigda* ‘never’ (see above), all other adverbial negative pronouns are regularly derived from the interrogative bases. In the spatial negative *ňikhaj* ‘nowhere’, there is irregular aspiration, which is missing in the source

interrogative form *kāj*, and the vowel of the base is shortened. In Khudlovo, there is also a form *ñikhā* with the unshortened vowel.

- (102) *te na mukes ko roma ñikhaj*
 NCOMP NEG leave.PRS.2SG at/to Rom.PL nowhere
ñisavo holmos (UzhhS)
 no.NOM.SG.M dress.NOM.SG.M
 ‘May you not leave any dress anywhere at Roma’s places.’
- (103) *od’a tože ñisar na vakeren romanes* (Per)
 there also in_no_way NEG speak.PRS.3PL Romani.ADV
 ‘There, too, they don’t speak in Romani in any way.’
- (104) *ñigda na dumin* (Ser)
 never NEG think[IMP.2SG]
 ‘Never think.’

In Uzhhorod, the temporal negative *ñigda* may be emphasised by another word *šoha*, from the Hungarian temporal negative *soha*, in a fixed phrase *ñigda šoha* ‘never ever’. The form *šoha* is never used independently without *ñigda*.

- (105) *me ñigda šoha na kheld’omas važ o lovve* (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 I never never NEG dance.IRR.1SG for ART money.PL
 ‘Never ever would I dance for money.’

6.3.3 Free-choice indefinites

Free-choice pronouns, words such as ‘whoever’ or ‘whatever’, may be derived by one of two prefixes, one of which is of North Slavic origin and occurs in various forms, and the other one is borrowed from Hungarian. In addition, a special loan adjective serves to express the free-choice identity/selection (‘any (one), whichever’), and a special syntactic construction exists for the free-choice quality (‘of any kind’). Free choice is also commonly expressed by Slavic switches in Eastern Uzh Romani. All these devices will be discussed in the following sections.

6.3.3.1 Free-choice pronouns in *xot’-* and its variants

In all Eastern Uzh varieties, the free-choice pronouns are commonly derived from interrogative bases by a prefix that occurs in a variety of phonological variants such as *xot’-*, *xoč-*, *hot’-* and *hoč-*. This prefix in all its variants is etymologically related to the Slavic

volitive verb (cf. Russian *хотеть*, Old Church Slavonic *хотѣти* ‘to want’) and, as a free-choice marker, also occurs in Slovak and Polish, and in Ukrainian dialects.¹¹⁰ The most common variant seems to be *xot’-*, which matches the free-choice marker in local Ukrainian (Rusyn), and, as put by Pugh (2009: 89), is ‘phonologically clearly East Slavic in character’ (cf. also Russian *хоть* ‘although’). The other form *xoč-* is closer to the form of the prefix in East Slovak dialects of the Zemplín – Uzh region, but *xoč* is also a focus particle ‘at least’ in Ukrainian and, as such, is sometimes used as a word expressing free-choice in some Ukrainian varieties (cf. *xоч уо* ‘whatever’). The forms with the initial *h-*, reminiscent of the Standard Slovak free-choice prefix *hoc(i)-*, are far less frequent than the forms in *x-*, but sporadically occur in particular in Uzhhorod.

- (106) *tu šaj xudes, me, ov, xoč-ko* (UzhhS)
 you can get.PRS.2SG I he FREE_CHOICE-who
 ‘You can get [it], I, he, whoever.’
- (107) *ta mije xot’-sar* (UzhhS)
 so OPT.COP FREE_CHOICE-how
 ‘So, let it be anyhow.’
- (108) *amen roma sam, bešaha hoč-kāj* (UzhhS)
 we Roma COP.PRS.1PL sit.FUT.1PL FREE_CHOICE-where
 ‘We are Roma, we will sit wherever.’

See also the following pair of elicited sentences:

- (109) *ov mā od’a hotovo te džan xot’-kana* (Per)^{LQCR}
 he already there ready NCOMP go.INF FREE_CHOICE-when
- (110) *ov mā od’a hotovo te džan xoč-kana* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 he already there ready NCOMP go.INF FREE_CHOICE-when
 ‘He is finally ready to go there at any time.’

¹¹⁰ As discussed by Kopečný et al. (1980: 207–210), cognates of this prefix occur in various functions in an eastern part of North Slavic (including Polish, Slovak and some Czech dialects, but excluding Standard Czech and Sorbian). Besides the free-choice marking, the most common functions are those of a concessive subordinator ‘although’ and a focus particle ‘at least’. In both these functions, the borrowed *xoč(a)/xot’(a)* is common in Uzh Romani as well (see 13.3.3 for the concessive subordinator).

- (114) *šaj kadā phenel akār-ko* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 can this.SPEC say.PRS.3SG FREE_CHOICE-who
 ‘Anybody can say this.’
- (115) *akār-kas le* (Uzhhs)
 FREE_CHOICE-who.ACC take.IMP.2SG
 ‘Marry whomever.’

6.3.3.3 Free-choice identity/selection adjective *l’ubo*

A de-interrogative identity/selection free-choice pronoun (‘any (one), whichever’) is attested only in Uzhhorod by the form *akār-sav-o*, which is derived by the free-choice prefix *akār-* mentioned in the previous section. Otherwise, the East Slavic loan adjective *l’ubo* is commonly used in all varieties as the identity/selection free-choice adjective (cf. Russian *любой* ‘any’). The adjective has the xenoclitic adjective inflection: a single nominative singular form *l’ubo* for both masculine and feminine and the extension *-on-* inserted in all non-nominative cases (116). It may be substantivised and act as a person or thing free-choice interrogative, as in (118).

- (116) *phuč l’ubone romendar* (Uzhhs)
 ask[IMP.2SG] any.OBL.PL Rom.ABL.PL
 ‘Ask any Roma.’
- (117) *me šaj l’ubo d’ives* (Per)
 I can any.NOM.SG.M day[NOM.SG.M]
 ‘I can [do it] on any day.’
- (118) *ov majjekfeder denašel l’ubonestar* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 he best run.PRS.3SG any.ABL.SG.M
 ‘He runs best out of anyone.’

6.3.3.4 Free-choice quality expressions

In Uzhhorod, the free-choice quality (‘of any kind’) is derived from *savo* ‘which’:

- (119) *sakone dadeske leskero čhavōro jekšukareder na?*
 every.OBL.SG.M father.DAT his child.DIM beautiful.SUPL NEG
hoi’-sav-o mije (Uzhhs)
 FREE_CHOICE-which.QUALITY-NOM.SG.M OPT.COP
 ‘For every father, his child is most beautiful, isn’t he? No matter what he is like.’

In Khudlovo and Serednie, where the quality interrogative is represented by the peculiar form *soza* (6.2.1.3), the free-choice quality is expressed by a special syntactic construction rather than by a derived free-choice pronoun. Such a construction consists of the negative optative clause with the subjunctive copula (see 12.2), the restrictive focus particle *čak* ‘only’ (9.6.1.3) and the quality interrogative:

- (120) *me kamav mijre čhas,*
 I love.PRS.1SG my.OBL.SG.M son.ACC.SG.M
soza čak te n’ ejl (Khu)
 which.QUALITY only NCOMP NEG COP.PRS.SBJV.3SG
 ‘I love my son, no matter what he is like.’ (Literally: ‘may he be not of any kind’)

6.3.3.5 Slavic free-choice periphrases

Not uncommonly, free choice is expressed by phrasal switches to the current contact Slavic languages. In the following two examples, the Russian phrases *в любое время* ‘at any time’ (temporal) and *по-любому* ‘in any way’ (manner) occur instead of a Romani pronoun.

- (121) *o vudar phuterdo* {v l’uboje vremja}^{Russian} (Per)
 ART door open {at any time}
 ‘The door is open at any time.’
- (122) *bo {po-l’ubomu}*^{Russian} *vaj avka vaj avka meres* (Ser)^{RDž}
 because {anyhow} or thus or thus die.PRS.2SG
 ‘Because anyhow, either so or so, you (will) die.’

6.4 Universal pronouns

Universal pronouns are words that express the collectivity, totality or integrity of referents, such as ‘all’, ‘whole’, ‘every’, etc. In contrast to indefinite pronouns, universal pronouns are not derived from interrogative bases in Eastern Uzh Romani, but are rather expressed by various inherited or borrowed items (cf., however, 6.4.3 for a unique example of a derived universal pronoun). Moreover, there are no dedicated person and thing universal pronouns ‘everybody’ and ‘everything’. Instead, the ontological categories of person and thing are expressed by the collective pronouns that mean ‘all’. A relatively significant degree of variability exists in expressions of the universal pronouns of place (‘everywhere’); see Table 52.

Table 52: Universal pronouns

CATEGORY	FORM	MEANING
COLLECTIVE PERSON/THING	<i>savoro</i> <i>sa</i>	all
INTEGRAL	<i>savoro</i> <i>cejlo</i> <i>calo</i> (Uzhhorod)	whole, entire
DISTRIBUTIVE (EMPHATIC)	<i>sako</i> <i>dogdojek</i>	every, each each and every
GENERIC	<i>šel'ijako</i>	various
MANNER	<i>šel'ijak</i>	variously
PLACE	<i>sakāj</i> (Radvanka) <i>khatar okārik</i> (Uzhhorod) <i>ušadzik/fsadzik/fs'agde</i> (common) <i>vijgik</i> (Khudlovo, Serednie)	everywhere
TIME	<i>mindik</i>	always

6.4.1 Universal pronouns *savoro* and *sa*

There are two non-borrowed universal pronouns that overlap to a considerable degree in their functions: *savoro*, which has an irregular stress on the first syllable [ˈsa.vo.ro] (see 2.3), and *sa*, which might historically be a reduced form of the former. These two forms are used as collective universal pronouns in the meaning ‘all’ and as the substantival person and thing pronouns ‘everybody’ and ‘everything’. However, they differ in their morphosyntactic properties: while *savoro* declines like other adjectives, *sa* is indeclinable.

As a collective determiner, *savoro* normally occurs as a single determiner within a noun phrase, while *sa* may introduce a complex noun phrase with more determiners.

- (123) *savore roma asanas* (UzhhS)
 all.NOM.PL Rom.NOM.PL laugh.IPF/POT.3PL
 ‘All Roma were laughing.’

- (124) *xutkerde avri savore māčhen* (Ser)^{RDZ}
 catch.AOR.3PL out all.OBL.PL fish.ACC.PL
 ‘They caught up all fishes.’

- (125) *sa mijre čhave bāre* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 all my.NOM.PL child.NOM.PL big.NOM.PL
 ‘All my children are adult.’
- (126) *zašulav sa kodala šmeci* (UzhhS)
 sweep_up[IMP.2SG] all that.SPEC.PL rubbish.NOM.PL
 ‘Sweep up all this rubbish.’

As substantival heads, both *savoro* and *sa* refer to universal entities of person (‘everybody’) and thing (‘everything’). In the meaning of a universal person ‘everybody’, they require plural agreement on the predicate and the longer form *savoro* takes on a plural form *savore*. The indeclinable form *sa* does not occur in roles that require a case other than the nominative. In such cases, only *savore* may occur.

- (127) *od’a mā savore soven* (Per)
 there already all.NOM.PL sleep.PRS.3PL
 ‘There everybody is already sleeping.’
- (128) *od’a sa soven* (Per)
 there all sleep.PRS.3PL
 ‘There everybody is sleeping.’
- (129) *o čhaja o pheña, sa vakeren*
 ART daughter.PL ART sister.PL all speak.PRS.3PL
avka slovāřika (UzhhR)
 thus Slovak.ADV
 ‘The daughters, the sisters, everybody speaks this way – in Slovak.’
- (130) *savoren šukār bāre khera* (UzhhR)
 all.ACC.PL beautiful big house.PL
 ‘Everybody has nice big houses.’

In the meaning of the universal thing ‘everything’, either the singular form of *savoro* or plain *sa*, both with the singular agreement on the predicate, occurs. As in the person reference, the indeclinable form *sa* cannot occur in roles that require a case other than the nominative. However, since in inanimate entities the nominative is used to mark the direct objects, *sa* in its function as the thing pronoun may occur in marking the direct object, which is a difference from *sa* as a person (i.e. animate) pronoun.

- (131) *te hin lovve, akor hin savoro* (Uzhhs)
 if COP.PRS.3 money then COP.PRS.3 all.NOM.SG.M
 ‘If there are money, then there is everything.’
- (132) *zapisin savoro* (Per)
 write_down[IMP.2SG] all.NOM.SG.M
 ‘Write down everything.’
- (133) *sa tuño sas* (Khu)
 all cheap COP.PST.3
 ‘Everything was cheap.’
- (134) *čit, bo sa pisinel* (Ser)
 hush because all write.PRS.3SG
 ‘Be quiet because he records everything.’

The form *savoro* may also be used as an integral determiner ‘whole, entire’, even though Slavic-origin adjectives are more commonly employed in this meaning (see 6.4.2 below).

- (135) *me džās savoro drom* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 I go.IPF/POT.1SG all way
 ‘I was going all the way.’
- (136) *xund’om avri duj ezera the štār šel,*
 get.AOR.1SG out two thousand and four hundred
avka diňom od’a savoro kamibe (Per)
 thus give.AOR.1SG there all debt
 ‘I got two thousand and four hundred, so that I paid off all the debt.’
- (137) *tu savoro veš opphan’al* (Ser)^{RDZ}
 you all forest tie_around.AOR.2SG
 ‘You have tied the whole forest around.’

The form *sa* also functions as a restrictive focus particle ‘nobody/nothing but’; see 9.6.1.3 for more details.

6.4.2 Borrowed universal adjectives

In addition to *savoro* and *sa*, there are several universal adjectives of Slavic origin or developed under the Slavic influence.

Loan adjectives exist for the integral meaning ‘whole, entire’. The most common one is *cejlo* (cf. Slavic *cel-* and its variants), supplemented by the East Slovak loanword *calo* in the Uzhhorod varieties (dialectal Slovak *caly*, cf. also Polish *cały*). In all varieties, inflection of these loan adjectives oscillates between xenoclitic and oikoclitic ones. Thus, for example, both *cejlo rāti* and *cejli rāti* ‘the whole night’, headed by the feminine noun *rāti* ‘night’, occur.

- (138) *calo tāboris sa rukonenca* (UzhhR)
 whole settlement nobody_but dog.INST.PL
 ‘The whole Romani settlement is full of dogs.’
- (139) *ov cejlo rāti khuvelas košāra* (Per)
 he whole night weave.IPF/POT.3SG basket.PL
 ‘He was weaving baskets all the night.’
- (140) *me šaj xāl'om cejl'a simjaha* (Khu)
 I can eat.AOR.1SG whole.OBL.SG.F family.INST.SG.F
 ‘I could eat with the whole family.’
- (141) *ov hino honno tuha te bešen cejlo d'ives* (Ser)
 he COP.PRS.3SG.M able you.INST NCOMP sit.inf whole.NOM.SG day.NOM.SG
 ‘He can sit with you all the day.’

The distributive universal pronoun ‘each, every’ is *sako*, which is a loanword from the South Slavic (Serbo-Croatian) *svak-* (cf. Serbo-Croatian *svaki* ‘every’). The form *sako* does not inflect in the nominative: cf. SG.F *sako rāti* ‘every night’, PL *sako duj rāta* ‘every two nights’. When determining substantival forms in the oblique cases, it is attested as both an indeclinable form, as in Shakhta *sako jekhestar* (ABL) ‘from each one’, and a xenoclitic adjective with the stem *sak-on-*, as in Radvanka *sak-on-e nijpos* [every-EXT-OBL.SG.M people.ACC] ‘every people’.

- (142) *te poŭinkeren kampe sako čhon* (UzhhR)
 NCOMP pay.ITER.INF be_needed.PRS every month
 ‘One should pay every month.’
- (143) *sako rāti modl'inas amen* (Per)
 every evening pray.PRS.1PL we.ACC
 ‘Every evening, we pray.’

The form *sako* may also occur as a substantivised head in reference to a universal person ‘everyone’. In such a case, it is always marked by the extension suffix *-on-* in non-nominative cases, e.g. *sak-on-es* [every-EXT-ACC.SG.M] ‘everyone’ (as a direct object or a possessor), *sak-on-es-ker-o* [every-EXT-OBL.SG.M-GEN-SG.M] ‘of everyone’, *sak-on-es-ke* [every-EXT-OBL.SG.M-DAT] ‘to everyone’, *sak-on-a-tar* [every-EXT-OBL.SG.F-ABL] ‘from everyone.F’, etc. Like other substantival pronouns, *sako* has locative marking in prepositional phrases (145).

- (144) *sako kamel kapka feder te dživen* (UzhhR)
 every want.PRS.3SG a_little better NCOMP live.INF
 ‘Everyone wants to live a bit better.’
- (145) *ke sakoneste āver čhib* (Khu)
 at/to every.LOC other language
 ‘Everyone has a different language.’

In addition to *sako*, there is an emphatic distributive adjective *dogdojek* ‘each and every’. It has no clear etymology, but its final part obviously comes from the numeral *jek(h)* ‘one’, while *do* may be from the Slavic locative preposition *do* ‘into’, which is reminiscent of certain Slavic fixed phrases, such as Slovak *všetci do jedného* [all into one] ‘every single one, each and every one’. Indeed, there is a distributive adjective *dojekh* ‘every’ in some North Central varieties of Slovakia; cf. also Hübschmannová, Šebková and Žigová (1991: 93) who document this word in the emphatic meaning (*úplně každý, všichni do jednoho*). What still remains unexplained is the initial segment /dog/ in the Eastern Uzh Romani form.

- (146) *dogdojek šmecos kide opre* (UzhhS)
 every.EMP piece_of_rubbish collect.IMP.2SG up
 ‘Pick up each and every piece of rubbish.’
- (147) *man andro tāboris savore kamenas, dogdojek* (Per)
 I.ACC in settlement all.PL love.IPF/POT.3PL every.EMP
 ‘Everybody loved me in the Romani settlement, every single one.’

Finally, there is an adjective *šel'ijako* (or *šil'ijako*) ‘various’ (cf. Czech/Slovak *všelijaký* ‘various, diverse’), which is semantically close to concepts of both universality and differentiation (see the next section about the differential pronouns). The adjective consistently maintains the xenoclitic plural ending *-a* in all varieties (PL *šel'ijaka* or *šil'ijaka*).

- (148) *adaj šel'ijaka roma* (Per)
 here various.PL Rom.PL
 'There are various Roma here.'

6.4.3 Adverbial universal pronouns

The universal pronoun of manner is *šel'ijak* or *šel'ijakones* 'in various ways, variously' (cf. *šel'ijako* 'various'). The form is borrowed from Slavic (cf. Czech *všelijak*, Slovak *všelijako*).

The universal pronoun of place 'everywhere' shows a striking diversity of expressions, among which both indigenous and loan forms can be found. The following examples show various translations of a single sentence 'Good people are everywhere.', which were elicited from various speakers. For the spontaneous sentences, see below.

- (149) *lāčhe manuša hin sakāj* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 good.PL human.PL COP.PRS.3 everywhere
 'Good people are everywhere.'
- (150) *hin sadzik lāčhe nijpos* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 COP.PRS.3 everywhere good.PL people
 'They are everywhere, good people.'
- (151) *lāčhe manuša hin khatar okārik* (UzhhrS)^{LQCR}
 good.PL human.PL COP.PRS.3 everywhere
 'Good people are everywhere.'
- (152) *lāčhe manuša hin ušadzik* (UzhhrS)^{LQCR}
 good.PL human.PL COP.PRS.3 everywhere
 'Good people are everywhere.'
- (153) *lāčhe l'udos hin fs'agde* (Per)^{LQCR}
 good.PL people COP.PRS.3 everywhere
 'Good people are everywhere.'
- (154) *lāčhe nijpos vijgik hin* (Khu.Ser)^{LQCR}
 good.PL people everywhere COP.PRS.3
 'Good people are everywhere.'

Only in Radvanka, is there a non-borrowed one-word pronoun that is derived from the corresponding interrogative, viz. *sakāj*. It consists of the place interrogative *kāj* 'where' prefixed by *sa-* and is probably modelled on a reanalysis of the universal determiner *sako* 'every' as *sa-ko*, in which *ko* is identified by the speakers as the interrogative *ko* 'who'.

- (155) *the ke tumende hin po slovensko avka,*
 also at/to you.PL.LOC COP.PRS.3 on Slovakia thus
sakāj (UzhhR)
 everywhere

‘It takes place in such a way even at your place in Slovakia, everywhere.’

The other non-borrowed expression for ‘everywhere’ is *khatar okārik*, common in both Uzhhorod varieties (see (156) and (157)). It is a lexicalised two-word expression that consists of the adessive separative preposition *khatar* ‘from’ (see 11.2.1.2) and the separative-perlative contrastive demonstrative *okārik* (see 7.2.2.6). It is also attested in Serednie, but only in a separative meaning ‘from everywhere’ (158), which is probably its original meaning, given the functional character of both components.

- (156) *le romen but graja verdana hin,* (UzhhR)
 ART Rom.ACC.PL many horse.NOM.PL carriage.NOM.PL COP.PRS.3
phiren khatar okārik
 go_often.PRS.3PL everywhere

‘Roma have many horses and carriages, they travel everywhere.’

- (157) *o roma dživen khatar okārik* (UzhhS)
 ART Rom.PL live.PRS.3PL everywhere

‘Roma live everywhere.’

- (158) *vijgik khatar okārik izavenas pen*
 everywhere from DEM.CNTR.ADV come_together.IPF/POT.3PL REFL.PL
o nijpos (Ser)^{LQCR}
 ART people

‘From everywhere, people were coming.’

Borrowed universal pronouns of place are more widespread. They comprise various related forms of Slavic origin, such as *ušadzik* attested in Shakhta, Perechyn and Khudlovo and *fsadzik* or *sadzik* attested in Radvanka and Perechyn, both known from Slovakia as dialectal forms of the Standard Slovak *všade* ‘everywhere’. In Perechyn, moreover, a dialectal Ukrainian form *fs'agde* occurs (cf. *всiгда* in Prešov Rusyn; Pugh 2009: 166). In Khudlovo and Serednie, the most common universal pronoun of place is *vijgik*, which has developed

through a semantic extension of the Hungarian terminative noun *vég-ig* [end-TERM] ‘up to the end’ (> ‘everywhere’).

- (159) *fsadzik vakeren ukrajincika* (Per)
 everywhere speak.PRS.3PL Ukrainian.ADV
 ‘Everywhere they speak Ukrainian.’
- (160) *adā ušadzik sas adaj, ušadzik* (Khu)
 this everywhere COP.PST.3 here everywhere
 ‘This was happening everywhere here, everywhere.’
- (161) *phirkerav vijgik, kāj mā čak na somas* (Ser)^{RDZ}
 go_often.ITER.PRS.1SG everywhere where already only NEG COP.PST.1SG
 ‘I travel everywhere, there is hardly any place where I haven’t been.’

In contrast to ‘everywhere’, the temporal universal pronoun ‘always’ is uniform throughout Eastern Uzh Romani. In all varieties, it is expressed by *mindik* borrowed from the Hungarian *mindig* ‘everywhere’.

- (162) *o phuvre manuša mindik nasval'on* (UzhhS.Ser)^{LQCR}
 ART old.PL human.PL always get_ill.PRS.3PL
 ‘Old people always get sick.’
- (163) *mindik dživās ade* (Per)
 always live.IPF/POT.1SG here
 ‘I have always been living here.’

6.5 Differential pronouns

Differential pronouns are words that express otherness or distinctiveness of referents. They resemble the universal pronouns in that they are not derived from interrogative bases and do not contain dedicated person and thing pronouns, which are expressed by the substantivised differential adjective *āver* ‘other’; see Table 53.

Table 53: Differential pronouns

CATEGORY	FORM	MEANING
PERSON/THING/QUALITY	<i>āver</i>	(an)other
MANNER	<i>āvret(h)e</i> <i>inakše/inakša/inakšones</i> <i>inšak/inšakones</i> <i>podruhomu</i>	in another manner
PLACE	<i>āvret(h)e</i> <i>āvret(h)er</i>	elsewhere from/via elsewhere
TIME	<i>āvret(h)e</i> <i>māsovar</i> <i>māškor (Uzhhorod)</i>	at another time

6.5.1 Differential adjective *āver*

The adnominal differential adjective ‘other’ is *āver*, which is of Indo-Aryan origin. It determines other non-specific and/or indefinite referents (‘another, other’), but, in general, it does not determine a definite referent (‘the other’) since the latter function is fulfilled by contrastive demonstratives (see 7.2.1.4). This also means that *āver* is normally not combined with the definite article.

The form *āver* is a declinable zero adjective, which has a single form in the nominative. In the oblique, the reduced base *āvr-* occurs before the adjectival suffixes; see Table 54.

Table 54: Inflection of *āver* ‘other’

	NOM	OBL
SG.M	<i>āver-∅</i>	<i>āvr-e</i>
SG.F	<i>āver-∅</i>	<i>āvr-a</i>
PL.M/F	<i>āver-∅</i>	<i>āvr-e</i>

(164) *one dživnas pre āver uca* (Per)
 they live.IPF/POT.3PL on other street
 ‘They lived in another street.’

(165) *bāriľe lak’ āver bala* (Ser)
 grow.AOR.3PL she.DAT other hair.PL
 ‘Her other hair grew out.’

- (166) *mijri ĉhaj barātkozinlas pes*
 my daughter be_friend.IPF/POT.3SG REFL
āvre ĉhajenca (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 other.OBL.PL girl.INST.PL
 ‘My daughter was making friends with other girls.’

The adjective *āver* is also used in the temporal meaning ‘next’ in prepositional phrases headed by the preposition *pre* ‘on’ (11.2.1.3), as in:

- (167) *takoj pr’ āver ĥilaj o ujcus muv’la* (Per)
 right on other summer ART uncle die.AOR.3SG
 ‘The uncle died right next summer.’

When it is substantivised, *āver* takes on a value of a thing or person pronoun ‘another one’. While it maintains its basic form *āver* in the nominative, it has the oikoclitic substantival inflection in non-nominative cases with the oblique stems SG.M *āvr-es-*, SG.F *āvr-a-* and PL *āvr-en-*. In Serednie, the oblique stem occurs with the extension *-on-* added between the reduced base *āvr-* and oblique stem suffixes, as in (170) and (171).

- (168) *de man vareso āver* (common)^{LQCR}
 give.IMP.2SG I.ACC something other[NOM.SG]
 ‘Give me something other.’
- (169) *ta soske dahas āvr-en-ge?* (UzhhR)
 so why give.IPF/POT.1PL other-OBL.PL-DAT
 ‘So why would we give [it] to other ones?’
- (170) *na asa āvr-on-es-tar* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 NEG laugh[IMP.2SG] other-EXT-OBL.SG.M-ABL
 ‘Don’t laugh at another one.’
- (171) *na dža ĥikhaj āvr-on-a-ha* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 NEG go[IMP.2SG] nowhere other-EXT-OBL.SG.F-INST
 ‘Don’t go anywhere with another one (girl).’

6.5.2 Adverbial differential pronouns

In Eastern Uzh Romani, there is a general adverbial differential pronoun *āvrethe* or *āvrete*, which is attested in the ontological values of manner (‘in another manner, differently’), place (‘elsewhere’), and occasionally even time (‘at another time’); see (172), (173) and (174)

- (178) *možed bit' čirla phennas inakša* (Ser)
 maybe long_ago say.IPF/POT.3PL in_another_way
 'Maybe in the past, they used to say [it] in another way.'
- (179) *na sam honno te phenen inšakones* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 NEG COP.PRS.1PL able NCOMP say.INF in_another_way
 'We are not able to say [it] in another way.'

An East Slavic loanword *podruhomu* (cf. Russian *no-òpyzomy*) is also present:

- (180) *mā cigāl'inel tuke, mange phend'a podruhomu* (Uzhhs)
 already lie.PRS.3SG you.DAT I.DAT tell.AOR.3SG in_another_way
 'He is already telling you a lie, he has told me in another way.'

The meaning of place 'elsewhere' is invariably expressed by *āvret(h)e*. This must be the original function of *āvret(h)e* since it is widespread across Central Romani in this function. Moreover, *āvret(h)e* is likely to have developed through univerbation of the noun phrase **avre thane* 'in/to a different place' (cf. Romani *than* 'place' and *-e* as the old locative suffix retained in some adverbialised forms, such as *khejr-e* '(at) home'; see 9.3.2). The optional loss of aspiration in the current *āvret(h)e* may be due to analogy with the Layer II locative ending *-te*. The form *āvret(h)e* is used in both stative (see (173) above) and directive (181) meanings.

- (181) *me prebešav varekāj āvrethe,*
 I change_seat.PRS.1SG somewhere elsewhere
bo igen ade pe'ol (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 because very here bake.ITR.PRS.3SG
 'I will sit somewhere else because I swelter here a lot.'

Furthermore, there is another form with the final rhotic *āvret(h)er*, which is primarily used in the separative and perlocative meanings 'from elsewhere' and 'via elsewhere' ('another way') respectively. The form *āvret(h)er* probably represents a partial analogy of the stative-directive *āvret(h)e* to nominal ablatives in *-tar*. Moreover, there is even a unique occurrence of *āvretar* in the data, in which the final syllable is identical to the ablative suffix.

- (182) *šaj te džan the āvrether* (Uzhhs)
 can NCOMP go.INF also another_way
 ‘It is possible to go another way as well.’
- (183) *ov na munkāčistar avla,*
 he NEG Mukachevo.ABL come.AOR.3SG
a avla āvretar (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 and/but come.AOR.3SG from_elsewhere
 ‘He didn’t come from Mukachevo, but he came from elsewhere.’

In the temporal meaning ‘at another time’ *āvret(h)e* is attested only in Perechyn and Khudlovo (see (174) above for the Khudlovo example).

- (184) *av āvrete* (Per)^{LQCR}
 come[IMP.2SG] another_time
 ‘Come at another time.’

Other expressions of the temporal meaning ‘at another time’ include *māsovar* of unknown etymology (but note that *-var* is the multiplicative suffix, see 8.1.2), which is also used as a temporal adverb ‘next time’ (7.3.2), and the Hungarian loanword *māškor* (from Hungarian *máskor* ‘at another time’) in Uzhhorod. The latter form is often preceded by another Hungarian-origin temporal expression *maj* ‘at a time in the future, later’, replicating the common Hungarian phrase *majd máskor*:

- (185) *me avā maj māškor* (UzhhsR)^{LQCR}
 I come.FUT.1SG later at_another_time
 ‘I will come later at another time.’
- (186) *aveha māsovar* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 come.FUT.2SG at_another_time
 ‘You will come at another time.’

7 ARTICLES, DEMONSTRATIVES AND DEICTICS

This chapter deals with a group of function words which have in common that they are used in various deictic, endophoric and/or situative references, namely with articles, demonstratives, and temporal and comparative deictic expressions.

7.1 Definite and indefinite articles

Presence of the definite article whose development from older demonstratives is ascribed to structural convergence with Greek is characteristic of most Romani dialects, although in some dialects the article is in decline (cf. Boretzky 2000; Matras 2002: 96–98). In Eastern Uzh Romani, the definite article is a vital category, sharing its properties and forms with North Central dialects of East Slovakia. Still, various anaphoric and cataphoric functions of the article described in other dialects (cf. Boretzky 2000: 44–54) have already been taken over by the plain non-proximal demonstrative *odā* (see 7.2.1.3) in the dialect under description. For the indefinite article, see 7.1.2 below.

7.1.1 Inflection of the definite article

The definite article inflects for gender, number and case. It has the adjectival pattern of inflection with distinct nominative and oblique forms. The nominative forms are used when the article determines a nominative head. The oblique forms occur when the article determines a head in any non-nominative case save the vocative since vocative nouns take no article. The gender is neutralised in the plural of both cases. See Table 55 for inflection of the definite article in Eastern Uzh Romani.

Table 55: Inflection of the definite article

	SG.M	SG.F	PL
NOM	<i>o</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>o</i>
OBL	<i>le</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>le</i>

Note that the nominative and oblique forms differ in their phonological features in that the nominative article always consists of a single vowel, while the more complex oblique forms have forms beginning in the consonant /l/. The masculine singular and plural forms of the article are identical in each of the two cases.

A single general form of the oblique article *le* often occurs in Perechyn, and the article may be uninflected for gender and number in the oblique case there. This is a recent development in Perechyn since elderly speakers still use the conservative distinct feminine

oblique form *la*. For variation of the oblique singular feminine article in Perechyn, see the following pair of sentences:

Perechyn speaker *1946:

- (1) *mange kampil te phučen la romňatar* (Per)^{LQCR}
 I.DAT be_needed.PRS NCOMP ask.INF ART.OBL.SG.F wife.ABL
 ‘I should ask my (literally: the) wife.’

as against Perechyn speaker *1975:

- (2) *od’a il’om le romňa* (Per)
 there take.AOR.1SG ART.OBL wife.ACC
 ‘I married there.’ (Literally: ‘I took the wife there.’)

7.1.2 Indefinite article

The numeral *jek(h)* ‘one’ functions as an indefinite article. It determines singular noun phrases that introduce new, previously unmentioned or unknown topics.

- (3) *sas peske the nesas*
 COP.PST.3 REFL.DAT and NEG.COP.PST.3
jek rom the jek romňi (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 one Rom and one Romani_woman
 ‘Once upon a time, there was a man and a woman.’

- (4) *mā vaj trijn berš džan le grajenca,*
 already about three year go.PRS.3PL ART horse.INST.PL
adaj poperen on andre jek gavōro,
 here get_to.PRS.3PL they in one village.DIM
phučen jekha babatar (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 ask.PRS.3PL one.OBL.SG.F grandmother.ABL
 ‘They have already been travelling with their horses for about three years, and now they get into a little village [and] ask an old woman.’

7.2 Demonstratives

In this subchapter, demonstratives are discussed. I follow the conceptual framework of Diessel (1999a, 1999b), who distinguishes adnominal demonstratives (demonstrative determiners) from pronominal demonstratives and includes location deictics (words such as ‘here’ and ‘there’) as a subcategory called ‘adverbial demonstratives’.

Demonstratives exhibit a huge cross-dialectal diversity of forms and structural properties within Romani (see Matras 2000). In Eastern Uzh Romani, there is a four-way demonstrative system with two basic contrasts, viz. proximity (proximal versus non-proximal) and specificity (plain versus specific). Specific demonstratives refer to discrete entities that are explicitly singled out from a group of related referents for the sake of disambiguation. Thus, there are plain proximal demonstratives ('this', 'here'), specific proximal demonstratives ('this one here', 'right here'), plain non-proximal demonstratives ('that', 'there' used mainly as endophoric devices) and specific non-proximal demonstratives (used mainly in reference to distant entities: 'that one there', 'right there'). Some other sets of demonstratives used in rather specialised meanings, such as contrastive demonstratives and spatial indicators, are present in addition to the basic demonstratives and will be discussed in 7.2.1.4 and 7.2.2.5 respectively.

7.2.1 Adnominal and pronominal demonstratives

Adnominal demonstratives function as determiners, as in *adā kher* 'this house' and *adale kherestar* 'from this house', while pronominal demonstratives substitute for a noun phrase, as in *adā* 'this one' and *adalestar* 'from this one'. In Romani, the adnominal and pronominal demonstratives have the same forms and only differ in their non-nominative inflection.

Proximal and non-proximal demonstratives differ in the root vowel, which is *-a-* in the proximal series (*adā*) and *-o-* in the non-proximal series (*odā*),¹¹¹ while specificity is marked by the initial velar consonant added to the plain forms: plain *adā* 'this' versus specific *kadā* 'this one here'.

7.2.1.1 Inflection of demonstratives

Demonstratives inflect for gender, number and case. Adnominal demonstratives distinguish the nominative and oblique cases like other adjectival forms. Pronominal demonstratives take the substantival inflectional suffixes in non-nominative forms (see below), while their nominative forms, shown in Table 56, are identical to those of the demonstrative determiners.

¹¹¹ Matras (2000), who calls this vocalic segment in Romani demonstratives 'carrier vowel', suggests that this vowel may indicate a semantic-pragmatic distinction between intra- and extralinguistic domains of reference in Romani dialects. According to Matras' analysis, the *a*-demonstratives have extralinguistic or situational-physical reference, while the *o*-demonstratives point to intralinguistic or discourse-contextual referents. As follows from the discussion in this chapter, such a functional explanation for distribution of both vowels in demonstratives does not hold for Eastern Uzh Romani.

Table 56: Proximal and non-proximal demonstratives

	PROXIMAL		NON-PROXIMAL	
	PLAIN	SPECIFIC	PLAIN	SPECIFIC
SG.M	<i>adā</i>	<i>kadā</i>	<i>odā</i>	<i>kodā</i>
SG.F	<i>adi</i>	<i>kadi</i>	<i>odi</i>	<i>kodi</i>
PL.M/F	<i>a(da)la</i>	<i>ka(da)la</i>	<i>o(da)la</i>	<i>ko(da)la</i>

Inflection of the demonstratives exhibits certain peculiarities. In the nominative singular, the two inflectional suffixes are *-ā* for masculines and *-i* for feminines. While the singular masculine *-ā* is peculiar to demonstratives, the feminine suffix *-i* is similar to *-i* of feminine adjectives but, in contrast to the adjective inflection, the preceding stem consonant *-d-* is not palatalised in demonstratives (cf. *adi* ‘this’ versus *garud’-i* ‘hidden’). An important trait of all nominative singular demonstratives is that they are oxytonic, and their final inflectional suffix is stressed, i.e. *adā́* [a.'da:], *adí* [a.'di] *kodā́* [ko.'da:], *kodí* [ko.'di], etc. (see also 2.3).

The nominative plural demonstratives are marked either by *-la* (*a-la*) or by *-ala* (*a-d-ala*). This results in two forms for each category: a short form, as in *ala*, *ola*, *kola*, etc., and a long form, as in *adala*, *odala*, *kodala*, etc. Both short and long forms have been documented in all varieties, but with certain preference to one or the other form in particular varieties. Namely, the long forms are more common in Uzhhorod and Perechyn than in Khudlovo and Serechnie, where the shorter forms are given priority. It cannot be ruled out that there may be functional differences between the short and long forms, but these have not been understood yet.¹¹²

The oblique forms of demonstratives are similar to the nominative plural forms in that they occur with a lateral extension as *a(da)-l-*, *o(da)-l-*, *ka(da)-l-*, *ko(da)-l-* followed by an inflectional suffix, which is identical to the regular adjectival (5) or substantival (6) suffixes. Like the nominative plural forms, the oblique forms occur in two optional forms that differ in presence or absence of /ad/, e.g. *ol-* ~ *odal-*.

¹¹² Historically, the first vowel /a/ in the long plural suffix *-ala* was formerly part of the complex vocalic root with two identical vowels, as in Western North Central *a-d-a-la* versus *o-d-o-la*. Matras (2000: 97) points out that the two vowels /a/ and /o/ cannot be combined in a single form since they stand in a semantic opposition to one another. However, in Eastern Uzh Romani, the second vowel in the long plural and non-nominative forms always occurs as /a/, including in the *o*-demonstratives such as *odala*, *kodala* and *okala*, probably due to analogy with the proximal demonstratives *adala* and *kadala*. It means that the vowel /a/ in the long plural and oblique forms is no longer part of the vocalic root but belongs to the inflectional suffixes in Eastern Uzh Romani.

- (5) *ada-l-e grajes imā ñigda tuke na kampe* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 this-OBL-SG.M horse.ACC already never you.DAT NEG be_needed.PRS
 ‘You will never need this horse any longer.’
- (6) *ada-l-e-ha mā ñiko pes na foglalkozinel* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 this-OBL-OBL.SG.M-INST already nobody REFL NEG deal_with.PRS.3SG
 ‘Nobody occupies himself with this any longer.’

7.2.1.2 Proximal demonstratives

The proximal demonstratives refer to entities that are close to the speaker. The plain proximal *adā* refers to proximate and contextually unambiguous entities that are easily identifiable; see also (5) and (6).

- (7) *na pre adi sejra dživnas,*
 NEG on this side live.IPF/POT.3PL
a od’a kāj cehli keren (Per)
 and/but there where brick.PL make.PRS.3PL
 ‘They did not live on this side but there where bricks are produced.’
- (8) *no adā beng pes vopšem na daral mandar*(Ser)^{RDZ}
 PART this devil REFL in_no_way NEG fear.PRS.3SG I.ABL
 ‘Well, this devil is not afraid of me in any way.’ (And there is no other devil.)

The specific proximal demonstrative *kadā* is used to refer to particular entities selected out of a group of similar entities.

- (9) *peršo sikav la terňa, avel avri. kadi? naa,*
 first show[IMP.2SG] ART bride.ACC come.PRS.3SG out this.SPEC.F no
kadi? naa, na, āke hiñi! (UzhhR)
 this.SPEC.F no no right_here COP.PRS.3SG.F
 ‘‘‘At first, show the bride.’’ [A woman] is coming. ‘‘This one?’’ ‘‘No.’’ ‘‘This one?’’ No, no.’’
 ‘‘Here she is!’’ (From a description of a betrothal ritual.)
- (10) *lāche kala mogočki, feder sar ajse* (Per)
 good.PL this.SPEC.PL seed.PL better how such.PL
 ‘These particular seeds are good, they are better than the ordinary ones.’
- (11) *ko kadā?* (Khu)
 who this.SPEC

‘Who is this one here?’

The specific demonstrative may also occur in intralinguistic reference, if specificity has to be indicated:

- (12) *a čexika sar odā pes phenel me bisterd'om,*
 and Slovak.ADV how DEM REFL say.PRS.3SG I forget.AOR.1SG
me džanās kadā čexika te phenen (Uzhhs)
 I know.IPF/POT.1SG this.SPEC Slovak.ADV NCOMP say.INF

‘And I forgot how it is called in Slovak. I knew this particular [word] to say in Slovak.’

- (13) *mištes, kadā pes tuke na raxinla (Ser)^{RDž}*
 well this.SPEC REFL you.DAT NEG count.FUT.3SG

‘Well, this one [riddle I’ve just asked] won’t be counted for your sake.’ (Referring to one particular riddle out of more riddles.)

The proximal demonstrative also occurs in temporal phrases in reference to a current or forthcoming period of time, e.g. *adi rat* ‘this night’, *adala d'ivesa* ‘these days’, etc. Based on the data, the plain demonstrative *adā* is more common in such a function than the specific *kadā*, although the latter also occurs, in particular in Perechyn.

- (14) *kadā berš menk aveha? (Per)*
 this.SPEC year still come.FUT.2SG

‘Will you come this year yet?’

- (15) *adā berš esas lāčhi pohoda (Ser)^{LQCR}*
 this year COP.PST.3 good weather

‘It has been good weather this year.’

7.2.1.3 Non-proximal demonstratives

The non-proximal demonstratives refer to entities for which spatial distance is not relevant or known as well as to entities that are relatively distant to the speaker.

The plain non-proximal demonstrative *odā* has lost its deictic force and no longer plays a role in spatial (extralinguistic) deixis. Instead, *odā* is commonly used as an endophoric demonstrative in intralinguistic reference. As such, it occurs as an anaphoric demonstrative referring to antecedents, as in (16), (17), (19) and (20), or a cataphoric demonstrative referring to things introduced in a postcedent (18). It may also refer to entities understood from the

‘Ask him (I cannot recall his name), that one, (how is he called), Ernest.’

In Perechyn, the non-proximal plain demonstrative is also attested in temporal phrases in the meaning ‘last’, although the contrastive demonstrative is more common in such phrases (see 7.2.1.4 below).

- (23) *oj odā berš muv’la* (Per)
 she DEM year die.AOR.3SG
 ‘She died last year.’

The specific non-proximal demonstrative *kodā* mainly functions as a distal demonstrative in extralinguistic reference.

- (24) *dikhes kodi bāri momeli?* (UzhhS)
 see.PRS.2SG that.SPEC.F big candle
 ‘Do you see that big candle?’

- (25) *kadi pheñ mange muv’la,*
 this.SPEC.F sister I.DAT die.AOR.3SG
a kodā phral bešel andre tūrma (Khu)
 and/but that.SPEC.M brother sit.PRS.3SG in jail
 (Showing a photograph:) ‘This sister of mine here has died, while that brother sits in jail.’

- (26) *tu lemad’al kole čhavōres,*
 you hit.AOR.2SG that.SPEC.OBL.SG.M boy.DIM.ACC
so kod’a rovel? (Ser)^{LQCR}
 what there.SPEC weep.PRS.3SG
 ‘Have you hit that boy who is weeping over there?’

7.2.1.4 Contrastive demonstratives *akā/okā*

In addition to proximal and non-proximal demonstratives discussed in the previous sections, there is another series of demonstrative forms that are used in rather specialised and more or less lexicalised meanings. They are labelled as contrastive demonstratives here on the basis of their main function to express the meaning ‘the other, the opposite’.

Contrastive demonstratives are also based on the vocalic roots either *a-* (*akā*) or *o-* (*okā*). However, contrary to the proper demonstratives, there is no functional difference between the different vocalic roots, e.g. in expressing the proximity. Instead, their distribution is associated with particular varieties: *akā* occurs in both Uzhhorod varieties, while *okā* is

typical of Perechyn, Khudlovo and Serednie, and of some speakers in Radvanka. See Table 57, which shows the nominative forms of all contrastive demonstratives with their dialectal distribution.

Table 57: Contrastive demonstratives

	UzhhR.UzhhS	UzhhR.Per.Khu.Ser
SG.M	<i>akā</i>	<i>okā</i>
SG.F	<i>aki</i>	<i>oki</i>
PL.M/F	<i>akala</i>	<i>okala</i>

As follows from Table 57, contrastive demonstrative have the nominative suffixes typical of other demonstratives, i.e. SG.M *-ā*, SG.F *-i* and NOM.PL *-ala*, including their ultimate stress pattern. The oblique forms are similar to the nominative plural forms in that they are based on the stem *akal-/okal-* followed by regular adjectival or substantival suffixes.

Contrastive demonstratives serve to refer to discrete or definite entities that stand in explicit contrast and/or opposition to other entities, e.g. in drawing a comparison. In this context, they may occur in spatial reference to distant objects that contrast with closer objects:

(27) *adā dubos pāšeder sar akā* (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 this tree close.COMPR how DEM.CNTR
 ‘This tree is closer than the other one over there.’

(28) *adā kaš bareder čem okā* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 this tree big.COMPR than DEM.CNTR
 ‘This tree is bigger than that the other one over there.’

This contrastive or oppositive function results in their most common meaning ‘the other, the opposite’, which can be encountered in demonstrative sets of other Romani dialects (cf. Matras 2000: 116).

(29) *adārik deš džane,*
 from_here ten person.PL
andal akā tāboris deš džane (UzhhR)
 out_of DEM.CNTR settlement ten person.PL
 ‘From here ten people, from the other Romani settlement ten people.’

- (30) *varesej nijpos bešen are khangejri,*
 some.PL people sit.PRS.3PL in church
a okala terdon (Khu)^{LQCR}
 and/but DEM.CNTR.PL stand.PRS.3PL
 ‘Some people are sitting in a church, while the others are standing.’
- (31) *tu icardeha kodā bar dži oki sejra*
 you hurl.FUT.2SG that.SPEC stone TERM DEM.CNTR.F side
prig e rika? (Ser)^{LQCR}
 across/through ART river
 ‘Will you hurl that stone across the river to the other side?’

Moreover, the contrastive demonstratives are in all varieties commonly used in the meaning ‘last’ in temporal phrases.

- (32) *man akā berš sas šov rukone ande drovra* (UzhhR)
 I.ACC DEM.CNTR year COP.PST.3 six dog.PL in courtyard
 ‘I had six dogs in the yard last year.’
- (33) *adā berš talam ejla ajso bāro jevend*
 this year perhaps COP.FUT.3SG such big winter
sar akale beršeskero (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 how DEM.CNTR.OBL.SG.M year.GEN
 ‘It is possible that this year the winter will be as long as the last year’s [winter].’
- (34) *oki rāti oj avla ade pal mande* (Per)^{LQCR}
 DEM.CNTR.F night she come.AOR.3SG here PREP I.LOC
 ‘She came here to visit me last night.’

7.2.2 Adverbial demonstratives

Adverbial demonstratives in Eastern Uzh Romani express the identical four-way contrast based on proximity and specificity of localisations as the adnominal demonstratives. In addition, there is a two-way distinction in orientation, which differentiates forms of the stative (‘here’) and directive (‘to here’) values from the forms with the separative (‘from here’) and perlativ (‘this way’) meanings; see Table 58.

Table 58: Adverbial demonstratives

	PROXIMAL		NON-PROXIMAL	
	PLAIN	SPECIFIC	PLAIN	SPECIFIC
STATIVE – DIRECTIVE	<i>adaj/ ade(j)</i>	<i>kadaj/ kade(j)</i>	<i>odoj/ ode(j)</i> <i>od'a</i>	<i>kodoj/ kode(j)</i> <i>kođ'a</i>
SEPARATIVE – PERLATIVE	<i>adārik</i>	<i>kadārik</i>	<i>odārik</i>	<i>kodārik</i>

The vocalic roots in adverbial demonstratives are also identical to those of the demonstrative pronouns, i.e. proximal *a-* versus non-proximal *o-*, and specificity of localisation is expressed by the initial velar stop.

7.2.2.1 Stative – directive demonstratives

Two basic stative – directive adverbial demonstratives are proximal *adaj* ‘here’ and non-proximal *odoj* ‘there’, which are also known from other Central Romani dialects. In Eastern Uzh Romani, both *adaj* and *odoj* are often replaced by *ade(j)* and *ode(j)* respectively with a common ending *-e(j)* in both forms. Such a change in *adaj* > *adej* may be due to rising of /a/ to /e/ before the palatal approximant, while the loss of the approximant in *ade* may be triggered, or at least reinforced, by analogy with the deictic indicators *āke* and *ovke* (7.2.2.5) and with spatial adverbs, such as *andre* ‘inside’ (9.3.1), and in particular by coalescence with the special directive deictic *arde* (7.2.2.4). The non-proximal form *ode(j)* may have developed by analogy with the proximal *ade(j)*. Both *adaj/odoj* and their innovated forms *ade(j)/ode(j)* are often encountered in a single variety, with *adaj* and *odoj* being more common in elder speakers. However, take note of example (40) where *odoj* and *odej* are used by a single speaker side by side in a single sentence.

(35) *adaj o roma čirla igen bedno dživnas* (Khu)
 here ART Rom.PLlong_ago very poorly live.IPF/POT.3PL
 ‘Here, the Roma lived very poorly in the past.’

(36) *oj mā adej sikl'ila amendar* (Khu)
 she already here learn.AOR.3SG we.ABL
 ‘She has already learned [it] from us.’

(37) *oj ade dživlas tože lakeri daj* (Khu)
 she here live.IPF/POT.3SG also her mother
 ‘She also lived here, her mother.’

- (38) *sa pre scena, odoj but ludos sa* (UzhhS)
 all on stage there many people all
 ‘Everybody is on the stage, there are many people, everybody.’
- (39) *andre jek gav šund’ol ajso hijros,*
 in one village be_heard.PRS.3SG such information
hoj ode merel jek manušni (UzhhS)
 FCOMP there die.PRS.3SG one woman
 ‘In a village, there is a rumour that one woman is dying there.’
- (40) *keci me dživav, me pametina,*
 how_long I live.PRS.1SG I remember.PRS.1SG
hoj odoj sas, odej sas roma (UzhhR)
 FCOMP there COP.PST.3 there COP.PST.3 Rom.PL
 ‘As long as I live, I remember that they were there, there were Roma.’

The other very common form for the non-proximal adverbial demonstrative is *od’a* with the palatal /dʲ/ and the final vowel /a/. There is no functional difference between *odoj* and its phonological variants *ode(j)* and *ode* on the one hand and *od’a* on the other hand. Both forms are often used side by side in a single variety, rarely even by a single speaker, as in (44), although particular speakers usually prefer one of the two forms or use it exclusively. Both *odoj* (*ode(j)*) and *od’a* are attested in Uzhhorod, but the former form seems to be more common there, at least with respect to the available data. In Perechyn and Khudlovo, the preference is for *od’a*, and in Serednie, no *odoj* and its variants have been recorded at all. See also the sentences in (50) to (53) below.

- (41) *na sanas adād’ive od’a pro pijacis?* (UzhhR)
 NEG COP.PST.2PL today there on market
 ‘Haven’t you been there in the market today?’
- (42) *kanākes od’a džal remontos andre* (UzhhS)
 now there go.PRS.3SG construction inside
 ‘Now, construction is underway there indoors.’
- (43) *lakeri pheñ od’a dživlas le romeha* (Per)
 her sister there live.IPF/POT.3SG ART husband.INST
 ‘Her sister was living there with her husband.’

- (44) *mijri pheň od'a dživel,*
 my sister there live.PRS.3SG
i menk jek cetka man dživel ode (Khu)
 and still one aunt I.ACC live.PRS.3SG there
 'My sister is living there, and I have one more aunt [who] lives there.'

Still, another innovated form occurs in Sereďnie in addition to *od'a* (see (50) below), viz. *od'e(j)*, which probably developed via analogy similar to that of *ode(j)* discussed above.

- (45) *the me od'ej somas* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 also I there COP.PST.1SG
 'I have been there too.'

- (46) *k' amende o ceni tuñeder, na,*
 at/to we.LOC ART price.PL cheap.COMPR NEG
sar od'e ke tumende (Ser)
 than there at/to you.PL.LOC
 'Prices here (literally: at our place) are lower than there where you live (literally: at your place), aren't they?'

7.2.2.2 Separative – perlative demonstratives

The plain separative – perlative adverbial demonstratives are *adārik* 'from here, this way' and *odārik* 'from there, that way'. They have developed through grammaticalisation of demonstrative phrases that involved the inherited Indo-Aryan noun **rig* 'side' (cf. Elšík and Matras 2006: 276).¹¹³

- (47) *ov gejl'a adārik, a na odārik* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 he go.AOR.3SG this_way/from_here and/but NEG that_way/from_there
 'He went this way and not that way.'
- (48) *tumen džan het čim sigeder adārik* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 you.PL go.IMP.2PL away PART soon.COMPR this_way/from_here
 'You go away from here as soon as possible'
- (49) *jaj bengeja, denaš odārik* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 oh devil.VOC run[IMP.2SG] that_way/from_there
 'Oh devil, run away from there.'

¹¹³ In today's Uzh Romani, **rig* no longer exists as an independent word, and the noun *sejra* is used in the meaning 'side', as in the North Central dialects of East Slovakia (*sera*, etc.).

7.2.2.3 Proximity and specificity in adverbial demonstratives

Functions of adverbial demonstratives are similar to those of adnominal demonstratives. The proximal deictics are used in reference to proximate locations, while the non-proximal deictics occur either in non-spatial reference or in reference to locations that are outside the speaker's space.

The plain non-proximal deictic is particularly used in endophoric reference, as in (50) (see also the examples above). It may also refer to locations that are known from the situational context, as in (51).

- (50) *me dikh'lom o tunelis, sar me džās*
 I see.AOR.1SG ART tunnel how I go.IPF/POT.1SG
ko dejl, i od'a šund'om holos (Ser)
 at/to God and there hear.AOR.1SG voice
 'I saw a tunnel when I was approaching the God and there I heard a voice.'

- (51) *so od'a rodes čhaje ?* (Per)
 what there look_for.PRS.2SG girl.VOC
 'What are you looking for there, girl?'

The specific adverbial demonstratives express the specific, precise and/or definite localisation and are often accompanied by some form of an extralinguistic gesture. The specific non-proximal deictic may also refer to spatial locations that are perceived as not being part of the speaker's location (52).

- (52) *ta kāj džas kod'a?* (UzhhR)
 so where go.PRS.2SG there.SPEC
 'So, where are you going there?'

- (53) *me tut thod'om andro kreslos*
 I you.ACC put.AOR.1SG in armchair
kode te bešen (UzhhS)
 there.SPEC NCOMP sit.INF
 'I put you in the armchair to sit over there.'

- (54) *thov kade mārōro leske* (Khu)
 put[IMP.2SG] here.SPEC bread.DIM he.DAT
 'Put the bread right here for him.' (Showing the exact place.)

- (55) *te tu gej'alas od'a kodārik,* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 if you go.IRR.2SG there that_way/from_there.SPEC

tu zabludzind'alas tut
 you lose_way.IRR.2SG you.ACC
 'If you went there that specific way, you would go astray.'

Juxtaposition of the proximal demonstrative with the non-proximal one expresses the meaning 'in/at/to various places, first here and then there':

- (56) *o roma imā keren kade vudar,*
 ART Rom.PLalready make.PRS.3PL here.SPEC door
kode vudar (Uzhhr)
 there.SPEC door
 'The Roma [like to] make a door first here and then there.'
- (57) *džanes romen ade od'a na?* (Khu)
 know.PRS.2SG Rom.ACC.PL here there NEG
 'You recognise Roma here and there, don't you?'

7.2.2.4 Special directive *a(r)de*

Alongside *adaj* and its variants, another proximal deictic adverb is *arde* or *ade*, which has the exclusive directive meaning 'hither' and is only used in extralinguistic reference.

In its conservative form, which is common in the North Central dialects of East Slovakia, *arde* is extremely rare and definitely obsolete in Eastern Uzh Romani; it is only attested in the speech of some elder speakers.¹¹⁴ Otherwise, it has a form *ade* and is therefore undistinguishable from the phonologically reduced variant of the stative-directive *adaj* (see above). It follows that there are speakers who use the single stative – directive form *ade*, in which both old deictics *adaj* and *arde* have completely merged, while some other speakers make use of *adaj* or *adej* as the general stative – directive proximal deictic and *ade* as an exclusive directive deictic in certain phrases. In all varieties, the special directive *a(r)de* functions as the directive adverb in fixed commands, such as the following:

- (58) *av arde!* (Per)¹¹⁵
 come[IMP.2SG] hither
 'Come here!'

¹¹⁴ Still, a comparative adverb *ardeder* 'here closer' is attested in Uzhhorod even from some young speakers who otherwise do not use the form *arde* in the positive degree.

¹¹⁵ A male speaker born in 1945.

- (59) *av ade!* (common)
 come[IMP.2SG] hither
 ‘Come here!’

7.2.2.5 Spatial indicators *āke* and *ovke*

Another set of forms used in spatial deixis is represented by what is called here ‘spatial indicators’. Two spatial indicators in the Eastern Uzh Romani dialect are proximal *āke* ‘over here, right here, at/to this very specific place’ and distal *ovke* ‘over there, right there, at/to that very specific place’. Note that the roots *ā-* and *ov-* resemble the respective proximal and non-proximal root vowels *-a-* and *-o-*. In Khudlovo, some speakers optionally insert prothetic /h/ to these forms, which leads to *hāke* and *hovke*, while in Perechyn, some speakers use morphological variants *ākes* and *ovkes* analogical to the deadjectival adverbs in *-es* (9.1.1).

Spatial indicators express the highest degree of spatial specificity, definiteness and semantic specialisation and are functionally equivalent to the respective proximal and distal particles *ось* and *оһ* in Ukrainian and *вот* and *воһ* in Russian. They are exclusively used in extralinguistic reference. The indicators commonly occur in nominal sentences, either with the overt copula, as in (61) and (65), or with the zero copula, as in (63), (64) and (66), to point to the precise localisation of objects in question. They are also common in commands or incentives with verbs such as *l-* ‘to take’ (60) and *dikh-* ‘to look’ (62). Juxtaposition of two nominal clauses with the proximal indicator serves to express the immediate proximity (63).

- (60) *le āke!* (common)
 take.IMP.2SG right_here
 ‘Take it!’

- (61) *āke hiñi!* (common)
 right_here COP.PRS.3SG.F
 ‘Here she is!’

- (62) *dik ovke* (UzhhS)
 see[IMP.2SG] right_there
 ‘Have a look there.’

- (63) *dur na kampil te phiren,*
 far NEG be_needed.PRS NCOMP go_often.INF
ākes tāborňa, ākes khangejri (Per)
 right_here settlement right_here church
 ‘It is not necessary to walk far, the settlement and the church are immediately next to each other.’

- (64) *āk' o lon, tu kori sal ?* (Per)
 right_here ART salt you blind.F COP.PRS.2SG
 'Here is the salt, are you blind [that you don't see it]?'

 (65) *kade hin mā'la hāke avri* (Khu)
 here.SPEC COP.PRS.3 field right_here outside
 'Here, there is a field right here outside.'

 (66) *hovke mijro graj* (Khu)
 right_there my horse
 'There is my horse over there.'

The spatial indicators may also be combined with various specific deictics to emphasise the specificity even further (see also (65)):

- (67) *me āke kade sovav* (Uzhhs)
 I right_here here.SPEC sleep.PRS.1SG
 'I (will) sleep precisely here.'

 (68) *ovke kodā so kod'a terd'ol,*
 right_there that.SPEC what there.SPEC stand.PRS.3SG
odā kerdo trastestar (Per)^{LQCR}
 DEM made iron.ABL
 'That one there which stands over there is made of iron.'

7.2.2.6 Contrastive demonstratives *akārik* and *okārik*

Finally, there are separative – perlocative demonstratives *akārik* and *okārik*, which represent the adverbial counterparts of the contrastive demonstratives *akā* and *okā* (7.2.1.4). Like the latter forms, *akārik* and *okārik* seem not to express the spatial distance. They are either part of fixed lexicalised phrases, such as *khatar okārik* 'everywhere' in Uzhhorod and 'from everywhere' in Sereďnie (see 6.4.3) or are used as specific contrastive deictics 'from the other place; the other way' (69).

- (69) *me džav akārik* (Uzhhs)
 I go.PRS.1SG DEM.CNTR.ADV
 'I'm going the other way.'

7.3 Temporal deictics

As discussed above, adnominal demonstratives are used in the current and past time reference as modifiers of nouns referring to time periods, e.g. proximal *adā kurko* ‘this week’ (see 7.2.1.2), contrastive *akā kurko* (in Uzhhorod) or *okā kurko* (in Perechyn, Khudlovo and Serednie) ‘last week’ (see 7.2.1.4). In the future reference, the differential pronoun *āver* ‘other’ in a prepositional phrase headed by *pre* ‘on’ occurs (see 6.5.1).

Adverbial demonstratives are not normally used in the temporal meaning, but there is rare evidence that the proximal adverb *adaj (ade)* ‘here’ and the spatial indicator *āke (ākes)* ‘over here, right here’ may occur in a reference to the current or recent period:

- (70) *ākes somas duj trin kurke odaleske* (Per)
 right_here COP.PST.1SG two three week.PL DEM.DAT
 ‘Now (recently) I was [there], two or three weeks ago.’ (A reply to one’s query about when the speaker was in a particular place.)
- (71) *adaj avla o sombat* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 here come.AOR.3SG ART Saturday
 ‘Now, Saturday has come.’

Otherwise, deictic adverbs of time are represented by special temporal adverbs, among which both inherited and borrowed forms occur. In what follows, the deictic expressions of days (‘yesterday’, ‘today’, etc.) will be discussed first before other temporal expressions.

7.3.1 Deictic adverbs of days

Table 59 shows forms of the deictic adverbs that refer to particular days.

Table 59: Deictic adverbs of days

FORM	MEANING
<i>paliždžeskerō (paliždžeskorō)</i>	the day before yesterday
<i>ijdž</i>	yesterday
<i>adād’ive</i>	today
<i>tajsa</i>	tomorrow
<i>paltajsaskerō (paltajsaskorō)</i>	the day after tomorrow

The deictic expressions of days are one-word adverbs. However, only *ijdž* ‘yesterday’, which is of Indo-Aryan origin (< OIA *hyah*; see CDIAL 14108), and the old Greek loanword

for ‘tomorrow’ *tajsā* (< Greek *ταχιά*; see Boretzky and Igla 2004: 198) occur as simple forms. The word for ‘today’ *adād’ive* has developed through adverbialisation and apocopation from the phrase *adā d’ives* ‘this day’, while *paliždžeskero* ‘the day before yesterday’ and *paltajsaskero* ‘the day after tomorrow’ (or *paliždžeskoro* and *paltajsaskoro*; see 4.1.3) are transparent genitive forms of *ijdž* and *tajsā* respectively, with the fused preposition *pal*.

The adverbs for ‘yesterday’, ‘today’ and ‘tomorrow’ also have ablative forms to mark the posterior duration (‘since XY’), viz. *ijdžestar* ‘since yesterday’, *adād’ivestar* or *adād’ivesestar* ‘since today’ and *tajsastar* ‘since tomorrow’.

7.3.2 Other temporal deictics

Various deictic expressions of time are presented in Table 60.

Table 60: Deictic adverbs of time

FORM	MEANING
<i>akor</i>	then, at that time
<i>čirla</i>	long ago, formerly
<i>nadočirla</i>	not so long ago, recently
<i>angomiš</i>	a moment ago, a while ago
<i>kanāke(s)</i>	now
<i>mindār, mind’a(r)</i>	in a moment, in a short while
<i>takoj</i>	immediately, right then
<i>sig(o)</i>	soon
<i>maj</i>	at a time in the future, sometime (later)
<i>pališ, pal’i, pajiš</i>	then, afterwards
<i>māsovar</i>	next time

Non-borrowed forms shared with other Eastern North Central dialects are *čirla* ‘long ago, formerly, in the past’ (see (77) below) and *sig* ‘soon’ (also *sigo* in Khudlovo and Serednie), which is identical to the adverb of manner ‘quickly’ (9.2) and to the temporal adverb ‘early’ (9.4.2). The word for ‘then, afterwards’ occurs in related phonological variants, such as *pališ* (73), which is the most common variant in all varieties, *pal’i* (74), which is attested in all varieties except in Khudlovo, and *pajiš* (72), which occurs only in Radvanka. This adverb might be related either to the repetitive particle *pāle* ‘again’ (9.6.4) or to the Proto-Romani spatial adverb **pale* ‘in/to the back’ (Eastern Uzh Romani *palal*; see 9.3.1).

Another adverb *angomiš* ‘a moment ago, a while ago’ (75) is probably related to the Proto-Romani spatial adverb **angle* ‘in/to the front’ (Eastern Uzh Romani *anglal*; 9.3.1).

- (72) *trin d'ives pijen xan, a pajiš mā naa* (UzhhR)
 three day drink.PRS.3PL eat.PRS.3PL and/but then already no
 ‘They drink [and] eat for three days, and then they no longer do.’
- (73) *presuv'al tut, pališ tosāra ušil'al* (UzhhS)
 sleep_through.AOR.2SG you.ACC then morning get_up.AOR.2SG
 ‘You had a good sleep [and] then, in the morning, you got up.’
- (74) *me džā andre khangejri, pali avā khejre* (UzhhS)
 I go.FUT.1SG in church then COP.FUT.1SG home
 ‘I will go to the church [and] then I will be at home.’
- (75) *angomiš vakerahas pal tute* (UzhhS)
 while_ago speak.IPF/POT.1PL about you.LOC
 ‘A while ago, we were talking about you.’

Another temporal deictic adverb whose cognates are common in other Romani dialects is *kanāke(s)*, the general word for ‘now’. It has developed from Proto-Romani **akana*, which is known from other dialects, by several phonological and morphological processes, such as paragoge of the velar stop /k/ (> **akanak*), analogy with deadjectival adverbs in *-es* (> **akanakes*), aphaeresis of the initial vowel (> **kanakes*) and lengthening of the vowel in the stressed syllable (> *kanākes*). Furthermore, the final sibilant in *kanākes* may be (and often is) omitted, resulting in *kanāke* (cf. the similar alternation in *mištes* and *mište* ‘well’).

- (76) *majinel t' aven pre dovo'enka kanākes* (UzhhR)
 should.PRS.3SG NCOMP come.INF on holiday now
 ‘S/he should come on holiday now.’
- (77) *čirla on amen mārnas, a kanāke amen len* (Khu)
 long_ago they we.ACC beat.IPF/POT.3PL and/but now we they.ACC
 ‘In the past, they used to beat us, while now, we [beat] them.’

The adverb *nadočirla* ‘not so long ago, recently’ is modelled upon the dialectal Slavic form *ne-do-davno* [not-until-long_ago]; it contains the Romani negator *na* and the adverb *čirla* ‘long ago’ separated by the Slavic preposition *do* in between. A form *načirla* rarely occurs as well.

- (78) *jek kadā muv'la nadočirla* (Khu)
 one this.SPEC die.AOR.3SG not_so_long_ago
 (Showing a photograph:) ‘This one here has died recently.’

The adverbs *čirla* and *kanāke(s)* may occur in ablative forms *čirlastar* and *kanākestar* in the posterior durative meaning ‘since a long time ago’ and ‘since now’ respectively. The meaning ‘since then’ is expressed by the Slavic loanword *ottedi* (cf. Slovak *odvtedy*), which is also attested with the Romani ablative suffix as *ottedestar* (see also 13.3.4).

The adverb *takoj* ‘immediately, right then’ is of local Slavic origin; see 9.6.4 for its function of a particle modifying spatial and temporal phrases.

- (79) *takoj xaha kapkica* (Per)
 immediately eat.FUT.2SG a_little.DIM
 ‘You will eat a little bit immediately.’

- (80) *menk čak ov phend'a odā,*
 still only he say.AOR.3SG DEM
oj takoj muv'la (Per)
 she immediately die.AOR.3SG
 ‘As soon as he said it, she died right then.’

Some other temporal deictics are of Hungarian origin. They comprise the most general deictic adverb of time *akor* ‘then, at that time’ (cf. Hungarian *akkor*), which is also used as a correlative element introducing the main clause in the conditional sentences (see 13.3.1).

- (81) *akor sa amen andro bunkera garuvkerahas* (UzhhS)
 then all we in bunker.PL hide.ITER.IPF/POT.1PL
 ‘At that time, we all were hiding ourselves in bunkers.’

- (82) *duvar trival kampe leske te phenen, vit'ka vit'ka,*
 twice thrice be_needed.PRS he.DAT NCOMP tell.INF Vitka Vitka
akor ov lel ejstre (Ser)
 then he take.PRS.3SG AKT
 ‘It is necessary to address him twice or thrice, “Vitka, Vitka”, [only] then will he take notice.’

Other Hungarian-origin deictic adverbs are *maj* ‘at a time in the future, sometime (later)’ (from Hungarian *majd*) and *mind’ār* or *mind’ar* (in Perechyn also *mind’a*) ‘in a moment, in a short while’ (from Hungarian *mindjárt*). In Uzhhorod, *māškor* ‘next/another time’ (from Hungarian *máskor*) occurs in addition to *māsovar*, which has an unclear etymology (see also 6.5.2 for its meaning ‘at another time’).

(83) *mind’ār aro telefonos sikavā les* (Ser)
 in_a_moment in phone show.FUT.1SG he.ACC
 ‘In a moment, I will show him [to you] on my phone.’

(84) *mind’a džala ke tumende* (Per)
 in_a_moment go.FUT.3SG at/to you.PL.LOC
 ‘In a moment, he will go to you.PL.’

An East Slavic loan *ranše* ‘earlier’ (cf. Russian *раньше*) is attested in spontaneous speech in Khudlovo alongside the inherited *čirla*:

(85) *ranše važ o pāndž kopejki buločka*
 in_the_past for ART five Kopek.PL bread_roll
cinahas amenge (Khu)
 buy.IPF/POT.1PL we.DAT
 ‘In the past, we used to buy a bread roll for five kopeks.’

7.4 Comparative deictics

Comparative deictic expressions of quantity, quality and manner are presented in this section. While quantity (‘so much, so many’) is represented by a single form with no indication of specificity, there are two distinct plain and specific deictic forms for both quality (‘such’) and manner (‘thus’); see Table 61.

Table 61: Comparative deictics

CATEGORY		FORM	MEANING
QUANTITY		<i>ajci</i>	so much, so many, so long
QUALITY	PLAIN	<i>ajso(v)</i>	such, so + ADJ
	SPECIFIC	<i>kajso(v)</i>	
MANNER	PLAIN	<i>avka</i>	thus, like this, in such a way
	SPECIFIC	<i>kāke</i>	

7.4.1 Quantity deictic *ajci*

The deictic adverb of quantity is *ajci* ‘so much, so many’, which corresponds to the interrogative *keci* ‘how much, how many; how long’ (see 8.2.1), and, like the latter, may also have a temporal meaning (‘so long’). Note that *ajci* and *keci* share the form of the final syllable, which probably reflects the Proto-Romani quantity marker *-(t)ti. At the same time, *ajci* resembles the adjectival quality deictic *ajso* (see below) in terms of its initial syllable.¹¹⁶

The deictic quantifier may modify nouns (86), verbs (87) and other adverbial quantity expressions, such as *ajci but* ‘such a great amount’ and *ajci butāl'ik* ‘such a long time’. It may be separated from the words it modifies (88).

- (86) *keci* *o* *šābl'ika* *tašl'ile,*
 how_much ART safety_match.PL sink.AOR.3PL
ajci *manuša* *dine* *jākhendar* (UzhhS)
 so_much human.PL give.AOR.3PL eye.ABL.PL
 ‘How many of the safety matches sank, so many people cast an evil eye.’
- (87) *keci* *tuke* *kampel,* *ajci* *vakerava* (Per)
 how_much you.DAT be_needed.PRS so_much speak.FUT.1SG
 ‘How much you need, so much I will talk.’ (Or: ‘How long you need, so long I will talk.’)
- (88) *ajci* *len* *but* *čhave* *sas,*
 so_much they.ACC much child.PL COP.PST.3
keci *pro* *ňebos* *o* *čerxeňa* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 how_much on sky ART star.PL
 ‘They had so many children, how many stars there are in the sky.’

7.4.2 Quality deictics *ajso(v)* and *kajso(v)*

The deictic adjective of quality is *ajso* ‘such’. It has an irregular stress position on the final syllable, i.e. SG.M *ajsó*, SG.F *ajsí*, PL *ajsé*, apart from the substantivised forms marked by the Layer II case suffixes, such as ablative *ajséstar* ‘from such one’. In Khudlovo and Sereďnie, the nominative forms also occur with the final diphthong as *ajsóv* [a.'jsou], *ajsíj* and *ajséj*, which are probably analogical to the indefinite adjectives *varesov*, *varesij* and *varesej* ‘some’ (see 6.3.1.1). Moreover, the palatal approximant of the deictic base tends to be dropped in fast articulation in both varieties, which eventually results in *asó(v)* [a.'so(ʉ)], *así(j)* and *asé(j)*.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ In some other Eastern North Central dialects, but not in Eastern Uzh Romani, there is also a variant *kajci*, which is marked for specificity.

¹¹⁷ In the following examples, final stress is not marked.

The deictic adjective may modify nouns, as in (89) and (90), and adjectives (91). In addition to its function in extralinguistic reference, it is also used as an endophoric device, as in (92) and (93), and may be substantivised as an independent head (92).

- (89) *kāj ajsē perumi māren ?* (Ser)^{Rdž}
 where such.PL thunder.PL beat.PRS.3PL
 ‘Where such thunders rumble?’
- (90) *man tože sas ajsov aparát* (Khu)
 I.ACC also COP.PST.3 such camera
 ‘I also had such a camera.’
- (91) *mijro rom lācho manuš, ov ajsov lācho manuš!* (Ser)
 my husband good human he such.M good human
 ‘My husband is a good man. He is so good man!’
- (92) *ov ajso, hoj čōre romen pomožinkerel* (UzhhR)
 he such.M FCOMP poor Rom.ACC.PL help.ITER.PRS.3SG
 ‘He is such [a person] that he regularly helps poor Roma.’
- (93) *oj ričinlas, pal o fali peha cirkerlas,*
 she scream.IPF/POT.3SG over ART wall.PL REFL.INST pull.ITER.IPF/POT.3SG
ajsi la duk sas (Per)
 such.F she.ACC pain[F] COP.PST.3
 ‘She was screaming, she was thrashing about from one wall to the other – such a pain afflicted her.’

The deictic adjective *ajso* is also used in the lexicalised meaning ‘ordinary, commonplace’, as in the following sentence:

- (94) *lāche kala mogočki, feder sar ajse* (Per)
 good.PL this.SPEC.PL seed.PL better how such.PL
 ‘These particular seeds are good, they are better than the ordinary ones.’

The variant *kajso(v)* is marked by the specificity prefix *k-* (see 7.2 above on the specific demonstratives in *k-*). It serves to emphasise particular/specific qualities (‘such particular’, ‘such specific’) and is often accompanied by a gesture in extralinguistic reference (97).

- (95) *vašodā, kamav tuke te phenen,*
 therefore want.PRS.1SG you.DAT NCOMP say.INF
merkin pre kajse manuša (Uzhhs)
 be_careful[IMP.2SG] on such.SPEC human.PL
 ‘That’s why I want to tell you, be careful of such particular people (as described in an antecedent discussion).’
- (96) *man hin phērdo kajse* (Uzhhs)
 I.ACC COP.PRS.3 full such.SPEC.PL
 ‘I have plenty of such particular ones [like these here].’
- (97) *mijre dadeskere phrales sas kajsi bāri*
 my father.GEN brother.ACC COP.PST.3 such.SPEC.F big.F
brada (Khu)^{LQCR}
 bread.F
 ‘My father’s brother had such a big bread.’ (Showing the size.)

7.4.3 Manner deictics *avka* and *kāke*

There are two deictic adverbs of manner (‘thus, like this, in such a way’): *avka* and *kāke*. The form *avka* is the most common one in all varieties. It may modify adverbs (98) and verbs ((99) and (100)), and may also occur as an endophoric device referring to previous or following statements (101).

- (98) *the ade avka čōres dživen o roma* (Uzhhr)
 also here thus poor.ADV live.PRS.3PL ART Rom.PL
 ‘Even here the Roma live in such poverty (literally: so poorly).’
- (99) *amen vakeras avka sar ungvārate,*
 we speak.PRS.1PL thus how Uzhhorod.LOC
čak od’a kapka akcentos avka zacirden (Per)
 only there a_bit articulation thus spin_out.PRS.3PL
 ‘We speak like in Uzhhorod, just there they somewhat spin their articulation out a bit.’
- (100) *ov the na šunel avka,*
 he also NEG hear.PRS.3SG thus
sar obično šunel pes (Ser)
 how usually hear.PRS.3SG REFL
 ‘He even doesn’t hear in such a way as one usually hears.’

- (101) *ade avka, jek rom kerla bida andro gav,*
 here thus one Rom do.FUT.3SG trouble in village
savore roma xudena (Khu)
 all Rom.PL.get.FUT.3PL
 ‘Here it is like this: one Rom will make a trouble, all Roma will get [a thrashing].’

The word *avka* also occurs in certain idiomatic phrases. For example, it may be preceded by the negator *na* to yield the meaning ‘amiss’ (cf. Russian and Ukrainian *не так*):

- (102) *prebačín, te vareso na avka* (UzhhS)
 sorry[IMP.2SG] if something NEG thus
 ‘Sorry if something is amiss.’

The other form *kāke* is used as a specific and emphatic deictic adverb of manner and is usually accompanied by an extralinguistic gesture. It is particularly common in Khudlovo and Serednie.

- (103) *oj la xund’a kāke vastestar* (Per)
 she she.ACC catch.AOR.3SG thus.SPEC hand.ABL
 ‘She grasped her hand this particular way.’ (Showing the way.)
- (104) *o nijpos kāke dikhenas* (Khu)
 ART people thus.SPEC see.IPF/POT.3PL
 ‘The people were looking in such a specific way.’
- (105) *na xud’ avk’ e čhuvri, a xude kāke* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 NEG catch.IMP.2SG thus ART knife and/but catch.IMP.2SG thus.SPEC
 ‘Do not take hold of the knife this way, but take [it] exactly like this.’

8 NUMERAL AND QUANTIFIERS

This chapter describes numerals and non-numerical quantifiers. Both morphological and syntactic expressions of quantity are discussed side by side.

8.1 Numerals

Inherited Romani numerals are vital in Eastern Uzh Romani.¹¹⁸ Still, it is not uncommon that speakers use local Ukrainian (Rusyn), Russian or Hungarian numerals when counting or referring to number units, and they do so in a process of either borrowing or code-switching. Numeral loanwords or phrase switches embedded in Romani discourse are less common with lower numerals and their occurrence increases with an increase in the value of the number. The more complex and the higher the Romani numeral, the more likelihood there is that it will be substituted by a non-Romani equivalent. In other words, simple Romani numerals are less commonly replaced than compound numerals and, among both simple and compound numerals, lower numerals are less commonly replaced than higher numerals. Some very complex mathematical operations, like those related to school instruction rather than to everyday life, are almost always conveyed in a non-Romani language. However, the given social context and functions of the language should also be taken into consideration. For example, Romani numerals are naturally used in secretive situations when the content of an utterance should not be understood by outsiders. There are also differences in using the Romani numerals among individual speakers and families, and perhaps also among varieties. Employment of non-Romani numerals in Romani discourse seems to be more common in Uzhhorod and Perechyn, where a number of young speakers especially do not actively use higher and more complex Romani numerals at all. In Khudlovo and Serechnie, in contrast, Romani numerals are commonly used by all generations.

8.1.1 Cardinal and fractional numerals

Basic cardinal numerals in all Eastern Uzh Romani varieties are shown in Table 62 (see the next page).

¹¹⁸ See Bakker 2001 and Boretzky and Igla 2004: 116–123 for a cross-dialectological overview of numerals in Romani.

Table 62: Basic cardinal numerals

VALUE	FORM	VALUE	FORM
1	<i>jek(h)</i>	20	<i>biš</i>
2	<i>du(v)j</i>	30	<i>tranda</i>
3	<i>tri(j)n</i>	40	<i>saranda</i>
4	<i>štār</i>	50	<i>penda</i>
5	<i>pāndž</i>	60	<i>šov(v)ārdeš</i>
6	<i>šov</i>	70	<i>eftavārdeš</i>
7	<i>efta</i>	80	<i>oxtovārdeš</i>
8	<i>oxto</i>	90	<i>ejnavārdeš</i>
9	<i>ejña</i>	100	<i>šel</i>
10	<i>deš</i>	1,000	<i>ezeros</i>

The simple cardinal numerals are inherited from Late Proto-Romani. They consist of numerals of either Indo-Aryan (‘1’ to ‘6’, ‘10’ ‘20’, ‘100’) or Greek origin (‘7’, ‘8’, ‘9’, ‘30’, ‘40’, ‘50’). The decades ‘60’ to ‘90’ are multiplicative compounds of base cardinals with *deš* ‘10’ with the help of *-vār-* (cf. the multiplicative marker *-var-* discussed below). For ‘1,000’, a xenoclitic noun *ezer-os*, which is borrowed from the Hungarian *ezer*, is used.

The hundred numerals ‘200’ to ‘900’ are formed by base cardinals plus *šel*, which remains in its singular form, e.g. ‘200’ *duj šel*, ‘900’ *ejña šel*. The masculine noun *ezer-os* has a regular plural form *ezer-a* in the thousand numerals, e.g. ‘2,000’ *duj ezera*, ‘100,000’ *šel ezera*.

Combinations of decades and digits are either compounds or phrases, usually accompanied by an additive connector. The numerals ‘11’ to ‘16’ are compounds of *deš* ‘10’ with the digit numeral connected by *-u-*, i.e. ‘11’ *deš-u-jekh*, ‘12’ *deš-u-duj*, ‘13’ *deš-u-tri(j)n*, ‘14’ *deš-u-štār*, ‘15’ *deš-u-pāndž*, ‘16’ *deš-u-šov*, while the Greek-origin digits ‘7’ to ‘9’ are connected to *deš* with no connector, i.e. ‘17’ *deš-efta*, ‘18’ *deš-oxto*, ‘19’ *deš-ejña*. The identical strategy occurs in numerous other Romani dialects and probably represents a Proto-Romani legacy (cf. Bakker 2001; Elšík and Matras 2006: 164–165). The additive connector in the compounds for ‘21’ to ‘29’ is *-thaj-*, which is sometimes pronounced without aspiration, i.e. ‘21’ *biš-t(h)aj-jekh*, ‘22’ *biš-t(h)aj-duj*, ‘23’ *biš-t(h)aj-tri(j)n*, ‘24’ *biš-t(h)aj-štār*, ‘25’ *biš-t(h)aj-pāndž*, ‘26’ *biš-t(h)aj-šov*, ‘27’ *biš-t(h)aj-efta*, ‘28’ *biš-t(h)aj-oxto*, ‘29’ *biš-t(h)aj-ejña*. Both *-u-* and *-t(h)aj-* are in Eastern Uzh Romani exclusive numeral connectors that do not occur in other parts of the grammar. Combinations of digits with decades above ‘30’ are regular phrases with the common phrasal connector *the* (see 13.5.1), e.g. ‘31’ *tranda*

the jekh, ‘32’ *tranda the duj*, ‘47’ *saranda the epta*, ‘67’ *šovārdeš the epta*, ‘101’ *šel the jekh*, ‘161’ *šel the šovārdeš the jekh*, ‘310’ *trin šel the deš*.

Similarity between the numeral connector *-thaj-* in ‘21’ to ‘29’ and the phrasal coordinator *the* is striking. It seems that *-thaj-*, in fact, represents an older phonological form of *the*, an assumption supported by evidence from other Romani dialects (South Central, Vlax), in which *t(h)aj* occurs as a common coordinator.¹¹⁹ It follows that the original phrasal conjunction **thaj* must have phonologically split into two forms in an ancestor of Eastern Uzh Romani. While it has maintained its original form in the fossilised numeral compounds of *biš* ‘twenty’, it underwent reduction of its final diphthong to a monophthong in its function as a phrasal coordinator.

Table 63 summarises formation of decade and digit-plus-decade numerals in Eastern Uzh Romani.

Table 63: Formation of decade and digit-plus-decade numerals

DECADES			DIGIT-PLUS-DECADE		
VALUE	FORMATION	CONNECTOR	VALUE	FORMATION	CONNECTOR
10	simple forms	N/A	11 – 17	compounds	<i>-u-</i>
			18 – 19		–
			21 – 29		<i>-thaj-</i>
20	compounds	N/A	31 – 99	phrases	<i>the</i>
30, 40, 50					
60, 70, 80, 90					
100	simple forms	N/A			
1,000					

The simple cardinal numerals of Indo-Aryan origin decline as zero adjectives with the obligatory oblique marking (see 5.1.1.2), e.g. *jekh-a ovr-a-tar* [one-OBL.SG.F hour-OBL.SG.F-ABL] ‘at one o’clock’, *Serednie duj-e cimbork-en-ca* [two-OBL.PL female_friend-OBL.PL-INST] ‘with two female friends’. In the compound numerals, only the last segment declines, e.g. *dešušov-e berš-en-ger-i* [sixteen-OBL.PL year-OBL.PL-GEN-NOM.SG.F] ‘(she) of sixteen years’, but uninflected compound numerals are also found, e.g. *dešušov berš-en-dar* [sixteen year-OBLPL-ABL] ‘at sixteen years’ in Perechyn. The Greek-origin numerals, which end in a vowel, never decline in the attributive position, e.g. *oxto*

¹¹⁹ See also its probable etymology in OIA *tathāpi* ‘even so, nevertheless’ (CDIAL 5647).

- (2) *ov dživel peskera trit-on-a romňaha* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 he live.PRS.3SG REFL.GEN third-EXT-OBL.SG.F wife.INST.SG.F
 ‘He lives with his third wife.’
- (3) *ov dživel trit-a romňaha* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 he live.PRS.3SG third-OBL.SG.F wife.INST.SG.F
 ‘He lives with [his] third wife.’

Some more complex ordinal numerals are optionally indeclinable in the attributive position and may even lack the numeral connector in their base. See the ablative phrase *eftavārdeštrito beršestar* ‘from the 73rd year’ as against the nominative phrase *eftavārdeš the oxtoto* ‘78th’ in the following example:

- (4) *eftavārdeš-trito beršestar dži eftavārdeš the oxtoto*
 seventy-third year.ABL until seventy and eighth
me od’a kerās buv’i (Uzhhr)
 I there do.IPF/POT.1SG work
 ‘Since 1973 (literally: 73rd year) till 1978 (literally: 78th), I worked there.’

The multiplicative numerals are marked by the suffix *-var*, which is etymologically related to the multiplicative connector *-vār-* in compounds of the decades ‘60’ to ‘90’ (see above), even though the two markers differ in their vowel quality, e.g. ‘once’ *jekh-var* (or *jekh-far* and rarely with no aspiration as *jek-var/jek-far*), ‘twice’ *du-var* (< **duj-var*), ‘ten times’ *deš-var*, ‘fifty times’ *penda-var*, etc. As a result of dissimilation in the forms that contain /r/ in the numeral root, the multiplicative marker has a phonologically conditioned allomorph *-val* in *tri-val* (< **trin-var*) ‘three times’, *štār-val* ‘four times’ and *ezer-val* ‘a thousand times’. Note that the locative-like form of the multiplicative numeral for ‘once’ *jekhvareste/jekhfareste* is used in the lexicalised meanings ‘at one time, all at once’ and ‘all of a sudden, suddenly’; see (9.2).

- (5) *me somas vaj jekvar či duvar,*
 I COP.PST.1SG or once whether twice
the buter na gej’lom (Per)
 and more NEG go.AOR.1SG
 ‘I have been [there] once or twice and haven’t gone [there] more.’

- (6) *ezerval* *leske phend'om* (Per)
 thousand_times he.DAT say.AOR.1SG
 'I have told him a thousand times.'

There are also multiplicatives of ordinal numerals in which the multiplicative suffix *-var* is attached to the ordinal numerals in their default nominative form in *-t-o*. These formations are used in a temporal meaning 'for the XY time', e.g. *dujtovar* 'for the second time', *tritovar* 'for the third time', etc. The expression 'for the first time' and 'for the last time' are, however, borrowed from Slavic. While 'for the first time' is expressed by a direct loanword *perširaz* (cf. dialectal East Slovak *perši raz*, Ukrainian *перший раз, першираз*), 'for the last time' is commonly *pos'edno raz* with the Romani adjective suffix *-o* in *pos'edn-o* (cf. Slovak *posledný raz*, Russian *последний раз*). Both *perširaz* and *pos'edno raz* contain the Slavic multiplicative marker *raz*. There is also a combination of this borrowed marker with the distributive adjective *sako* 'every', i.e. *sako raz* 'every time', which is a semi-calque of Slavic phrases, such as Slovak *každý raz*, Ukrainian *кожного разу* and Russian *каждый раз*.

- (7) *av* *dujto-var* *ade* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 come[IMP.2SG] second-MULTIPLICATIVE here
 'Come for the second time here.'
- (8) *kā* *tu* *dikh'l'al* *les* *pos'edno* *raz ?* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 where you see.AOR.2SG he.DAT last MULTIPLICATIVE
 'Where did you see him for the last time?'

8.1.3 Collective and distributive numerals

Collective and distributive numerals do not represent morphological categories in Eastern Uzh Romani. They are expressed in an analytical way by special particles modifying cardinal numeral phrases. The phrases with the distributive particle in particular are very common.

Collective numerals express a set or collection of all referents in a group. In Eastern Uzh Romani, they are attested only for the values of '2' and '3' and are indicated by the particle *so* preposed to the numeral phrase, e.g. *so duj phrala* 'both brothers', *so duj pindre* 'both feet', *so trin džane* 'all three persons'. It seems that *so* incorporates the plural article *o* since the oblique plural article usually turns up in the non-nominative phrases, e.g. *so le dujenca* INST 'with both', but phrases with no article also occur. Compare the following two examples:

- (9) *on zaprahinde so le duje grajen*
 they yoke.AOR.3PL COLL ART.OBL.PL two.OBL.PL horse.ACC.PL
aro verdan (Ser)^{LQCR}
 in carriage
 ‘They yoked both (of the) horses to the carriage.’
- (10) *zapravind’a so duje grajen pro verdan* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 yoke.AOR.3SG COLL two.OBL.PL horse.ACC.PL on carriage
 ‘He yoked both horses to the carriage.’

For the numbers above ‘3’, the universal determiner *savore* ‘all’ is normally employed, e.g. *savore štār phrala* ‘all four brothers’ (see 6.4.1).

The distributive numerals refer to an amount distributed in different time periods or recurrent in different groups of referents, such as ‘one by one, one at a time, one each’, etc. They are expressed by means of the Slavic-origin distributive particle *po*, e.g. *po jekh* ‘one each, one at a time’, *po duj* ‘two each, two at a time’, etc.

- (11) *po penda po šovārdeš rubli den* (Uzhhr)
 DISTR fifty DISTR sixty hryvnia(rouble).PL give.PRS.3PL
 ‘They give fifty sixty hryvnias (roubles) at a time.’
- (12) *hin tābora, kāj hin lenge*
 COP.PRS.3 settlement.PL REL COP.PRS.3 they.DAT
po duj šel berš (Per)
 DISTR two hundred year
 ‘There are [such] Romani settlements that are two hundred years old each.’
- (13) *o roma na keren duj trin val’ki,*
 ART Rom.PL NEG do.PRS.3PL two three adobe.PL
but val’ki keren, po deš ezera val’ki (Khu)
 many adobe.PL do.PRS.3PL DISTR ten thousand.PL adobe.PL
 ‘The Roma do not make two three adobe bricks, they make many adobe bricks, ten thousand adobe bricks at a time.’

8.2 Non-numerical quantifiers

In the following, I will deal with modifiers that express inexact quantities, i.e. non-numerical quantifiers. After a brief summary of interrogative and indefinite quantifiers, I will pay special attention to expressions of large and small quantities, i.e. to multal and paucal quantifiers

respectively, but various denominal, approximative and other quantifies will also be briefly mentioned. See also 7.4.1 for the deictic quantifier *ajci* ‘so much’.

8.2.1 Interrogative and indefinite quantifiers

Table 64 presents an overview of all interrogative and indefinite quantifiers in Eastern Uzh Romani.

Table 64: Interrogative and indefinite quantifiers

CATEGORY		FORM	MEANING
INTERROGATIVE	CARDINAL	<i>keci</i>	how much, how many
	ORDINAL	Uzhhorod, Perechyn <i>savo</i> Khudlovo, Serednie <i>soza</i>	how manieth, which in order
	MULTIPLICATIVE	<i>kecivar</i>	how many times
	DISTRIBUTIVE	<i>po keci</i>	how many each, how much at a time
INDEFINITE	SPECIFIC	<i>vajkeci</i>	several
	NEGATIVE	<i>ņikeci</i>	no number
	FREE-CHOICE	<i>xořkeci</i>	however much of, any number

The basic quantity interrogative is *keci* ‘how much, how many’, which also has a durative temporal meaning ‘(for) how long’ (see 6.2.2).

- (14) *keci terđol?* (common)
 how_much stand/cost.PRS.3SG
 ‘How much does it cost?’

The interrogative *keci* does not decline in the attributive position, but does so when it is substantivised, with the oblique stem *kecen-*, cf. *keci ovr-en-dar* [how_much hour-OBL.PL-ABL] as against *kec-en-dar* [how_much-OBL.PL-ABL] ‘at what time’.

While the multiplicative interrogative *keci-var* is regularly formed from *keci* by the multiplicative suffix *-var*, the ordinal interrogative ‘how manieth, which in order’ is expressed by the quality interrogative ‘(of) which (kind)’, i.e. by *savo* in Uzhhorod and Perechyn and *soza* in Khudlovo and Serednie (see 6.2.1.2 and 6.2.1.3 for more details). In contrast to some other Romani dialects, the marker of ordinal numerals *-t-* cannot be applied to the basic interrogative *keci* (**kecito*).

- (15) *kecivar* *šund'om,* *hoj* *sas* *ajse* *vipatki* (UzhhR)
 how_many_times hear.AOR.1SG FCOMP COP.PST.3 such accident.PL
 ‘How many times have I heard that there were such accidents.’
- (16) *savo* *adād'ive* *d'ives* ? (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 which today day
- (17) *savo* *adād'ive* *čislos* ? (UzhhS.Per)^{LQCR}
 which today date
- (18) *soz'* *adād'ive* *d'ives* ? (Khu)^{LQCR}
 which today day
- (19) *soz'* *adād'ive* *čislos* ? (Ser)^{LQCR}
 which today date
 ‘What day is it today.’ (Literally: ‘which day’ or ‘which date’)

The distributive interrogative is expressed regularly by the preposed distributive particle *po*.

All indefinite interrogatives are derived from *keci* through prefixation. While in the negative indefinite *ñi-keci* ‘no number, no amount’ and in the free-choice indefinite *xot'-keci* ‘any number, any amount’, the regular prefixes of negative and free-choice pronouns *ñi-* and *xot'-* occur (see 6.3.2 and 6.3.3.1), the specific indefinite *vaj-keci* ‘several’ contains a unique prefix *vaj-* instead of the prefix of specific indefinite pronouns *vare-*, e.g. *vajkeci cigarekl'i* ‘several cigarettes’, *vajkeci roma* ‘several Roma’, etc. (see 8.2.4 for *vaj* in the function of an approximative quantifier).

- (20) *mije* *xot'keci* (UzhhS)
 OPT.COP any_number
 ‘May it be any number.’
- (21) *ov* *mā* *čindo* *esas* *vajkeci* *ovri* (Per)^{LQCR}
 he already wet COP.PST.3 several hour.PL
 ‘He was wet no less than several hours.’

8.2.2 Multal quantifiers and intensifiers

Eastern Uzh Romani is quite homogenous with respect to the inventory of multal quantifiers, which express a large quantity. The adjectival multal quantifier that modifies nouns is invariably *but* ‘much, many’ of Indo-Aryan origin, e.g. *but thud* ‘much milk’, *but ovri* ‘many hours’, *but pāñi* ‘much water’.

- (22) *but roma pregejle ungvārate te dživen* (Per)
 many Rom.PL move.AOR.3PL Uzhhorod.LOC NCOMP live.INF
 ‘Many Roma moved to live in Uzhhorod.’

The basic adverbial multal quantifier is the Hungarian *igen* ‘very’, which may modify adjectives, e.g. *igen thuvli* F ‘very heavy’, verbs, *igen daravel* ‘is very jealous’, adverbs, *igen mišto* (*igen mištes*) ‘very well’, and even adjectival quantifiers, *igen but mas* ‘very much meat’. It may be reduplicated to intensify its meaning (25).

- (23) *od’a igen bāro pijacis* (UzhhR)
 there very big market
 ‘There is a very large market there.’

- (24) *ijdž igen šil sas* (UzhhR)
 yesterday very cold COP.PST.3
 ‘It was very cold yesterday.’

- (25) *adaj o roma čirla igen bedno dživnas,*
 here ART Rom.PL long_ago very poorly live.IPF/POT.3PL
igen igen bedno dživenas (Khu)
 very very poorly live.IPF/POT.3PL
 ‘Here, Roma lived in great poverty (literally: very poorly) in the past, in extreme poverty (literally: very very poorly).’

- (26) *ov igen nervāšno hino* (Ser)
 he very nervous COP.PRS.3SG.M
 ‘He is very nervous.’

- (27) *igen pal late kampil te dikhen* (Ser)
 very after she.LOC be_needed.PRS NCOMP look_at.INF
 ‘It is necessary to watch her a lot.’

The form *igen* often functions as a plain intensifier without indicating a large quantity, as in *igen frima pāni* ‘too little water’. Another intensifier is *fejs* in Uzhhorod and Perechyn and *fes* in Khudlovo and Serechnie (cf. Slovak colloquial *fest* ‘firmly, strongly’), which usually intensifies verbs (28) and only sporadically adjectives and adverbs, mainly in Khudlovo and Serechnie (30). Most often, *fejs/fes* co-occurs with *igen* in order to further intensify the meaning. In such a case, *fejs/fes* always follows *igen* and not vice versa, as in (29).

- (28) *fejs les demade* (UzhhR)
 very he.ACC hit.AOR.3PL
 ‘They hit him strongly’
- (29) *igen fejs khandel* (UzhhS)
 very very stink.PRS.3SG
 ‘S/he stinks really hard’
- (30) *kerades andre, fes kerades* (Ser)
 hot.ADV inside very hot.ADV
 ‘It’s hot inside, very hot.’

In contrast to North Central dialects of Slovakia, the plain multal quantifier *but* does not possess a temporal meaning. Still, it is contained in a temporal adverb *butālig* ‘for a long time’ (see 9.4.2), which is a semi-calque of Hungarian *sokáig* (< *sok* ‘much, many’).

Table 65: Multal quantifiers

	ADJECTIVAL QUANTIFIER	ADVERBIAL	
		QUANTIFIER	INTENSIFIER
PLAIN	<i>but</i>	<i>igen</i>	<i>(igen), fe(j)s</i>
INTENSIFICATION	<i>igen but</i>	<i>igen igen</i>	<i>igen fe(j)s</i>

Finally, there is a deadjectival multal quantifier used as a modifier of nouns in the meaning ‘full of, a lot of, plenty of’, viz. *pherdol/phērdo* (< ‘full’), e.g. *phērdo čhave* ‘lots of children’, *phērdo kašta* ‘loads of wood’, *phērdo texan* ‘plenty of foods’, etc.

- (31) *od’a xustoste hin phērdo vlaxi,* (UzhhR)
 there Khust.LOC COP.PRS.3 full Vlax.PL
 ‘There are a lot of Vlax Roma there in Khust.’
- (32) *les phērdo aro šejro džuva the likha* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 he.ACC full in head louse.PL and nit.PL
 ‘He has a head full of lice and nits.’

8.2.3 Paucal quantifiers

As for expressions of a small quantity, there is no syntactic distinction between adjectival and adverbial paucal quantifiers in Eastern Uzh Romani, but a semantic distinction between an absolute or definite amount of quantity (‘few, little’) and a relative or indefinite amount of quantity (‘a few, a little’).

The absolute/definite meaning ‘few, little’ is invariably expressed by *frima*, a grammaticalised loan from a Greek noun *θρόμια* ‘sliver, shard’:

(33) *povši abo frima abo but* (UzhhR)
 sand or little or much

‘Sand is either little or a lot.’

(34) *čapate frima roma* (UzhhS)
 Chop.LOC few Rom.PL

‘In Chop there are few Roma.’

(35) *roma but ade, a khera frima* (Per)
 Rom.PL many here and/but house.PL few

‘The Roma are many here, while the houses are few.’

(36) *le romeske kila mas frima* (Ser)
 ART Rom.DAT kilogram meat little

‘For a Rom, one kilogram meat is few.’

The relative/indefinite paucal meaning ‘a few, a little’ may be expressed by several forms, among which one non-borrowed form and two loanwords can be found. The non-borrowed paucal quantifier is *jekhnaj*, which is used by some speakers in Uzhhorod and is shared with some Western Uzh Romani dialects and with Central Romani dialects of Ukrainian Galicia. It has developed through grammaticalisation of a noun phrase *jekh naj* ‘one fingernail’ (cf. Elšík 2014).¹²⁰ The quantifier has a diminutive derivation *jekhnajōro* ‘a little bit’ marked by the oikoclitic diminutive suffix *-ōr-* (see 4.2.1.1 and 5.2.1.1); see example (47) below, which shows *jekhnajōro* in the function of a verb modifier.

(37) *vareko thovel andre jekhnaj riškāša* (UzhhR)
 someone put.PRS.3SG inside a_bit rice

‘Someone adds some rice.’ (Literally: ‘a bit rice’)

(38) *me kamav jekhnaj terneder t’ ejn* (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 I want.PRS.1SG a_bit young.COMPR NCOMP COP.INF

‘I want to be a bit younger.’

¹²⁰ Note that *jekhnaj* maintains the aspiration of the *jekh* element, which confirms the status of *jekhnaj* as a single word since aspiration is kept in the preconsonantal position word-internally but often deleted in the attributive position (*jek naj*).

The most common relative/indefinite paucal quantifier throughout the dialect region is *kapka* or else its nominal diminutive derivation *kapkica* ‘a wee bit, a little bit’ (see 4.2.1.2). The quantifier *kapka*, shared with Western Uzh and some Southern Zemplín Romani dialects, is a form grammaticalised from the West Slavic noun for ‘drop’: cf. Czech *kapka*, Slovak *kvapka*, dialectal *kapka* ‘drop’.

- (39) *vareko kapka dikhel, a vareko vobec*
 someone a_little see.PRS.3SG and/but someone not_at_all
na dikhel (UzhhR)
 NEG see.PRS.3SG
 ‘Someone sees a little, while someone doesn’t see at all.’
- (40) *sako kamel kapka feder te dživen* (UzhhR)
 every want.PRS.3SG a_little better NCOMP live.INF
 ‘Everyone wants to live a bit better.’
- (41) *hin tut kapka lovōre* (Khu)
 COP.PRS.3 you.ACC a_little money.DIM
 ‘You have a little money.’
- (42) *oj mange kapka pomožinlas* (Khu)
 she I.DAT a_little help.IPF/POT.3SG
 ‘She was helping me a bit.’
- (43) *lenca man kapk-ica hin problēma* (Ser)
 they.INST I.ACC a_little-DIM COP.PRS.3 problem
 ‘I have a problem with them a little bit.’

The other borrowed paucal quantifier is *čut’čut’* of Russian origin (*чуть-чуть*). Cf. example (44) with that in (38) above.

- (44) *me kaml’omas čut’čut’ terneder t’ ejn* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 I want.IRR.1SG a_bit young.COMPR NCOMP COP.INF
 ‘I would like to be a bit younger.’
- (45) *ta tav kāvejos čut’čut’* (UzhhS)
 so cook[IMP.2SG] coffee a_bit
 ‘So make some coffee’.
- (46) *čut’čut’ xovel’i menk labol* (Khu)
 a_bit coal still burn.PRS.3SG
 ‘Some live coals still burn.’

In contrast to the plain multal quantifiers, the relative paucal quantifiers are commonly used in a temporal meaning to indicate a small amount of time, as in:

- (47) *užar jekhnaj-ōro, hā?* (UzhhS)
 wait[IMP.2SG] a_little-DIM yes
 ‘Wait a little while, okay?’

Table 66 summarises the paucal quantifiers in Eastern Uzh Romani.

Table 66: Paucal quantifiers

MEANING	PLAIN FORM	DIMINUTIVE	DISTRIBUTION
absolute (‘few, little’)	<i>frima</i>	–	common
relative (‘a bit, a few, a little’)	<i>jekhnaj</i>	<i>jekhnajōro</i>	only Uzhhorod
	<i>kapka</i>	<i>kapkica</i>	common
	<i>čuičut’</i>	–	common

8.2.4 Other quantifiers

Other quantifiers comprise numerous nouns that are syntactically used as attributive modifiers of other nouns. They commonly refer to various containers or to pieces, such as *govno* ‘sack’, as in *jek govno āro* ‘one sack of flour’, *kotor* ‘piece, slice’, as in *kotor māro* ‘a slice of bread’, *caklos* ‘bottle’ (perhaps from Serbo-Croatian *staklo* ‘glass’), as in *jek caklos pivos* ‘one bottle of beer’, *pačka* ‘packet’ (from Russian/Ukrainian *пачка*), as in *duj pački cigarekl’i* ‘two packets of cigarettes’, *pohāris* ‘(drinking) glass’ (from Hungarian or Slovak *pohár*), as in *pohāris thud* ‘a glass of milk’, *tāška* ‘bag’ (from Hungarian *táska*), as in *jek tāška somnak(aj)* ‘one bag of gold’, etc.

The approximative quantifier that is used as a modifier of numeral phrases (‘about, approximately, circa’) is *vaj*, e.g. *vaj duj d’ives* ‘about two days’, *vaj penda romenca* ‘with about fifty Roma’. It is borrowed from the Hungarian *vagy* and is identical to the disjunctive coordinator *vaj* ‘or’ (see 13.5.2).

- (48) *lake sas vaj biš, kana ov muv’la* (Per)
 she.DAT COP.PST.3 about/or twenty when he die.AOR.3SG
 ‘She was around twenty years old when he died.’

Diverse forms exist for the approximative modifier of verbs and nouns ('almost, nearly'). The most common ones are related to the Hungarian *majdnem* (*majd* + NEG *nem*) 'almost' and in Eastern Uzh Romani have the following forms: *majnem*, *majna*, *najma* and *vajna*. The form *majnem*, common in both Uzhhorod varieties (49), is a direct loanword from Hungarian, while *majna*, attested in Uzhhorod and Khudlovo (50), is a semi-calque containing the Romani negator *na* instead of the Hungarian *nem*. Another form *najma* is a metathetic form of *majna*, while *vajna* differs from *majna* in having the initial fricative consonant instead of the nasal; both *najma* and *vajna* occur in Shakhta (51). Less common forms for 'almost' are East Slavic loanwords, viz. *počt'í* from Russian *почту* (52) and *majže* from Ukrainian *майже*. The latter form is in all varieties attested as a modifier of adverbial phrases, e.g. *majže jejva* 'almost gratis'. In Serednie and Perechyn, *čut'* 'barely, hardly' (cf. Russian *чуть*), accompanied by the verb negator, commonly occurs as a verb modifier 'almost' (53).

- (49) *majnem zvisal'ila* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 almost faint.AOR.3SG
 'S/he almost fainted.'
- (50) *tu man majna tejle lemad'al* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 you I.ACC almost down hit.AOR.2SG
 'You almost knocked me.'
- (51) *oj najma pej'la* (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 she almost fall.AOR.3SG
 'She almost falled.'
- (52) *počt'í berš paž mande sas* (Per)
 almost year beside I.LOC COP.PST.3
 'S/he was at my place for almost a year.'
- (53) *čut' na muvl'as* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 barely NEG die.AOR.3SG
 'S/he almost died.'

There are a number of other borrowed quantifiers of mostly Slavic origin, such as *dosta* 'enough, sufficiently', e.g. *dosta lovve* 'enough money', *pāru*, Serednie *pāra*, 'a couple of' (cf. dial. Ukrainian *napy*, Russian, Ukrainian *napa*, ACC *napy*), e.g. *pāru d'ives*, Serednie *pāra d'ives* 'a couple of days', *pāru štuk* 'some pieces' (East Slavic *napy umyk*), e.g. *pāru štuk cigarekl'i* 'several cigarettes', etc.

In Khudlovo and Sereďnie, the adverbial quantifier *nemigen* ‘not so much’, consisting of the Hungarian negator *nem* plus the intensifier *igen*, is common as a modifier of adjectives, adverbs and verbs, e.g. *nemigen dilino* ‘not so much silly’ and see also (54). In both Uzhhorod varieties and in Perechyn, the semi-calque *na igen* occurs instead, as in (55) and (56).

- (54) *od'a rusika nemigen džanen* (Ser)
 there Russian.ADV not_so_much know.PRS.3PL
 ‘There they don’t know Russian (or: East Slavic) so well.’
- (55) *adā na igen mišto* (UzhhR)
 this NEG very well
 ‘This is not so much good.’
- (56) *kajse xolovva pārne na igen kamen te len* (Per)
 such.SPEC trousers.PL white NEG very want.PRS.3PL NCOMP take.INF
 ‘They don’t want to take such white trousers [like these ones] so much.’

The word for ‘completely, entirely’ is either *calkom* (cf. dialectal Slovak *calkom*), e.g. *calkom dilino* ‘completely silly’, or *pólnošt’u* from Russian *полностью*. In Radvanka, *egisen*, from Hungarian *egészen*, is also used.

9 ADVERBS AND PARTICLES

This chapter provides an overview of some adverbs and particles. The morphology of adverbs is mainly discussed in relation to deadjectival adverbs, while adverbs of manner, place and time and phasal adverbs are introduced as distinct semantic categories. The final subchapter on particles deals with focus and terminative particles, plus with various utterance expressions. For various deictic adverbs, including location and temporal deictics, see chapter 7.

9.1 Deadjectival adverbs

Adverbs can be formed from adjectives by suffixes to be discussed in the following sections. The bases of such derived adverbs may be either inherited adjectives or adjectives borrowed from Slavic languages. Adverbs based on the Hungarian-origin adjectives are represented by direct Hungarian loans, such as *bistošan* ‘certainly’ < Hungarian *biztosan*, *hirtelen* ‘suddenly’ < Hungarian *hirtelen*, *ritkán* ‘rarely’ < Hungarian *ritkán*, etc.

9.1.1 Adverbs in (-on)-es

The inherited and most common suffix of deadjectival adverbs is *-es*, at least in Uzhhorod and Perechyn, from which most of the data presented in this section come. The suffix *-es* is homophonous with the OBL.SG.M suffix of nouns, and therefore, deadjectival adverbs are homophonous with accusative forms of substantivised adjectives, e.g. adjective *kerad-o* ‘hot’ > adverb *kerad-es* ‘hot’, *phār-o* ‘hard, heavy’ > *phār-es* ‘hard, with difficulty; sadly’, *šukār* ‘beautiful’ > *šukār-es* ‘beautifully’, *uvč-o* ‘high’ > *uvč-es* ‘high’ (adverb), *žuvž-o* ‘clean, pure’ > *žuvž-es* ‘cleanly, purely’, etc. Adverbs in *-es* may also be formed from derived oikoclitic adjectives, such as *džung-āl-o* ‘ugly, obscene’ > *džung-āl-es* ‘in an ugly manner, obscenely’, *gādž-ikan-o* ‘relating to non-Roma’ > *gādž-ikan-es* ‘in a non-Romani manner (or language)’, *rom-an-o* ‘Romani, Gypsy’ > *rom-an-es* ‘in (a) Romani (manner)’ (or *rom-adun-o* > *rom-adun-es* in Radvanka), including from the diminutive adjectives in *-ōr-*, such as *žuvž-ōr-o*, the diminutive of *žuvžo*, > *žuvž-ōr-es* ‘in a pretty clean manner’.

Adverbs derived from Slavic-origin adjectives insert an extension *-on-* between the borrowed base and the adverbial suffix, as in *cix-o* ‘silent’ > *cix-on-es* ‘silently’, *čast-o* adjective ‘often’ > *čast-on-es* adverb ‘often’, *kul'turn-o* ‘cultured, polite’ > *kul'turn-on-es* ‘politely’, *podl-o* ‘bad, evil’ > *podl-on-es* ‘badly, meanly’, *slab-o* ‘weak’ > *slab-on-es* ‘weakly’, *strašn-o* ‘awful, terrible’ > *strašn-on-es* ‘awfully, horribly’, *tuň-o* ‘cheap’ >

tuň-on-es ‘cheaply’, *zdrav-o* ‘healthy’ > *zdrav-on-es* ‘healthily’, etc. Some adverbs based on borrowed bases lack an adjective counterpart (or the counterpart is unattested), e.g. *pejš-on-es* ‘on foot’ (cf. Slovak *pešo* ‘on foot’) and *točn-on-es* ‘exactly, certainly, definitely’ (alongside the non-integrated form *točno*; cf. East Slavic *точно*). Diminutive adverbs with borrowed bases contain the extension *-on-* between the base and the diminutive suffix, as in *cix-on-ōr-es* ‘in a pretty silent manner’ (diminutive adjective *cixōro*).

The extension *-on-* is optionally attested even in adverbs derived from some inherited adjectives, e.g. *bang-o* ‘lame’ > *bang-on-es* ‘lamely’ alongside *bang-es*, and in particular in adverbs derived from some multisyllabic bases, such as *barval-o* ‘rich, wealthy’ > *barval-on-es* ‘wealthily’ alongside *barval-es*, *dilin-o* ‘foolish, silly’ > Uzhhorod *dilin-on-es* ‘foolishly, in a silly manner’ (no **dilin-es*), *mel-al-o* ‘dirty’ > *melal-on-es* ‘in a dirty manner’ alongside *melal-es*. With the exception of *šukār* (see above), *-on-* is also contained in adverbs derived from zero adjectives, such as *god’aver* ‘clever, wise’ > *god’aver-on-es* ‘cleverly, wisely’, *kuč* ‘expensive’ > *kuč-on-es* ‘expensively’. In Uzhhorod, an adverb derived from *xol’ame(n)* ‘angry’ is attested, viz. *xol’amen-on-es* in Shakhta and *xol’am-on-es* in Radvanka.

Some deadjectival derivations are blocked because of presence of a suppletive adverb. The adverbial counterpart to *lāčho* ‘good’ is *mišto* or *mište(s)* ‘well’ instead of the regularly derived **lāches*, which is considered ungrammatical by speakers (similarly: *nalāčho* ‘bad’ > *namišto/namište(s)* ‘wrong’). In other cases, a source adjective has been lost or changed its morphosyntactic properties. The adverb *čāčes* ‘truly, really, indeed’ is obviously derived from *čāčo*, but the latter form is attested only as a noun ‘truth’, and the corresponding adjective is *čāčuno* or *čāčutno* ‘true, real’ (see 5.2.2.3 and 5.2.2.5). An interesting feature is the presence of three adverbs that express the meaning ‘slowly’ and a different semantic range of each of them: (i) *lovkes*, which primarily means ‘easily’ and ‘lightly’ (from *lovko* ‘easy, light’), (ii) *polovkes* with an additional element *po-*, the most common adverb for ‘slowly’, which appears to be formally influenced by Slavic adverbs of the type *pomaly*, *pomaluu*, and (iii) *cixones*, whose primary meaning is ‘silently’ (see above) but is also used in the meaning ‘slowly’.

In Khudlovo and Serednie, deadjectival adverbs in *-es* are less frequent than in Uzhhorod and Perechyn as they compete with adverbs derived by another suffix *-ān* (see the next section). Still, only the suffix *-es* is found with multisyllabic and complex bases in Khudlovo and Serednie, such as *dilinal-es* ‘foolishly, in a silly manner’, *fovrot’ikan-es* ‘in Uzhhorod manner, in the Romani speech of Uzhhorod’, the aforementioned forms *cixonōres*

(‘slowly’), *gādžikan-es*, *god’aver-on-es*, *kerad-es*, *pejš-on-es*, *roman-es*, *šukār-es*, etc. The suffix *-es* in Khudlovo and Serednie also derives adverbs from monosyllabic bases that contain the open vowel /ā/, such as *čāč-es* and *phār-es* (see the next section).

9.1.2 Adverbs in *-ān*

The productive suffix of deadjectival adverbs in Khudlovo and Serednie is *-ān*, which is of Hungarian origin. The suffix must have been initially introduced via direct Hungarian loan adverbs, such as *ritkān* ‘rarely’ from Hungarian *ritkán*. Later, it was extracted from the Hungarian loans to other bases and became the productive adverbial marker. Thus, most adverbs in *-ān* in Khudlovo and Serednie contain Slavic bases, including the most recent East Slavic bases, e.g. *bistr-ān* ‘fast’ (cf. Russian *быстро*), *cix-ān* ‘silently’ (cf. East Slovak, Polish *cicho*), *čast-ān* ‘often’ (common Slavic *často*), *kuľturn-ān* ‘decently, politely’ (Russian/Ukrainian *культурно*), *podl-ān* ‘badly’ (Slovak *podlo*, Russian *подло*), *pozn-ān* ‘late’ (Russian *поздно*, Ukrainian *пізно*), *prost-ān* ‘simply’ (common Slavic *prosto*), *resk-ān* ‘abruptly, suddenly’ (Russian *резко*), *točn-ān* ‘exactly; certainly, definitely’ (Russian/Ukrainian *точно*), *tuň-ān* ‘cheaply’ (East Slovak adjective *tuňi* ‘cheap’, also in dialectal Ukrainian), etc.

The suffix also occurs with some inherited bases instead of *-es* in Uzhhorod and Perechyn, e.g. *čōr-ān* ‘poorly’, *lovk-ān* ‘easily, lightly’, *polovk-ān* ‘slowly’, *uvč-ān* ‘high’, etc. However, it does not occur with bases that contain the long vowel /ā/ (see above), , perhaps due to a dissimilatory tendency to prevent occurrence of the open vowel in two consecutive syllables (*phār-es* ‘hard’, never **phār-ān*).

Based on the available data, the Khudlovo variety has some conservative adverbs in *(-on)-es* instead of the forms in *-ān* attested in Serednie, e.g. *strašnon-es* ‘terribly’ and *žuvž-es* ‘cleanly’ in Khudlovo as against *strašnān* and *žuvžān* in Serednie. It indicates that the development of the adverbial suffix *-ān* may be an innovation with its centre in Serednie and gradually diffuses into neighbouring Khudlovo. In Uzhhorod and Perechyn, the only adverbs in *-ān* are the direct Hungarian loans, such as *ritkān* ‘rarely’.

9.1.3 Language adverbs in *-ik-a*

Adverbs derived from the xenoclitic relational adjectives of ethnic names in *-ik-* (see 5.2.3.1) are marked by the suffix *-a*. Such adverbs usually refer to the language spoken by the given group of people, modifying verbs of speaking, knowing and understanding, e.g. *čex-ik-a* ‘in Czech or Slovak’, *močār-ik-a* ‘in the Romani variety of Mocharika Roma’ (i.e. in Shakhta Romani), *ňemc-ik-a* ‘in German’, *rus-ik-a* ‘in East Slavic or Russian’, *slovāk-ik-a* (or *slovāt-*

ik-a) ‘in Slovak’, *ukrajinc-ik-a* ‘in Ukrainian’, *ungr-ik-a* ‘in Hungarian’, *vlast-ik-a* ‘in Vlax Romani (or in a foreign Romani dialect in general)’, etc.

9.2 Adverbs of manner

Adverbs of manner modify verbs to provide a description how an action or event takes place, i.e. they form adverbial counterparts to the manner interrogative *sar* ‘how’. Many deadjectival adverbs in *(-on)-es* and *-ān*, as well as the language adverbs in *-ik-a*, fulfil this function:

- (1) *mā'arkutn-on-es* *dživen* (Uzhhs)
 drunkard-EXT-ADV live.PRS.3PL
 ‘They live as drunkards.’
- (2) *amen tože džanas ungrik-a* (Khu)
 we also know.PRS.1PL Hungarian-ADV
 ‘We also know [how to speak] in Hungarian.’
- (3) *kola čirikle igen fes uvč-ān lecinen* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 DEM.SPEC.PL bird.PL very very high-ADV fly.PRS.3PL
 ‘Those birds fly so high.’

Apart from these productive derivations, there are a number of primary (underived) adverbs and a number of secondary adverbs that are derived by unproductive suffixes. The following paragraphs provide an overview of several most common adverbs of manner.

The adverbial expression ‘well’ is *mišto*, *mištes* or *mište*, whose different final segments are idiolectal rather than dialectal variants.

The basic adverb for ‘quickly, fast’ is *sig* (also *sigo* in Khudlovo and Serednie), which also has a temporal meaning ‘soon’ (see 9.4.2 below). In addition to this inherited adverb, some borrowed forms are commonly used in particular in commands. In Khudlovo and Serednie, a combination of the two lowest numerals *jek duj* ‘one two’ occurs as an approximate calque of the local Slavic *raz dva*, literally ‘once two’, in the meaning ‘quickly, as soon as possible’ (4), while the direct loanword is common in Uzhhorod and Perechyn (5). Other borrowed adverbs with a similar function are *bistrān* in Serednie (cf. Russian *быстро*) and *bihóm* in Perechyn (cf. Ukrainian *бігом*, literally ‘by running’).

- (4) *jek duj tut kide* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 one two you.ACC gather/clothe.IMP.2SG
 ‘Get dressed as soon as possible.’

- (5) *lidža les kode raz dva* (UzhhS)
 carry[IMP.2SG] he.ACC there.SPEC quickly
 ‘Carry him there quickly.’

The meanings ‘gratis, free of charge’ and ‘in vain’ are expressed by a monomorphemic adverb *jejva* (in Radvanka also attested as *jevalo* from a single speaker), which is probably cognate with Vlach *ivja* (cf. Boretzky and Igla 2004: 207). The form *jejva* is also part of a special adverbial form *jejavalo* ‘gratuitously, for no reason’, which is noteworthy for its suffix *-valo* unattested in another adverb. The development of *-valo* in *jejavalo* is not clear, but it might be related to the Hungarian suffix *-való* in *hiáavaló* ‘useless, futile’ (cf. Hungarian *hiába* ‘in vain’).

- (6) *cind’a tuñān, majže jejva* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 buy.AOR.3SG cheap.ADV almost gratis
 ‘He bought [it] cheaply, almost gratis.’
- (7) *tu jejva viskines, ňiko tut na sājinel* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 you gratis lament/call.PRS.2SG nobody you.ACC NEG feel_sorry.PRS.3SG
 ‘You lament in vain, nobody feels sorry for you.’
- (8) *mārde les jejavalo* (Ser)
 beat.AOR.3PL he.ACC gratuitously
 ‘They beat him for no reason’.

The expression for ‘together’ occurs as an adverbialised prepositional phrase *andre jek* (*are jek*) ‘in one’, with the inessive preposition *andre* (*are*) (see 11.2.1.1) plus the numeral *jek(h)* ‘one’. This replicates the Hungarian adverb *egy-ütt*, historically ‘in one’, but note that similar formations are also described for some Slavic dialects of the area (cf. *дoвeднa*, *вeднo* mentioned by Pugh 2009: 174). A reflex of Proto-Romani **jekhe-thane* (see Boretzky and Igla 2004: 205) is not present in Eastern Uzh Romani.

- (9) *ke vojna are jek dživnas savore* (Ser)
 at/to war in one live.IPF/POT.3PL all.PL
 ‘Until the war, they all lived together.’

There are special adverbs *pindral* and *šerand*, which are used as modifiers of the verb *sov-* ‘to sleep’ to provide meanings ‘to sleep against each other’ and ‘to sleep head by head’ respectively.¹²¹ The form *pindral* contains the unproductive, ‘old ablative’ suffix *-al* (9.3.2), which is also contained in another adverb of manner *čovral* ‘secretly, stealthily’, perhaps from the old noun **čor* ‘thief’.

- (10) *me āke kade sovav,*
 I right_here here.SPEC sleep.PRS.1SG
a tu kode pindral (UzhhS)
 and/but you there foot.ADV
 ‘I will sleep right here, and you will sleep over there against me (= with your head next to my feet).’
- (11) *on pen stričinnas čovral* (Khu)
 they REFL.PLmeet.IPF/POT.3PL secretly
 ‘They were meeting secretly.’

Some forms marked by the ‘locative’ suffix *-te*, which has lost its productivity in nouns (see 4.1.3 and 11.1.1.6), can also be classified as derived adverbs of manner. They comprise *bokh-a-te* [hunger-OBL.SG.F-LOC] in Shakhta, which is used with the verb *mer-* ‘to die’ in the meaning ‘to die of hunger, to starve’, and common *jekhvar-es-te* (or *jekhfars-es-te*) [once-OBL.SG.M-LOC], which express the meanings ‘all of a sudden, suddenly’ (13) and ‘at one time, all at once’ (14).

- (12) *bokhate meras* (UzhhS)
 hunger.LOC die.PRS.1PL
 ‘We are starving.’
- (13) *ov jekhvareste ušil’a a gejl’a het* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 he once.LOC stand_up.AOR.3SG and/but go.AOR.3SG away
 ‘He suddenly stood up and left.’
- (14) *odā menk but kampil te pisinēn,* (Per)
 DEM still much be_needed.PRS NCOMP write.INF
jekhvareste na pisinav
 once.LOC NEG write.PRS.1SG
 ‘Much still needs to be written, [as] I don’t write [it] all at once.’

¹²¹ The form *šerand* is also used as a noun ‘head-site’.

Finally, there are numerous borrowed adverbs of manner, such as *direk* ‘for the sake of appearance, feignedly, pretendedly’ (**kamukeri* and the like is absent), *doholu* ‘until bare/naked’, *našil’u* ‘impudently, cheekily’, *verxóm* ‘on horseback’, *piškóm* ‘on foot’, *lično* ‘personally’, and many others. The North Slavic adverb *ledva* ‘hardly, barely’, or its variant *l’edu*, sometimes in an echo formation *l’edu bidu* known from East Slovak dialects, is common with the verb *užar-* ‘to wait’ in expressing the meaning ‘to look forward’ (15). However, it may modify any verb to express difficultness of an action and may even be reduplicated for further emphasis (16).

- (15) *l’edu užarav, hoj kana aveha* (UzhhS)
 hardly wait.PRS.1SG FCOMP when come.FUT.2SG
 ‘I am looking forward to your arrival.’ (Literally: ‘I hardly wait when you come.’)
- (16) *l’edu l’edu l’edu bidu varesar zasuv’al* (UzhhS)
 hardly hardly very_hardly somehow fall_asleep.AOR.2SG
 ‘You somehow fell asleep with great difficulties.’

9.3 Adverbs of place

In this section, one-word adverbial expressions of place are described. In addition to the basic non-borrowed spatial adverbs, some denominal and borrowed adverbs are also discussed. Deictic expressions, such as those meaning ‘here’ and ‘there’, are dealt with in the chapter on demonstratives in 7.2.2.

9.3.1 Basic spatial adverbs

The basic spatial adverbs are classified according to two dimensions: the value of localisation (such as the inessive value in ‘inside’, the extraessive one in ‘outside’, etc.) and the value of orientation (stative ‘inside’, directive ‘inwards’, separative ‘from inside’ and perlative ‘through inside’). The terminological categorisation follows that of Elšík and Matras (2006: 239–242 and elsewhere).

As in the reconstructed Late Proto-Romani system (Elšík and Matras 2006: 242), there is no distinction between the stative (local) and directive (allative) spatial adverbs. In contrast, the separative (ablative) and perlative spatial adverbs have distinct forms; see Table 67.

Table 67: Spatial adverbs

MEANING	STATIVE/ DIRECTIVE (‘in/to’)	SEPARATIVE (‘from’)	PERLATIVE (‘through’)
INESSIVE ‘inside’	<i>andre</i>	<i>andral</i> <i>andruneſtar</i>	<i>andruneha</i>
EXTRAESSIVE ‘outside’	<i>avri</i>	<i>avral</i> <i>avrunestar</i>	<i>avruneha</i>
SUPERIOR ‘above’	<i>opre</i>	<i>opruneſtar</i>	<i>opruneha</i>
INFERIOR ‘below’	<i>tejle</i>	<i>teluneſtar</i>	<i>teluneha</i>
ANTERIOR ‘the front’	<i>anglal</i>	<i>angluneſtar</i>	<i>angluneha</i>
POSTERIOR ‘the back’	<i>palal</i>	<i>paluneſtar</i>	<i>paluneha</i>
MEDIAL ‘the middle’	<i>maškāral</i> (<i>andro/pro maſkar</i>)	<i>maſkaruneſtar</i> (<i>andal o maſkar</i>)	<i>maſkaruneha</i>
PROXIMATE ‘nearby’	<i>pāšes</i>	<i>pāšuneſtar</i>	N/A
DISTANT ‘faraway’	<i>du(v)r</i>	<i>duraleſtar</i>	N/A

From a historical viewpoint, the most obvious difference of the Eastern Uzh Romani system from that reconstructed for Late Proto-Romani is a striking retreat of the former separative spatial adverbs in *-al*. While some of the adverbs in *-al* have shifted from the separative function to the stative/directive one, e.g. *anglal* ‘in/to the front’ < *‘from the front’, some others have been maintained as obsolete forms used alongside newer forms, e.g. *andral* ‘from inside’. The majority of the separative spatial adverbs in all Eastern Uzh varieties are homophonous with the ablative forms of substantivised adjectives, e.g. *andruno* ‘inner’ > ABL.SG *andruneſtar* ‘from the inner one; from inside’. In a similar manner, perlative adverbs are regular instrumental forms of adjectives, e.g. *andruneha* ‘through the inner one; through inside’. However, the base of certain separative adverbs is different from that of the regular deadverbial adjectives. The proximate adverb *pāšuneſtar* ‘from nearby’ displays the suffix *-un-* identical to that of other separative adverbs, but one that is different from the derivational stem *-utn-* in the corresponding adjective *pāšutno* ‘close, proximate’. Another peculiar separative adverb is *duraleſtar* ‘from far away’ with a base *dural-*, which can also be

found in a genitive-like adjective *duraleskero* ‘far, distant, remote’ (*dur* or *duvr* [du:r]).

- (17) *on avri* (common)^{LQCR}
they outside
‘They are outside.’
- (18) *me av’om avrunestar* (common)^{LQCR}
I come.AOR.1SG from_outside
‘I have come from outside.’
- (19) *odej palal calkom, paž o pāñi,*
there in/to_the_back totally beside ART water
odej sas tāboris (UzhR)
there COP.PST.3 settlement
‘There, totally in the back, by the river, there was a Romani settlement.’
- (20) *phenav tuke, thov anglal odā,*
tell.PRS.1SG you.DAT put[IMP.2SG] in/to_the_front DEM
a na palal (UzhR)^{LQCR}
and/but NEG in/to_the_back
‘I tell you, put it to the front and not to the back.’
- (21) *khatar te den, paluneha ?* (UzhS)
which_way NCOMP give.INF through_the_back
‘Which way should I give [it to you] – through the back?’
- (22) *palunestar sar pes cirdelas opre pre drabina(Ser)^{Rdž}*
from_the_back how REFL pull.IPF/POT.3SG above on ladder
‘From the back, when he was climbing up the ladder.’
- (23) *mijro džamutro dživel pāšes* (UzhS)^{LQCR}
my son_in_law live.PRS.3SG nearby
‘My son-in-law lives nearby.’
- (24) *dik kadā pāšunestar* (UzhS)^{LQCR}
see[IMP.2SG] this.SPEC from_nearby
‘Look at this from nearby.’
- (25) *the one od’a opre dživen* (Per)
also they there above live.PRS.3PL
‘They, too, live there above.’
- (26) *me denaš’om oprunestar* (Per)^{LQCR}
I run.AOR.1SG from_above
‘I ran from above.’

- (27) *me dživās duvr adārik* (Per)^{LQCR}
 I live.IPF/POT.1SG far_away from_here
 ‘I lived far away from here.’
- (28) *duralestar šunelas, hoj oj ričinel* (Per)
 from_far_away hear.IPF/POT.3SG FCOMP she scream.PRS.3SG
 ‘S/he heard from far away that she was screaming.’
- (29) *andre xaha či avri?* (Ser)
 inside eat.FUT.2SG whether outside
 ‘Will you eat inside or outside?’

While there are no cross-dialectal differences in most spatial adverbs, the medial series seems to be subject to such differences. The one-word adverb *maškāral* ‘in/to the middle’ is common in the data from Perechyn, Khudlovo and Serednie, but in both Uzhhorod varieties, prepositional phrases *andro maškar* and *pro maškar* are used instead. Similarly, the separative adverb ‘from the middle’ occurs as an ablative prepositional phrase *andal o maškar* in Uzhhorod instead of the one-word ablative form *maškarunestar* in the other varieties, where the prepositional phrase is rare.

- (30) *ov bešļa maškāral* (Per.Ser)^{LQCR}
 he sit.AOR.3SG in_the_middle
 ‘He sat in the middle.’
- (31) *ov il’a peske avri jek kārta maškarunestar* (Per)^{LQCR}
 he take.AOR.3SG REFL.DAT out one card from_the_middle
 ‘He took out a single card from the middle.’

as against:

- (32) *ov bešļa andro maškar* (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 he sit.AOR.3SG in middle
 ‘He sat in the middle.’
- (33) *ov peske il’a jek kārta andal o maškar* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 he REFL.DAT take.AOR.3SG one card out_of ART middle
 ‘He took a single card from the middle.’

For comparison of spatial adverbs, see 10.1, for the function of spatial adverbs as verb modifiers, see 12.3.5.

9.3.2 Denominal adverbs of place

The most common adverbs of place that are derived from inherited nominal roots are those based on *kher* ‘house’: stative-directive *khejre* ‘(at) home, homewards’ and separative *khejral* (rarer) or *kherunestar* (more common) ‘from home’. Both forms *khejre* and *khejral* contain the lengthened (diphthongised) root vowel and the ‘old’ locative and ablative suffixes of Middle Indo-Aryan origin *-e* and *-al* respectively. The other separative adverb *kherunestar* is analogical to the ablative-like separative spatial adverbs of the type *andrunestar* (see above). Note that *kherunestar* looks as if derived from an underlying adjective **kheruno* (like *andruno* ‘inner’ > *andrunestar* ‘from inside’), but the regular denominal adjective derived from *kher* is *kherutno* ‘domestic, home-made’ with a different adjective suffix *-utn-* (see 5.2.2.5).

- (34) *mijre čhavōre khejre meren are bokh* (Khu)
 my child.DIM.PL home die.PRS.3PL in hunger
 ‘My children are starving at home.’
- (35) *oj mā na gejla peskere phraleha khejre* (Khu)
 she already NEG go.AOR.3SG REFL.GEN brother.INST home
 ‘She didn’t go home with her brother any longer.’
- (36) *dešušov berš lake sas,*
 sixteen year she.DAT COP.PST.3
kana denašla kherunestar (Khu)^{LQCR}
 when run.AOR.3SG from_home
 ‘She was sixteen years old when she ran away from home.’

Another denominal adverb *āgoral* from the noun *āgor* ‘end’ is used in a stative-directive meaning ‘on the edge’.

- (37) *beš kade āgor-al* (UzhhS)
 sit[IMP.2SG] here.SPEC edge-ADV
 ‘Sit down here on the edge (of a bed, armchair, etc).’

9.3.3 Borrowed adverbs of place

Apart from inherited forms, there are various borrowed adverbs of place that do not form systematic paradigms of orientation categories (stative/directive – separative – perlativ).

The Hungarian-origin adverbs with a spatial meaning are *sembe* (Hungarian *szembe*) ‘opposite, in one’s direction’ and *vijgik* (Hungarian *végig*) ‘up to the very end’, which is also used in the meaning ‘everywhere’ (see 6.4.3).

- (38) *phuter o vudar avka vijgik* (Per)
 open[IMP.2SG] ART door thus up_to_the_end
 ‘Open the door wide.’ (literally ‘Open the door in such a way up to the end.’)

Common Slavic-origin spatial adverbs include circumlative *kruhom* ‘around (half-way)’, from the Slavic instrumental form of *kruh* ‘circle’, various forms for ‘around (full-way)’, such as *opkrúh* related to *kruhom*, plus *dokola*, *dokolu* and *okolo*, which are based on Slavic derivations of *kolo* ‘circle’, *naproti* ‘on the opposite side, across the street’ (cf. Ukrainian *на(в)проти*, Russian *напротив*, Slovak *naproti*) and *prjamo* ‘straight (ahead)’ (cf. Russian/Ukrainian *прямо*, Slovak *priamo*).

- (39) *dokola ke amende huri* (UzhhR)
 around at/to we.LOC mountain.PL
 ‘There are mountains around [here] at our place.’

- (40) *amen dokolu phirahas* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 we around go_ofTEN.IPF/POT.1PL
 ‘We were walking all around.’

- (41) *amen mindik phirahas opkrúh* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 we always go_ofTEN.IPF/POT.1PL around
 ‘We were always walking all around.’

- (42) *amen mindik phirahas okolo* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 we always go_ofTEN.IPF/POT.1PL around
 ‘We were always walking all around.’

- (43) *gejla kruhom* (Per)
 go.AOR.3SG around
 ‘S/he went around (half-way).’

- (44) *džaha prjamo, džaha dži ko vagzālis,*
 go.FUT.2SG straight go.FUT.2SG TERM at/to railway_station
a naproti dživel mijro džamutro (Ser)^{LQCR}
 and/but on_the_opposite_side live.PRS.3SG my son_in_law
 ‘You will go straight ahead, you will go up to the railway station, and on the opposite side, my son-in-law is living.’

- (48) *tāvas* *d'ives-e,* *rāči* *bešas* *tejle* (UzhhR)
 cook.PRS.1PL day-ADV night[ADV] sit.PRS.1PL down
 ‘We cook in the daytime, in the evening we sit down.’

Denominal adverbs derived by the suffix *-e* exist for the days of the week, as indicated in Table 68. The bracketed forms are obsolete (see the next paragraph).

Table 68: Names for the days of the week

NOUN	ADVERB	MEANING
<i>pondzelkos</i>	<i>pondzolkone</i>	‘on Monday’
<i>(utorkos)</i> <i>vovtorkos</i>	<i>(utorkone)</i> <i>vovtorkone</i>	‘on Tuesday’
<i>(štreda)</i> <i>sereda</i>	<i>(štredone)</i> <i>s(e)redone</i>	‘on Wednesday’
<i>(štvarťkos)</i> <i>čtvrťk</i>	<i>(štvarťkone)</i> —	‘on Thursday’
<i>parašovin</i>	<i>parašovine</i>	‘on Friday’
<i>sombat</i>	<i>sombatone</i>	‘on Saturday’
<i>kurko</i>	<i>kurke</i>	‘on Sunday’

There are four historical layers of loanwords in the names of the days of the week. The oldest layer is represented by the Greek-origin words for ‘Friday’ and ‘Sunday’, *parašovin* (cf. Greek *παρασκευή*) and *kurko* (*κυρικόν*), whose adverbial counterparts *parašovine* and *kurke* are marked by the plain suffix *-e*. The second layer consists of a single Hungarian loanword *sombat* ‘Saturday’, while the third layer contains the dialectal East Slovak loanwords for ‘Monday’ through ‘Thursday’: *pondzelkos* ‘Monday’, *utorkos* ‘Tuesday’, *štreda* ‘Wednesday’ and *štvar(t)kos* ‘Thursday’, whose adverbial counterparts contain the extension *-on-* added between the lexical base and the adverbial suffix *-e*. However, only *pondzolkone* is commonly used out of the four names of East Slovak origin, while the remaining words are attested only from some elder speakers in Uzhhorod and Perechyn and are no longer used in everyday speech, except in Radvanka. Otherwise, forms of East Slavic origin are commonly used for ‘Tuesday’ (*vovtorkos* or *vuvtorkos*), ‘Wednesday’ (*sereda*) and ‘Thursday’, for which a non-integrated noun *čtvrť(k)* or *čtvír* occurs (cf. Russian *четверг*, Ukrainian *четвер*). Occasionally, there are also East Slavic loanwords for ‘Friday’, ‘Saturday’ and ‘Sunday’, *pjátňic'a*, *subota* and *ned'ila* respectively, but there are no adverbs

Some temporal adverbs contain case-like suffixes, such as ablative *ciknevarbostar* (rarely also *ciknevarbostar*) ‘since childhood’, which is based on the adjective *cikno* ‘small’ with an unclear segment *-varb-*.

- (52) *me ciknevarbostar vakerav romanes* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 I since_childhood speak.PRS.1SG Romani.ADV
 and learn.IPF/POT.3SG
- (53) *me vakerav romanes ciknevarbostar* (UzhhS.Per.Ser)^{LQCR}
 I speak.PRS.1SG Romani.ADV since_childhood
 ‘I speak Romani since my childhood.’

Another temporal adverb *butāl'ik* ‘for a long time’ is a semi-loan translation of the Hungarian terminative adverb *sokáig* of the same meaning. Both forms contain the multal quantifier (‘much, many’): Romani *but* (see 8.2.2) and Hungarian *sok*.

- (54) *on butāl'ik pen mučinen pal'i pre phuv* (Ser)
 they for_a_long_time REFL.PL suffer.PRS.3PL then on earth
 ‘They suffer for a long time on earth afterwards.’

Numerous temporal adverbs are loanwords from recent or current contact languages. Some of these loan adverbs are, in fact, deadjectival adverbs (see 9.1), such as *častones* in Uzhhorod and Perechyn and *častān* in Khudlovo and Serednie ‘often’ (adjective *často* ‘frequent’).

- (55) *one igen čast-on-es vičinen le doxtoris* (Per)^{LQCR}
 they very often-EXT-ADV call.PRS.3PL ART physician
- (56) *on igen čast-ān viskinen avri le doxtoris* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 they very often-ADV call.PRS.3PL out ART physician
 ‘They often call the doctor.’

The meaning ‘rarely, seldom’ is conveyed by the non-integrated loan *ritkān* from Hungarian *ritkán* (see also 6.2.3), while Slavic loanwords are common for ‘constantly, continuously’, such as *postojano* (cf. Russian *постоянно*) and a two-word expression *jenne meri* (cf. Slovak *jednej miery* ‘of one measure/constant’ or *v jednej miere* ‘in one measure/constant’). The meaning ‘at first, for the first time’ is expressed either by the plain

ordinal numeral *peršo* or by *perši raz* (see 8.1.2); *sprvān* with the adverbial suffix *-ān* has also been documented in Khudlovo (cf. Slovak *sprvu*, Russian *сначала*).

- (57) *me ritkān d'ives-e pijav* (UzhhS)
 I rarely day-ADV drink.PRS.1SG
 'I rarely drink in the daytime.'
- (58) *posl'' o dijlos ov jenne meri xasalas* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 after ART noon he constantly cough.IPF/POT.3SG
 'In the afternoon, he was constantly coughing.'

9.5 Phasal adverbs

In addition to phasal verbs, such as *xud-* or *kezdin-* 'to begin, to start' and *pr(e)ačh-* 'to stop', which are discussed in 12.5.4, there are two phasal adverbs in Eastern Uzh Romani. Both are borrowed from Hungarian.

The first phasal adverb is a loanword from the Hungarian *(im)már* 'already'. It occurs in a variety of forms, such *imar*, *imār*, *mar*, *mār* and most frequently, with no final rhotic as *imā* or *mā*. In negative clauses, it acquires the meaning 'no longer':

- (59) *a pal'i, sar mār land'arkerde amen, štrihinkerde,*
 and/but then how already bath.ITER.AOR.3PL we.ACC cut_hair.ITER.3PL
phende (UzhhS)
 'And then, when they had already bathed us and cut our hair, they said.'
- (60) *no majinel sombatone mā t' aven khejr'*
 PART should.PRS.3SG Saturday.ADV already NCOMP come.INF home
o rom mijro (Ser)
 ART husband my
 'Well, he must already come home on Saturday, that husband of mine.'
- (61) *me imā pāle na džā, me imā kamav*
 I already back NEG go.FUT.1SG I already want.PRS.1SG
la te dikhen (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 she.ACC NCOMP see.INF
 'I will no longer go back, I already want to see her.'

Like its Hungarian source, as well as its Slavic equivalent *(j)uže*, *(i)mā(r)* and its variants have a range of functions broader than the English *already* has. For example, it may occur as a temporal particle indicating that an action takes place immediately, as in (62), or

that a given time period is earlier than may be expected (63). Very often, *(i)mā(r)* just pinpoints the fact that is in contrast to another fact, as in (64) and (65).

- (62) *le romenge nesas sabano*
 ART Roma.DAT.PL NEG.COP.PST.3 allowed
od'a te džan te pijen,
 there NCOMP go.INF NCOMP drink.INF
bo mā mārnas le romen (Khu)
 because already beat.IPF/POT.3PL ART Rom.ACC.PL
 ‘Roma were not allowed to go there to drink, because they were immediately getting a thrashing [from non-Roma].’
- (63) *tosāra mā od'a sal (Khu)*
 morning already there COP.PRS.2SG
 ‘No later than in the morning, you are already there.’
- (64) *me lengeri čhib džanav,*
 I their language know.PRS.1SG
a on mā amāri čhib naa (Khu)
 and/but they already our language no
 ‘I know their language, but they, in contrast, don’t know our language.’
- (65) *od'a mā ungrika vakeren (Khu)*
 there already Hungarian.ADV speak.PRS.3PL
 ‘There they, in contrast [to this place], speak Hungarian.’

The other phasal adverb is *menk*, which has a continuative meaning ‘still’. It is borrowed from the Hungarian *még* ‘still’, and is also used in negative clauses (‘yet’):

- (66) *hin menk but roma, kaj phiren menk (Per)*
 COP.PRS.3 still many Rom.PL REL go_often.PRS.3PL still
 ‘There are still many Roma who continue travelling.’
- (67) *menk sa na soven (Per)*
 still all NEG sleep.PRS.3PL
 ‘Everybody doesn’t sleep yet.’
- (68) *oj menk pijel ola praški khejre (Ser)*
 she still drink.PRS.3SG DEM.PL pill.PL home
 ‘She keeps taking the pills at home.’

- (69) *tut romñi menk nāne?* (Ser)
 you.ACC wife still NEG.COP.PRS.3
 ‘Aren’t you married yet?’

See also 9.6.1 and 10.1.3 about *menk* in the respective functions of the particle of addition (‘more’) and gradation (‘even’).

9.6 Particles

In the following, several important Eastern Uzh Romani particles are discussed. The main attention is given to focus and terminative particles, but various utterance expressions of affirmation and negation are also mentioned. In addition, two frequent interjections are mentioned in the final section. Other particles are dealt with in other parts of the dissertation, in particular in the chapter on verb syntax; see 12.5 for modal particles, 12.2 for optative particles, and 12.4 for the particle of clausal negation. See also chapter 10 for various particles in comparative, superlative and equative constructions.

9.6.1 Focus particles

9.6.1.1 Additive particles

The additive focus particle ‘also, too’ is *the*, which also functions as a phrasal coordinator ‘and’ (see 13.5.1). It always precedes the phrase it modifies.

- (70) *the mrov dad ade uv’ila* (UzhhR)
 also my father here be_born.AOR.3SG
 ‘My father was also born here.’
- (71) *odā kampe the te sikaven le čhaven* (UzhhR)
 DEM be_needed.PRS also NCOMP teach.INF ART child.ACC.PL
 ‘It is also necessary to teach the children.’
- (72) *mundarnas the le židen, na ča le romen* (UzhhS)
 kill.IPF/POT.3PL also ART Jew.ACC.PL NEG only ART Roma.ACC.PL
 ‘They were also killing the Jews, not only the Roma.’
- (73) *the one od’a opre dživen* (Per)
 also they there above live.PRS.3PL
 ‘They also live there upwards.’
- (74) *the mijro rom lenca gej’la* (Ser)
 also my husband they.INST go.AOR.3SG
 ‘My husband has also gone with them.’

The East Slavic loan particle *tože* (cf. Russian *может* ‘also’) is also common. In contrast to *the*, *tože* normally follows the modified phrase from which it can be separated:

(75) *oj ade dživlas tože, lakeri daj* (Khu)
 she here live.IPF/POT.3SG also her mother
 ‘She also lived here, her mother.’ (Besides other people.)

(76) *ov tože psixično* (Ser)
 he also psychotic
 ‘He is also psychotic.’

In Radvanka, the dialectal Slovak *tiž* (cf. Standard Slovak *tiež*) is used by some speakers:

(77) *e čhaj phureder, tiž avri hiňi* (Uzhhr)
 ART daughter old.COMPR also outside COP.PRS3G.F
 ‘The daughter is elder, she is also outside.’ (Besides other people.)

In both Uzhhorod varieties, another borrowed particle *iš*, from the Hungarian *is*, is used by some Hungarian L2 speakers. In contrast to *the*, *iš* immediately follows the phrase it modifies:

(78) *hin the barvale the čōre roma ade iš* (Uzhhr)
 COP.PRS.3 and rich and poor Rom.PLhere also
 ‘There are both rich and poor Roma here as well.’ (Besides other places.)

The continuative phasal adverb *menk* (see 9.5 above) performs the role of a particle of addition (‘more’) with numeral phrases (79). It also expresses gradation (see 10.1.3 and see also example (81) below).

(79) *ov sas l'incate are skl'epa,*
 he COP.PST.3 Lintsi.LOC in shop
and'a menk jek māro (Ser)
 bring.AOR.3SG still one bread
 ‘He was in a shop in Lintsi and brought one more bread.’

9.6.1.2 Scalar particles

The function of the scalar particle ‘even’ is fulfilled by the additive particle *the* ‘also’ (see above). It may further be reinforced by the particle of gradation *menk* ‘still’ (see 9.5 and 10.1.3) or by the East Slavic particle *daže* (cf. Russian *даже* ‘even’).

- (80) *xutkerās pro čhon the penda* (Khu)
 get.ITER.IPF/POT.1SG on month also fifty
 ‘I was receiving [a salary of] even fifty [roubles] a month.’
- (81) *sa tutar čovrnahas, menk the mārdaahas tut* (Uzhhs)
 all you.ABL steal.IRR.3PL still also beat.IRR.3PL you.ACC
 ‘They would steal everything from you, they would even beat you.’
- (82) *savorenge savorenge, daže the le l’ubake* (Per)
 all.DAT.PL all.DAT.PL even also ART Liuba.DAT
 ‘To everybody, to everybody, even to Liuba.’

The particle *the* may also occur in negative clauses:

- (83) *ov the na šunel avka,*
 he also NEG hear.PRS.3SG thus
sar obično šunel pes (Ser)
 how usually hear.PRS.3SG REFL
 ‘He even doesn’t hear in such a way as one usually hears.’

Otherwise, the function of the scalar particle in negative clauses (‘not even’) is most commonly fulfilled by the borrowed particle *añi* of West Slavic or Ukrainian origin (cf. Czech, Slovak, Polish *ani*, Ukrainian *ани*) or, rarely, by *ñi* of East Slavic origin (cf. Russian *ни*). Both *añi* and *ñi* are also used as the emphatic negative coordinators ‘neither...nor’ discussed in 13.5.5.

- (84) *nāne lestar šukareder,*
 NEG.COP.PRS.3 he.ABL beautiful.COMPR
añi feder lestar nāne (Uzhhs)
 not_even better he.ABL NEG.COP.PRS.3
 ‘There is not [anybody] more handsome than him, nor is there [anybody] better than him.’

- (85) *ov aňi na kamelas te pijen* (Per)
 he not_even NEG want.IPF/POT.3SG NCOMP drink.INF
 ‘He even did not want to drink.’
- (86) *aňi na džanav* (Per)
 not_even NEG know.PRS.1SG
 ‘I even don’t know.’
- (87) *o doxoris ke ma aňi na podavla* (Ser)
 ART physician at/to I.LOC not_even NEG approach.FUT.3SG
 ‘The physician does not even approach me.’
- (88) *ňi lovve na kampil’a* (Ser)
 not_even money NEG be_needed.AOR.3SG
 ‘Even money wasn’t needed.’

As a verb modifier, the aforementioned East Slavic particle *daže* also occurs in negative clauses:

- (89) *tu daže te soven na bijrinehas* (Uzhhs)
 you even NCOMP sleep.INF NEG manage.IPF/POT.2SG
 ‘You weren’t able even to sleep.’

9.6.1.3 Restrictive particles

The basic restrictive focus particle (‘only’) is *čak*, which is borrowed from the Hungarian *csak* ‘only’. When preceding words with an initial consonant, the final velar of the particle is optionally reduced, e.g. *čak les ~ ča les* ‘only him, just him’. The particle *čak* may also be used in a temporal reference ‘later than expected’, as in (93).

- (90) *odā čak o devlōro džanel* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 DEM only ART God.DIM know.PRS.3SG
 ‘God only knows.’
- (91) *ov cejlo drom čak asalas* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 he whole journey only laugh.IPF/POT.3SG
 ‘He was just laughing all the journey.’
- (92) *sako ča pal peste duminel adād’ive* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 every only about REFL.LOC think.PRS.3SG today
 ‘Everyone thinks only about himself nowadays.’

- (93) *avaha čak jevende* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 come.FUT.1PL only winter.ADV
 ‘We will come only in the winter.’

Furthermore, the particle *ča(k)* is common in imperative clauses as a particle of politeness to lessen the force of a request or command (cf. English *just*). It follows the imperative verb, either immediately or separated by another word (95).

- (94) *deñi av ča* (UzhhS)
 Deni come[IMP.2SG] only
 ‘Deni, just come on.’

- (95) *an o telefonos čak* (UzhhS)
 bring[IMP.2SG] ART telephone only
 ‘Just bring the phone.’

- (96) *soño, na phan čak* (Per)
 Sonia NEG close[IMP.2SG] only
 ‘Sonia, don’t close [the door] please.’

If it precedes the imperative verb, it has a strengthening or incentive force:

- (97) *ča na zal’iker tut dži rā’i* (UzhhS)
 only NEG delay[IMP.2SG] you.ACC until night
 ‘But importantly, don’t stay out until the night!’

- (98) *čak aven andre cetko* (Per)
 only come[IMP.2PL] inside aunt
 ‘Come in, madam, don’t hesitate!’

The numeral *jek(h)* ‘one’ is also commonly used in the function of a restrictive particle modifying noun phrases, either by itself or with *čak*. The complex particle *čak jek(h)* seems to be particularly common after the negative pronoun *nič* ‘nothing’ as an exceptive expression (‘nothing but’).

- (99) *jek o rusi, so začhenas važ o roma* (Khu)
 one ART Russian.PL what advocate.IPF/POT.3PL for ART Rom.PL
 ‘[There were] only Russians who stood up for the Roma.’

- (100) *are šparejta ačhil'a jek o praxos* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 in stove remain.AOR.3SG one ART dust
 'In the stove, only the dust has been left.'
- (101) *n' ačhil'a nič, ča jek e fala ačhil'a* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 NEG remain.AOR.3SG nothing only one ART wall remain.AOR.3SG
 'Nothing was left but the wall was left.'
- (102) *na xanas on nič, čak jek o koreña* (Ser)^{RDZ}
 NEG eat.IPF/POT.3PL they nothing only one ART root.PL
 'They were eating nothing but the roots.'

Furthermore, the universal pronoun *sa* 'all, everybody, everything' serves a function of a restrictive focus determiner in the meaning 'nobody/nothing but' (103), like the Slavic plural adjective *sam-/cam-* (104).

- (103) *andr' odā gav dživen sa ungri* (Per)^{LQCR}
 in DEM village live.PRS.3PL all Hungarian.NOM.PL
- (104) *в тому селі живуть' сами угорці* (Ukrainian)
 in DEM village live.PRS.3PL nobody_but Hungarian.NOM.PL
 'In that village, there live nobody but Hungarians.'

See also the following spontaneous sentences:

- (105) *bereznate sa nanges les mukle* (Per)
 Bereznyi.LOC all naked.ACC he.ACC leave.AOR.3PL
 'In Velykyi Bereznyi, they left him completely naked.'
- (106) *sa praxoh' o skamin* (Khu)
 all dust.INST ART table
 'The table is with nothing but dust.'

9.6.2 Terminative particle

The terminative particle occurs in a form *dži*, in Uzhhorod also with the initial fricative *ži*, whose cognates are attested in other Romani dialects (cf. Boretzky and Igla 2004: 78). It modifies the spatial and temporal phrases in the meanings 'up to' and 'till, until', e.g. *dži kana* 'until when', *dži keci ovri* 'until what time', *dži opre* 'up to the top', *dži tajsa* 'until tomorrow', etc. The particle is particularly common with phrases headed by the adessive preposition *ke*, e.g. *dži ko dumo* 'up to the back', *dži ke hrañica* 'up to the border', *dži ko*

khoča ‘up to the knees’, *dži ke phuv* ‘up to the ground’, *dži ko pašvara* ‘up to the ribs’, rarely by other prepositions, e.g. *dži tel o pindre* ‘up to under the feet’ (attested in Perechyn), *dži aro buvke* ‘up to (inside) the lungs’ (attested in Serednie).

(107) *eftavārdeštrito beršestar dži eftavārdeš the oxtoto*
 seventy_third year.ABL TERM seventy and eighth
me od’a kerās buv’i (UzhhR)
 I there do.IPF/POT.1SG work

‘Since 1973 (literally 73rd year) till 1978 (literally 78th), I worked there.’

(108) *ade na dživnas dži odā* (Per)
 here NEG live.IPF/POT.3PL TERM DEM

‘They didn’t live here until that [date].’

(109) *dži ko štār berš vakerās romanes* (Per)
 TERM at/to four year speak.IPF/POT.1SG Romani.ADV

‘Until four years [of my age], I spoke Romani.’

(110) *dži kanāke les ņiko na bijrinel*
 TERM now he.ACC nobody NEG manage.PRS.3SG
te arakhen (Khu)
 NCOMP find.INF

‘Until now, nobody has been able to find him.’

(111) *ligende les dži ko krāl’is* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 lead.AOR.3PL he.ACC TERM at/to king

‘They led him up to the king.’

(112) *dži od’a džahas pejšones* (Ser)
 TERM there go.IPF/POT.1PL on_foot

‘We went up there on foot.’

In both Uzhhorod varieties, *dži* also occurs with several nouns with no intermediary preposition, e.g. *dži dijlos* ‘until noon’ (as against *dži ko dijlos* in other varieties), *dži ņilaj* ‘until the summer’ (as against *dži ko ņilaj* in other varieties) and *dži rā’i* ‘until night’ (both *dži rā’i* and *dži ke rā’i* attested in other varieties). Still, out of these three examples, two contain nouns that are identical to their adverbial counterparts in Uzhhorod, viz. *ņilaj* is both a noun ‘summer’ and an adverb ‘in the summer’, and *rā’i* is both ‘night’ and ‘at night’, so that such cases should rather be regarded as combinations of *dži* with adverbs. The combination *dži dijlos* with the noun *dijlos* ‘noon’ may be an analogy to *dži ņilaj* and *dži rā’i*, in which *dži* +

ADVERB is reanalysed as *dži* + NOUN. The particle *dži* may also occur with numerals, either with no preposition (in Uzhhorod) or with the adessive preposition *ke* (in the other varieties):

- (113) *oj mā džanel te raxinen*
 she already know.PRS.3SG NCOMP count.INF
dži oxtō (Uzhhs)^{LQCR124}
 TERM eight

as against:

- (114) *oj mā džanel te genen* (Khu.Ser)^{LQCR}
 she already know.PRS.3SG NCOMP count.INF
dži ko oxtō
 TERM at/to eight
 ‘She already knows how to count up to eight.’

9.6.3 Affirmative and negative particles

Both inherited and borrowed items are encountered among expressions of affirmation and negation.

The most common utterance particle used as an affirmative response to a polar question (‘yes’) is *hā*, or rarely *hāt*, from the Hungarian *hát* ‘indeed, of course’.¹²⁵ Sporadically, *da* of Russian origin (*da*) is used as well. Other affirmative particles include the emphatic *kañešno* ‘of course’ (cf. Russian *конечно*) and permissive *mije* ‘may it be so’ from the optative copula (see 12.2.2). Some affirmative expressions are rather interjections, e.g. the hesitant *no* from Slavic *no* and the confirmative exclamation *vo* ‘Exactly! That’s it!’, which is also used in sudden remembrance (cf. Russian *во*). Confirmation is also commonly achieved by the adverb *mišto/mište/mištes* ‘well’, which is used to indicate acceptance or acknowledgment (‘okay’), and by a complex idiom *ta na?* with the negator *na* preceded by *ta* in a rising interrogative intonation, which emphasises refusal of any other option than the given statement, i.e. it roughly means ‘Who says not?’, ‘Definitely yes!’.

The basic negative response to a polar question (‘no, nope’) is *naa* [naʔa], resembling the inherited verb negator *na* but with double /a/ and a glottal stop between both vowels. Strong negation and refusal is commonly achieved by the spatial interrogative *kāj* ‘where’, in the meaning ‘not at all, in no way, definitely not’. Such employment of the pronoun ‘where’

¹²⁴ This example comes from both LQCR consultants of the Shakhta variety.

¹²⁵ The conservative form *hāt* with the final consonant is only attested from some old speakers (>70) in Uzhhorod and Perechyn.

in the function of a negative particle is common in North Slavic languages (cf. Kopečný et al. 1980: 380). A noteworthy Slavic-origin particle of strong refusal is *xraňboh* ‘God forbid’, cf. Slovak *chráňboh* developed through fusion of the imperative verb form *chráň* ‘protect’ and the noun *boh* ‘God’. It expresses very strong disagreement or refusal of an intended action connected with warning against a potential danger, as in example (115) below. There is also a lexicalised optative construction *o dejl m’ arakhel* or *o dejl t’ arakhel*, literally ‘May the God protect!’, which is a loan translation of the Slavic expression and is used in the same sense.¹²⁶

- (115) *seredňate xraňboh te džas* (Per)
 Serednie.LOC god_forbid NCOMP go.PRS.2SG
 ‘God forbid you go to Serednie.’

The basic affirmative particle *hā* and the negator *na* are also used as question tags:

- (116) *a on keren buv’i hā?* (Khu)
 and/but they do.PRS.3PL work yes
 ‘And they work, don’t they?’
- (117) *tumen romňa nāne na?* (Khu)
 you.PL.ACC wife.PL NEG.COP.PRS.3 NEG
 ‘You.PL are not married, are you?’

In sentence (118), the adverb *mište* ‘well, okay’ functions as a question tag that seeks approval of the addressee:

- (118) *me la vičinā ade, mište?* (Per)
 I she.ACC call.FUT.1SG here well
 ‘I will call her here, do you agree?’

9.6.4 Various borrowed particles

Numerous other particles occur in Eastern Uzh Romani. Only some of the most frequent ones are mentioned in the following discussion.

¹²⁶ The verb *arakh-* no longer occurs in the meaning ‘to protect’ in today’s language, and *o dejl t’ arakhel* is a fixed vestigial phrase. Another relic of this verb is an interjection *ara* ‘Make way!’ (< *‘Be careful!’ < *‘Protect!’). There is another verb *arakh-* in the meaning ‘to find’, which has a different etymology.

The repetitive particle *pāle* ‘again’ is of Greek origin (cf. Greek *πάλι*) and is shared with other Romani dialects (Boretzky 2012a: 17). See 12.3.5 about the verb modifier *pāle* ‘back’.

- (119) *ijdž* *oj* *esas* *nasval'i*,
 yesterday she COP.PST.3 ill
tajsa *mā* *oj* *ejla* *pāle* *zdravo* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 tomorrow already she COP.FUT.3SG again healthy
 ‘Yesterday she was ill, [while] tomorrow she will already be healthy again.’
- (120) *pāle* *phučel* *lestar* *e* *kirvi* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 again ask.PRS.3SG he.ABL ART godmother
 ‘Again his grandmother asks him.’

An example of a common particle of Hungarian origin is *inkām* (< Hungarian *inkább*), which serves to express preference or a favourite option (‘rather, preferably’).

- (121) *na* *fenkijpezin* *man*,
 NEG photograph[IMP.SG] I.ACC
inkām *fenkijpezin* *la* *tejle* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 rather photograph[IMP.SG] she.ACC down
 ‘Don’t take a photo of me, rather take a photo of her.’
- (122) *inkām* *mi* *dživel* *o* *baličho* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 rather OPT live.PRS.3SG ART pig
 ‘Preferably, may the pig live.’

The majority of other particles are of Slavic origin. Very common sentence-initial particles borrowed from local Slavic dialects are *hlavno* ‘mainly, particularly’ (cf. Slovak *hlavne*, Ukrainian *головно* ‘mainly’) and *hibaj* (cf. Ukrainian *хіба*) introducing a question to express some doubt or confusion (‘so’):

- (123) *hlavno* *na* *mā'uv* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 mainly NEG get_drunk[IMP.2SG]
 ‘What is most important: do not get drunk.’

- (124) *hibaj tu na džanes ?* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 so you NEG know.PRS.2SG
 ‘So you don’t know?’

Another particle of local Slavic origin is *takoj*, which is identical to the temporal deictic adverb ‘immediately’ (7.3.2). It serves to emphasise the spatial and temporal adverbial phrases in a way of English ‘right’:

- (125) *o al'ik od'a takoj paž e zona dživel* (Khu)
 ART Alik there right beside ART Zona live.PRS.3SG
 ‘Alik lives there, right next to Zona (name of a shop).’

Various other East Slavic utterance modifiers, mainly of Russian origin, are common, such as *fs'o* ‘that’s the end, that’s all, etc.’ (Russian *всё*), *vrod'i* ‘it seems’ (Russian *вроде*), *t'ipa* ‘kinda, as if’ (*muna*), *vopšé/vapšé, vopšem* (Serednie also *vovšém*) ‘at all’ (*вообще, в общем, вовсе*), *naprimér* ‘for example’ (*например*), *ímeno* ‘exactly, namely’ (*именно*), *dapust'ím/dopust'ím* ‘let’s assume, let’s say’ (*допустим*), *d'isvítel'no* ‘really, in fact’ (*действительно*), *nabarót* ‘on the contrary, by contrasts’ (*наоборот*), and many others. Note that such forms always keep the stress placement of the source form, which may differ from the regular penultimate stress pattern (see also 2.3).

- (126) *no dopust'ím me kamav la* (UzhhS)
 well let's_assume I love.PRS.1SG she.ACC
 ‘Well, let’s assume, I love her.’ (An introduction to a hypothetical description.)
- (127) *vopšé mǎ na av* (Per)
 not_at_all already NEG come[IMP.2SG]
 ‘Don’t come at all again.’
- (128) *o rusi nabarót važ o roma*
 ART Russian.PL on_the_contrary for ART Rom.PL
zaačhenas (Khu)
 advocate.IPF/POT.3PL
 ‘The Russians, on the contrary, stood up for the Roma.’

In Radvanka, particles of Slovak origin are used by some speakers along with the East Slavic ones, such as *vobec* ‘(not) at all’ (cf. Slovak *vôbec*) in the following sentence:

- (129) *vareko* *vobec* *na* *dikhel* (UzhhR)
 someone.NOM not_at_all NEG see.PRS.3SG
 ‘Someone doesn’t see at all.’

9.6.5 Verb-like imperative interjections

There is a group of two one-word imperative expressions that occur as utterances on their own and have plural forms reminiscent of the imperative inflection of verbs. One of these verb-like forms has developed from an older verb, while the other one is borrowed.

The non-borrowed imperative expression is *ara*, which is used in the meaning of a command ‘Make way! Step aside!’ and has a plural form *aran* used in addressing a group of people. It has developed from an imperative form of the verb **arakh-* ‘to protect’¹²⁷ via a transitional meaning *‘Be careful! Watch out!’.¹²⁸

The other form is *čit* ‘Hush! Quiet!’, which is an interjection common to various languages spoken at the territory of the former Kingdom of Hungary (cf. Hungarian *csitt*, Slovak *čít*, dialectal Ukrainian (Rusyn) *чим*). In North Central Romani, including the Eastern Uzh dialect, this interjection has developed a distinctive plural form *čiten* on analogy with the 2PL marking of consonantal verbs, such as *ker* [do.IMP.2SG] ~ *ker-en* [do-IMP.2PL]. Thus, the pair of *čit* and *čiten* represents an example of a transitional interjection-to-verb development, although no other conjugational forms occur.

¹²⁷ See the previous footnote in 9.6.3.

¹²⁸ In today’s varieties of Eastern Uzh Romani, regular imperatives of loan verbs *merkin-* (via local Slavic dialects from the German (*auf*)*merken*) and *vid’āzin-* (from the Hungarian *vigyáz*) are used in the meaning ‘Be careful! Watch out!’.

10 COMPARISON AND EQUATION

In this chapter, the morphological and syntactic means of expressing comparison and equation are discussed.

10.1 Comparative and superlative

As is typical of Central Romani, adjectives and some adverbs exhibit a three-value system of comparison in Eastern Uzh Romani: the positive, which is unmarked, the comparative, and the superlative. Distinctive comparative and superlative morphology is also a characteristic trait of the Slavic languages and Hungarian in East Central Europe, so that its presence in local Romani reflects one of the areal-typological characteristics of the region.

10.1.1 Comparative

The comparative is formed by the suffix *-eder*, which is assumed to be one of few Iranian loan morphemes into Proto-Romani.¹²⁹ It is productively used to derive comparative forms from both inherited and recently borrowed non-relational adjectives, e.g. *barval-o* ‘rich’ > *barval-eder* ‘richer’, Shakhta, Khudlovo, Serednie *kuč* ‘expensive’ > *kuč-eder* ‘more expensive’, Perechyn, Radvanka *drah-o* ‘expensive’ (from Slavic) > *drah-eder* ‘more expensive’, *tuň-o* ‘cheap’ (from Slavic) > *tuň-eder* ‘cheaper’.

Furthermore, the comparative can be formed from adverbial forms, such as temporal and manner adverbs, e.g. *cix-ones/cix-ān* ‘silently, slowly’ > *cix-eder* ‘more silently, more slowly’, *pozn-ones/pozn-ān* ‘late’ > *pozn-eder* ‘later’, *sig(o)* ‘soon, quickly’ > *sig-(er-)eder* ‘sooner, more quickly, more likely’ (see below), some quantifiers, e.g. *frima* ‘few, less’ > *frim-eder* ‘fewer, lesser’, and especially local adverbs, e.g. *andre* ‘inside’ > *andr-eder* ‘more inside’, *opre* ‘above’ > *opr-eder* ‘higher above’, *tejle* ‘below, low’ > *tel-eder* or *tejl-eder* ‘lower’, *pāšes* ‘nearby’ > *pāš-eder* ‘nearer’, and even *a(r)de* ‘hither’ > *ard-eder* ‘closer here’ attested in Shakhta and *od’a* ‘there’ > *od’a-der* ‘farther away’ (see below) attested in Khudlovo. The comparative may even occur with some substantival bases, such as *murš* ‘male’ > *murš-eder* ‘more male, manlier’, but denominal comparatives are more constrained

¹²⁹ The suffix *-eder* does not originate in the OIA comparative suffix *-tara-* as is sometimes claimed (cf. e.g. Boretzky and Iglá 2004: 414; Matras 2002: 78, 196). First, Romani *-eder* does not exhibit regular sound correspondences to *-tara-*; second, the OIA morphological comparative itself ceased to be productive quite early. In MIA, analytic comparative constructions started being used and in NIA there are virtually no traces of the old comparatives in *-tara-* (cf. Bloch 1965: 184–185).

‘better’ is inherited, two competing comparative counterparts of *nalāčh-o* (ADV *namište(s)*, *namišto*) are *horš-eder* and *xuž-eder* ADJ/ADV ‘worse’, which contain Slavic comparative bases *horš-* (cf. Slovak *horš-ie* ‘worse’) and *xuž-* (cf. Russian *хуже-е* ‘worse’) respectively. Note that there are no plain loan adjectives **horšo* and **xužo*, though the comparative meaning is inherent to *horš-* and *xuž-* in Slavic languages, so that *horšeder* and *xužeder* display, in a sense, double marking. Therefore, the comparative must always be marked by *-eder* in Eastern Uzh Romani even if the comparative form is based on a borrowed base with an inherent comparative meaning.

The semantic range of certain comparative forms shows that they replicate meanings of their equivalents in contact languages. For example, *sig(re)der* ‘sooner, more quickly’ is also used in a modal meaning ‘rather, more likely’, calquing the semantics of the comparative adverbs that mean ‘sooner’ in local Slavic; cf. Slovak *skôr*, Ukrainian *скорію(e)* and Russian *скорее*, which mean ‘more likely, rather’ along with ‘sooner, more quickly’.

- (3) *on sig-eder šaj aven,*
 they soon-COMPR can come.PRS.3PL
len but-er vozmožnosť (UzhhS)
 they.ACC much-COMPR opportunity
 ‘They are more likely to be able to come, they have more opportunity.’

10.1.2 Superlative

In Late Proto-Romani, no morphological distinction between the comparative and the superlative existed (cf. Elšik and Matras 2006: 146), and the development of the distinct superlative in Central Romani must therefore have postdated the split of the Romani dialects. The Central Romani superlative exhibits a structural pattern typical of the languages of East Central Europe in that it is formed by prefixation to the comparative. This is demonstrated in Table 69, which shows the system of comparison of adjectives meaning ‘big’ in Eastern Uzh Romani alongside several local languages.

Table 69: Comparison of superlative formations in East Central European languages

	POSITIVE	COMPARATIVE	SUPERLATIVE
Eastern Uzh Romani	<i>bāro</i>	<i>bareder</i>	<i>jeg-bareder</i>
Slovak	<i>veľký</i>	<i>väčší</i>	<i>naj-väčší</i>
dial. Ukrainian (Rusyn)	<i>великий</i>	<i>булий</i>	<i>май-булий</i>
Hungarian	<i>nagy</i>	<i>nagyobb</i>	<i>leg-nagyobb</i>

In contrast to the comparative, however, the superlative marking exhibits a certain degree of variation across the dialect region. The prefix *jek-/jeg-* indicated in Table 69 is the most widespread superlative prefix common in all the varieties, and is also shared with a large number of Romani dialects of Slovakia. It probably draws on the numeral *jek(h)* ‘one’, which makes perfect sense semantically: out of choice, there is only one entity that may be ascribed the superlative value. In contrast to the numeral, however, the superlative prefix has no aspiration, cf. also Shakhta *jek-int’eresn-eder* ‘most interesting’. Alternatively, it could also represent a borrowed Hungarian superlative prefix *leg-* (see the following paragraph) and its contamination by the Romani numeral.

In Radvanka and Khudlovo, borrowed superlative prefixes are also used, at least by some speakers. In Radvanka, it is the mentioned Hungarian prefix *leg-*, e.g. *leg-bar-eder*, *lek-f-eder*. In Khudlovo, the superlative prefix is *maj-*, like in the local Ukrainian (Rusyn) dialects (see Kopečný et al. 1980: 422 on this prefix of Romanian origin in dialectal Ukrainian), e.g. *maj-bar-eder*, *maj-barval-eder*. Furthermore, in Serednie, the prefix *maj-* is frequently added to the basic superlative forms in *jek-*, which results in double marking, e.g. *maj-jek-phur-eder* ‘eldest’. See Table 70 for a summarising overview of the superlative prefixes in Eastern Uzh Romani.

Table 70: Superlative prefixes

PREFIX	UzhhR	UzhhS	Per	Khu	Ser
<i>jek-</i>	+	+	+	+	+
<i>leg-</i>	+	–	–	–	–
<i>maj-</i>	–	–	–	+	–
<i>maj-jek-</i>	–	–	–	–	+

Both adjectival and adverbial superlatives in *jek-* may also be emphasised by *so*, a particle grammaticalised from the interrogative pronoun *so* ‘what’ (6.2.1.1), e.g. *so jeg-bar-eder* ‘as big as possible, the very biggest’, *so jek-cikn-eder* ‘as small as possible, the very smallest’, *so jek-f-eder* ‘the very best’, *so jek-xuž-eder* ‘the very worst’; see also the sentences in (4) and (5). This formation replicates the superlative formation ‘strengthened’ with ‘what’ in Slavic, cf. Ukrainian *що-най-кращий* ‘the very best’ (Pugh and Press 1999: 154), dialectal (Rusyn) *што-май-булиый* ‘as big as possible’ (Pugh 2009: 78–79), *што-май-боржі* ‘as fast as possible’ (Pugh 2009: 165), Slovak *čo naj-väčší*, Czech *co nej-větší* ‘as big as possible’, etc. Such superlative reinforcement is especially common in

Uzhhorod (Shakhta) and in Perechyn, where some speakers make use of it so often that such formations seem to lose their superlative emphasis; see, for example, Shakhta *mijro so jekphureder phral* ‘my (very) eldest brother’, where *so* is in principle redundant.

(4) *so jek-buter andre ungriko somas* (UzhhR)
 what SUPL-more in Hungary COP.PST.1SG
 ‘Most of all, I have been to Hungary.’

(5) *so jek-sigeder džan het khejre* (Ser)^{RDZ}
 what SUPL-sooner go.IMP.2PL away home
 ‘As soon as possible go away home.’

A similar emphasis can also be achieved by the particle *čim* preposed to the comparative, which seems to be particularly common with the adverb *sig(o)*, i.e. *čim sigeder* ‘as soon as possible’, as in (6). This also replicates the local Slavic pattern with a borrowed particle (cf. Ukrainian *чим скорше*).

(6) *tumen džan het čim sigeder adārik* (Ser)^{RDZ}
 you.PL go.IMP.2PL away PART soon.COMPR from_here
 ‘You go away from here as soon as possible’

There is one more way to form the superlative that is sporadically used, viz. an analytic construction with the adjective *samo*, which is borrowed from the East Slavic superlative adjective *сам-* (Ukrainian *самий*, Russian *самый*) ‘the very, the most’. As in East Slavic, the adjective *samo* is placed before a positive adjective to express the superlative degree, as in *samo šukār* ‘the most beautiful’ (cf. Russian *самый красивый*), but it may also be combined with the comparative form, as in *samo feder* ‘the best’ (cf. Russian *самый лучший*). Similar strategies were described in Northeastern Romani (Tenser 2008: 72–73), but in Eastern Uzh Romani, *samo* is markedly less common than the prefixes discussed above.

10.1.3 Syntax of comparison

The continuative phasal adverb *menk* ‘still’ (see 9.5) is used with comparative adjectives and adverbs to indicate gradation, e.g. *menk bareder* ‘even bigger’, *menk cikneder* ‘even smaller’, *menk feder* ‘even better’, *menk xužeder* ‘even worse’, etc.

- (7) *ov menk feder džanel te vakeren čim me* (Per)
 he still better know.PRS.3SG NCOMP speak.INF than I
 ‘He knows to speak even better than me.’

For marking the standard of comparison, two constructions are most commonly used. First, the standard may be marked by the ablative, as in:

- (8) *nāne lestar šukareder,*
 NEG.COP.PRS.3 he.ABL beautiful.COMPR
añi feder lestar nāne (Uzhhs)
 not_even better he.ABL NEG.COP.PRS.3
 ‘There is not [anybody] more handsome than him, nor is there [anybody] better than him.’
- (9) *leskoro kher bareder mijrestar* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 his house big.COMPR my.ABL
 ‘His house is bigger than mine’

Another strategy is to use a comparative/equative particle *sar* ‘than, like’ grammaticalised from the manner interrogative ‘how’:

- (10) *me kana māto, feder som sar ñerno* (Uzhhs)
 I when drunk better COP.PRS.1SG how sober
 ‘When I am drunk I am better than [being] sober.’
- (11) *phureder avri dičhol sar tu* (Khu)
 old.COMPR out be_seen.PRS.3SG how you
 ‘S/he looks older than you.’

The particle *sar* is obligatorily used when the standard of comparison cannot be marked ablative for formal reasons, for example, because it is a verb or an adverb:

- (12) *ov menk sas barvaleder sar amen duminahas* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 he still COP.PST.3 rich.COMPR how we think.IPF/POT.1PL
 ‘He was richer than we thought.’
- (13) *t’ ode bareder sar kade* (Uzhhs)
 so there big.COMPR how here.SPEC
 ‘So, there [it] is bigger than just here’

Both strategies, the ablative and the particle *sar*, represent replication of two different strategies in local Slavic: marking the standard of comparison either by the ablative preposition *od* (Ukrainian *від*) ‘from’ or by the particle *jak* (also ‘how’) respectively (cf. Pugh 2009: 191).

In Perechyn and Khudlovo, an East Slavic comparative particle derived from the Slavic instrumental of ‘what’ *čim/čem* is also commonly used.

(14) *leskoro kher bareder čim mijro* (Per)^{LQCR}
 his house big.COMPR than my
 ‘His house is bigger than mine.’

(15) *oj pametinlas feder čem ov* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 she remember.IPF/POT.3SG better than he
 ‘She remembered better than him.’

(16) *adā kaš bareder čem okā* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 this tree big.COMPR than DEM.CNTR
 ‘This tree is bigger than the other one over there.’

In Perechyn, this particle also occurs in a complex expression *čim kana* with a second element *kana* from the interrogative ‘when’:

(17) *ov denašel sigeder čim kana āver* (Per)^{LQCR}
 he run.PRS.3SG fast.COMPR than when other
 ‘He runs faster than others.’

The partitive in comparative and superlative constructions (‘out of’) is marked either by the ablative or by the preposition *maškar* ‘among, between’:

(18) *ov denašel legfeder savorendar* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 he run.PRS.3SG best all.ABL
 ‘He runs best out of everybody.’

(19) *tijri ejla kodi jekcikneder*
 your COP.FUT.3SG that.SPEC.F small.SUPL
maškar savorende (UzhhS)
 among/between all.LOC
 ‘Your [one] will be that smallest one out of all ones.’

- (20) *ko zoraleder ejla tumendar*
 who strong.COMPR COP.FUT.3SG you.PL.ABL
duvje džanendar (Ser)^{RDZ}
 two.OBL.PL person.ABL.PL
 ‘Who will be stronger out of you two.’

The quantitative difference the parameter (subject) of comparison has in relation to the standard is marked by the spatial preposition *pre* ‘on’ (see 11.2.1.3), which is a clear-cut replication of the East Slavic comparative construction with a preposition *на* ‘on’:

- (21) *lakoro phral phureder pro pāndž berš latar* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 her brother old.COMPR on five year she.ABL
 ‘Her brother is five years elder than her.’

In temporal constructions, the instrumental case is often used (see 11.1.1.5), e.g. *jekhe dīveseha pozneder* [one day.INST late.COMPR] ‘one day later’, which is structurally closer to Hungarian.

10.2 Equative and similitive

In contrast to the comparative and superlative, there are no morphological means of marking the equative and similitive (cf. Haspelmath and Buchholz 1998). Both are expressed by a syntactic construction in which the standard of equation/simulation is usually marked by the focus particle *the* ‘also, even’ and is preceded by the comparative/equative particle *sar* ‘than, like’ (< ‘how’). The parameter is modified by the adjectival deictic *ajso* ‘such’ in equation (see (22) and (23); see also 7.4.2) and by the adverbial deictic *avka* ‘thus’ in simulation ((24); see also 7.4.3).

- (22) *me ajso manuš som, sar the tu* (Khu)
 I.NOM such human COP.PRS.1SG how also you.NOM
 ‘I am such a man as you are.’
- (23) *man ajso ilo hin, sar the tut* (Khu)
 I.ACC such heart COP.PRS.3 how also you.ACC
 ‘I have such a heart as you have.’

- (24) *me avka buvt'i kerav, sar the tu keres buvt'i* (Khu)
 I thus work do.PRS.1SG how also you do.PRS.1SG work
 'I work in such a way as you work'

A special particle *ipen* 'exactly, just' of Hungarian origin (< Hungarian *éppen*) serves to emphasise the equal quality or manner:

- (25) *les ipen ajso sāmos hin, sar the man* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 he.ACC just such size COP.PRS.3 how also I.ACC
 'He has exactly the same size [of feet] as I have.'

- (26) *leskoro kher ajsov bāro, sar ipen the mijro* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 his house such big how just also my
 'His house is just as big as mine.'

- (27) *o roma na kernas, avka ipen sar the kanākes*
 ART Rom.PLNEG do.IPF/POT.3PL thus just how also now
o roma na keren, avka the čirla
 ART Rom.PLNEG do.PRS.3PL thus also long_ago
na kernas (Per)
 NEG do.IPF/POT.3PL

'The Roma didn't work. Just like they don't work now, so they didn't work in the past as well.'

The dependent modifiers of the head nominal may be attributive adjectives and various determiners, such as the article, adjectival pronouns, including adnominal demonstratives, numerals and quantifiers and even genitive nouns (see below). The adjective modifiers immediately precede the noun head, while forms of the other word classes precede the adjective. In (5), the adjective *šuvko* modifying the noun for ‘wood’ is preceded by the article *o*.

- (4) *ov zalabard'a o šuvko kaš* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 he set_on_fire.AOR.3SG ART dry wood
 ‘He set the dry wood on fire.’

Importantly, the word classes from which the dependent modifiers in NPs are drawn, with the exception of the article, may be substantivised and occur as heads of a NP by themselves. Sentence (5) contains a NP (in bold) headed by the ablative noun *romňatar*, which functions as a source argument of the verb *phuč-* ‘to ask’ and is modified by the dependent distal demonstrative *kola* and the adjective *šukār* ‘beautiful’. This NP is followed by two other NPs, which are governed by the same verb and contain substantivised adjectives as their heads: *savonatar*, the substantivised ablative of the interrogative adjective of selection *savo* ‘which (one)’, and *terňatar*, the substantivised ablative of the adjective *terno* ‘young’. In the latter NP (in bold and underlined), the substantivised adjective head is modified by a dependent demonstrative.

- (5) *phuč tut¹³⁰ kola šukār romňatar,*
 ask[IMP.2SG] you.ACC that.SPEC.OBL.SG.F beautiful woman.ABL.SG.F
savonatar ? kola _____ terňatar (Ser)^{LQCR}
 which.ABL.SG.F that.SPEC.OBL.SG.F young.ABL.SG.F
 ‘Ask that beautiful woman over there. Which one? That young one over there.’

In contrast to the head nominal, the dependent components have the adjectival pattern of inflection, which is characterised by two cases, nominative and oblique, and the lack of the Layer II case marking (see 5.1). This difference of the adjectival pattern from the substantival

¹³⁰ The accusative pronoun *tut* is here a coreferential dummy reflexive object of the verb, which is used according to the model of the Slavic formally reflexive (*reflexive tantum*) verb for ‘to ask’ (cf. Ukrainian *numamu-ся*, Slovak *pýtať sa*).

pattern manifests itself in partial agreement of the dependents with the head nominals. The full case agreement occurs when the adjective is in apposition to its head, i.e. when the attributive adjective follows the noun it modifies and assumes a substantival role. In this case, the adjective takes on the noun case markers. See example (6) in which the instrumental head noun *phralenca* is modified by the prenominal universal determiner *savore* ‘all’ and the postnominal possessive pronoun *mijrenca* ‘with my ones’, which is in full case agreement with the preceding noun.

- (6) *savore phralenca mijrenca me lācho som* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 all.OBL.PL brother.INST.PL my.INST.PL I good COP.PRS.1
 ‘I get on well with all my brothers.’

In the speech of some young speakers in Perechyn, dependent modifiers other than the article are sporadically attested with the substantival suffixes in full case agreement with the head, even in the prenominal position within a single NP, as in (7). This may indicate an incipient development of the adjectival inflection towards the adoption of the substantival case suffixes, although such an agreement is still optional in the given idiolects (8). In other varieties, no such agreement has been encountered. See also (11) below for a spontaneous example from another speaker in Perechyn.

- (7) *phuč pes kolatar šukārtar*
 ask[IMP.2SG] REFL that.SPEC.ABL.SG.F beautiful.ABL.SG.F
romñatar (Per)^{LQCR}
 woman.ABL.SG.F
 ‘Ask that beautiful woman over there.’

as against (from the same speaker):

- (8) *me phučās ole phuvre manušestar* (Per)^{LQCR}
 I ask.IPF/POT.1SGDEM.OBL.SG.M old.OBL.SG.M human.ABL.SG.M
 ‘I was asking that old man.’

In the NPs headed by the xenoclitic nouns for ‘people’, such as *nijpos* (from Hungarian (*nép*) and *ludos* (from Slavic; cf. Slovak *ľud*, Russian *людь*), the dependent components usually have plural agreement forms, even though *ludos* and *nijpos* are singular forms. Note that in the example from Perechyn (11), the dependent possessive pronoun exhibits the substantival inflection (see the preceding paragraph).

- (9) *ko ka-la nijp-os ?* (UzhS.Ser)^{LQCR}
 who DEM-NOM.PL people-NOM.SG.M
 ‘Who are these people?’
- (10) *o ňemci strašn-a nijp-os sas* (Khu)
 ART German.PL horrible-NOM.PL people-NOM.SG.M COP.PST.3
 ‘The Germans were horrible people [during the war].’
- (11) *stričind’om mijr-en l’ud-os ungvārate* (Per)
 meet.AOR.1SG my-ACC.PL people-ACC.SG Uzhhorod.LOC
 ‘I met my people in Uzhhorod.’

If the article is present in a NP, it occupies the first position (see (4) above). In contrast to other word classes, the article can never be substantivised and head a NP. Another difference from other adjectival modifiers is that the article does not form a phonological word for stress assignment by itself but only in combination with a word that follows it. Since Eastern Uzh Romani has fixed penultimate stress, the article is stressed if a monosyllabic word form follows, such as in a disyllabic noun phrase (see 2.3 for more details).¹³¹ The article is missing when a pronominal determiner occurs in a NP, and it can never be combined with a demonstrative, unlike in some Vlach and Balkan dialects (cf. Boretzky 2000: 42–43; Matras 2002: 97). However, it may be used before a numeral except for ‘one’, as in:

- (12) *mange ačhile čak o duj anglune*
 I.DAT remain.AOR.3PL only ART two anterior
th’ o duj palune (Ser)^{LQCR}
 and ART two posterior
 ‘I was left with the two [teeth] in the front and with the two [teeth] in the back.’ (Literally: ‘Just the two anterior and the two posterior remained to me.’)
- (13) *me la dikhl’om pro prāžņikos*
 I she.ACC see.AOR.1SG on party
le duje cimborkenca (Ser)^{LQCR}
 ART two female_friend.INST.PL
 ‘I saw her at the party with her (literally: the) two friends.’

¹³¹ This poses a significant difference from non-Central Romani dialects in which the definite article is never stressed within a NP (cf. Boretzky 2000: 40).

- (14) *tel o štār d'ives amen cinaha motoris (Ser)^{LQCR}*
 under ART four day we buy.FUT.1PL car
 'In four days, we will buy a car.'

The definite article cannot occur with the numeral *jekh* 'one' within a single NP (see 7.1.2 for *jekh* in the function of an indefinite article):

- (15) *tel jek ovra ov ñerñisal'ila avri (Ser)^{LQCR}*
 under one hour he sober.INCH.AOR.3SG out
 'In an hour, he sobered up.'

The article is obligatory with personal names and in non-pronominal prepositional phrases provided that no other determiner occurs (see 11.2). It may also be used as a determiner of objects that are in a kinship relation either to the subject referent or to the speaker, i.e. instead of an adnominal possessor.

- (16) *āk' o l'oñas, āke leskeri čhaj, e p'limjǎnica,*
 right_here ART Lionia right_here his daughter ART niece
āk' e pheñ e zulfika, āk' e raki,
 right_here ART sister ART Zulfika right_here ART girl
kadi, le al'ikoskeri romñi (Khu)
 this.SPEC ART Alik.GEN wife
 beat.AOR.3SG ART wife.ACC

(Showing a photograph:) 'This is Lionia, this is his daughter, [my] niece, this is [my] sister, Zulfika, this non-Romani girl here is the wife of Alik.'

Like in other Romani dialects, the adnominal possessor is marked by the genitive, which occurs as a dependent modifier of the nominal head (possessee) with which it agrees through the so-called 'Suffixaufnahme' (cf. Plank 1995; Kopjevskaja-Tamm 2000; see also 4.1.3 and 11.1.1.7). The genitive noun may also take on its own dependent modifiers, such as the article *la* in (17) and the demonstrative *kole* along with the numeral *štāre* in (18).

- (17) *amen na džan'am te arakhen*
 we NEG know.AOR.1PL NCOMP find.INF
l-a d-a-ker-i angrušni (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 OBL.ART-SG.F mother-OBL.SG.F-GEN-NOM.SG.F ring.NOM.SG.F
 'We weren't able to find the mother's ring.'
- (18) *me džanav*
 I know.PRS.1SG
kol-e štār-e čhaj-en-ger-a da (Ser)^{LQCR}
 that.SPEC-OBL.PL four-OBL.PL girl-OBL.PL-GEN-OBL.SG.F mother.ACC.SG.F
 'I know the mother of those four girls.'

Otherwise, in its function of the adnominal possessor, the genitive is not compatible with the article that would determine the nominal head of the genitive. Exceptions are phrases with non-anchoring genitives, which qualify the head nominal by providing its description rather than referring to the possessor (see 11.1.1.7), such as names of specific groups of people who are defined by their place of origin, e.g. *o seredňakere roma* 'The Roma of Serednie'.

The genitive adnominal may also be modified by another genitive adnominal, typically by a genitive (possessive) pronoun, which is common in descriptive kinship terms, such as *l-a-ker-e čha-s-ker-o čha* [3-OBL.SG.F-GEN-OBL.SG.M son-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.SG.M son.NOM.SG.M] 'the son of her son (i.e. her grandson)' and *mijr-e dad-es-ker-e cimbor-a* [my-OBL.SG.M father-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.PL friend.NOM.PL] 'friends of my father'.

The genitive adnominal in Eastern Uzh Romani usually precedes its head. The postnominal position is rare and mostly occurs in elicited translations, where its occurrence may be triggered by language interference: cf. the examples (19) and (20) elicited from two different speakers of a single variety plus the Ukrainian model sentence (21).

- (19) *lake pre dzeka sas*
 she.DAT on mood/liking COP.PST.3
mijr-a d-a-kor-o vigānos (Khu)^{LQCR}
 my-OBL.SG.F mother-OBL.SG.F-GEN-NOM.SG.M dress.NOM.SG.M
 'She liked the dress of my mother.'

(20) *lake pre dzeka pes pejl'a*
 she.DAT on mood/liking REFL fall.AOR.3SG
jek rokla mijr-a d-a-ker-i (Khu)^{LQCR}
 one skirt.NOM.SG.F my-OBL.SG.F mother-OBL.SG.F-GEN-NOM.SG.F
 ‘She started to like a skirt of my mother.’

(21) *її сподобалася*
 she.DAT start_being_liked.PST.3SG.F
сукня моєї мамі (Ukrainian)
 skirt.NOM.SG.F my.GEN mother.GEN
 ‘She started to like a skirt of my mother.’

Still, some instances of postnominal genitives may be found in spontaneous speech as well, where they seem to function as an afterthought to clarify the identification of the head referent, as in (22) and (23). If a genitive follows the modified noun, the constraint on the article does not apply.

(22) *adaj avel avri*
 here come.PRS.3SG out
e služanka ol-a krāl'ovn-a-ker-i (Ser)^{RDž}
 ART maidservant.NOM.SG.F DEM-OBL.SG.F queen-OBL.SG.F-GEN-NOM.SG.F
 ‘Here, a maidservant of that queen is coming to the scene.’

(23) *no majinel sombatone mā t' aven khejr'*
 PART should.PRS.3SG Saturday.ADV already NCOMP come.INF home
o rom m-ijr-o (Ser)
 ART husband[NOM.SG.M] I-GEN-NOM.SG.M
 ‘Well, he should already come home on Saturday, that husband of mine.’

Like other adjectives, the genitive nouns may also be further ‘substantivised’ to occur as head nominals. This process may result in acquiring further Layer II case markers suffixed to the oblique stem of the genitive forms. In the following sentences, genitives occur as heads of NPs. In example (24), there is a substantivised non-anchoring genitive noun *radvankakere* in the subject role. Note also the substantivised adjective *močārikenca* (*močāriko* ‘belonging to the settlement of Mochara’, *močāra* ‘Mochara, a name of the traditional Romani settlement in Uzhhorod’) in the comitative role. In (25), the anchoring genitive *āvreskerō* ‘of another one’ refers to an inanimate direct object. As such, it has nominative marking. In (26), the

substantivised genitive bases *krāl'isker-* ‘of the king’ and the reflexive *pesker-* occur as recipients of the verb of giving and are therefore marked by the Layer II dative suffix, like the substantivised genitive *govdiskereske* ‘to the one of Govdi’ in (27).

- (24) *čirla mārnas pen o radvanka-ker-e*
 long_ago beat.IPF/POT.3PL REFL.PLART.NOM.PL Radvanka-GEN-NOM.PL
le močār-ik-en-ca (Uzhhs)
 ART.OBL.PL Mochara-ADJ-OBL.PL-INST
 ‘In the past, the [Roma] of Radvanka and the Mocharika [Roma] used to fight each other.’
- (25) *me na čovrava, na čalavava āvr-es-ker-o* (Uzhhs)
 I NEG steal.FUT.1SG NEG touch.FUT.1SG other-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.SG.M
 ‘I shall not steal; I shall not touch anything of anybody else.’
- (26) *ov majind'a te den*
 he should.AOR.3SG NCOMP give.INF
le krāl'-i-s-ker-es-ke,
 ART.OBL.SG king-CLASS-OBL.SG.M-GEN-OBL.SG.M-DAT
a ov diña p-es-ker-es-ke (Uzhhs)
 and/but he give.AOR.3SG REFL-OBL.SG.M-GEN-OBL.SG.M-DAT
 ‘He should have given [it] to the one of the king (= to king’s son), but he gave it to the one of his own (= to his own son).’
- (27) *ov fajtos le govdi-s-ker-es-ke* (Per)
 he family ART Govdi-OBL.SG.M-GEN-OBL.SG.M-DAT
 ‘He is kin to the one of Govdi (= belongs to the family of Govdi).’

Finally, it should be noted that the oikoclitic zero masculine nouns of time periods *d'ives* ‘day’, *čhon* ‘month’ and *berš* ‘year’ have singular forms in nominative NPs if they are modified by the quantity interrogative *keci* or by a numeral. With some non-numerical quantifiers, such as *but* ‘much, many’, both singular and plural forms occur in the data, even in a single variety; cf. (31) and (32). See also sentence (14) above.

- (28) *oj užarlas pal leste oxta berš,*
 she wait.IPF/POT.3SG for he.LOC eight year[NOM.SG]
oxto čhon, the oxta d'ives (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 eight month[NOM.SG]and eight day[NOM.SG]
 ‘She was waiting for him eight years, eight months and eight days.’

- (29) *sas lake šel the biš berš* (Per)
 COP.PST.3 she.DAT hundred and twenty year[NOM.SG]
 ‘She was one hundred and twenty years old.’
- (30) *keci d’ives ade san aro fovros ?* (Ser)
 how_many day[NOM.SG] here COP.PRS.2PL in town
 ‘How many days are you here in Uzhhorod?’
- (31) *on mā but berš na dživen are jekh* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 they already many year[NOM.SG] NEG live.PRS.3PL in one
 ‘They have not been living together for many years.’

as against:

- (32) *on dživen but berša* (Ser)
 they live.PRS.3PL many year.NOM.PL
 ‘They live for many years.’

11.1.1 Functions of cases

In the following sections, the functions of substantival case markers are discussed in detail.

11.1.1.1 Nominative

The nominative is primarily the case of the grammatical subject.

- (33) *oj man na dikhel* (common)^{LQCR}
 she.NOM I.ACC NEG see.PRS.3SG
 ‘She doesn’t see me.’
- (34) *mijro dad vojovinlas* (Khu)
 my father[NOM.SG.M] fight_at_war.IPF/POT.3SG
 ‘My father was taking part in the war.’
- (35) *sas peske the nesas*
 COP.PST.3 REFL.DAT and NEG.COP.PST.3
jek rom the jek romñi (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 one Rom[NOM.SG.M] and one Romani_woman.NOM.SG.F
 ‘Once upon a time, there was a man (Rom) and a woman.’ (an introductory formula of a fairy-tale narrative)

The possessee in possessive predicative constructions (‘to have’) is marked by the nominative, regardless of the marking of the possessor.

- (36) *lāčhe motora hin le romen* (UzhhR)
 good.NOM.PL car.NOM.PL COP.PRS.3 ART.OBL.PL Roma.ACC.PL
 ‘The Roma have good cars.’
- (37) *ko vlaxi hin ajse graja* (UzhhR)
 at Vlax_Rom.NOM.PL COP.PRS.3 such.NOM.PL horse.NOM.PL
 ‘Vlax Roma have such horses.’
- (38) *man hin phral* (Per)
 I.ACC COP.PRS.3 brother[NOM.SG.M]
 ‘I have a brother.’
- (39) *la sas duj čhave* (Khu)
 she.ACC COP.PST.3 two[NOM] child.NOM.PL
 ‘She had two children.’

In copular sentences, including those with zero copula (43), the nominative also marks the nominal or adjectival predicate.

- (40) *ov hino rašaj* (common)^{LQCR}
 he.NOM COP.PRS.3SG.M priest[NOM.SG.M]
 ‘He is a priest.’
- (41) *me terñōri somas* (UzhhS)
 I.NOM young.DIM.NOM.SG.F COP.PST.1SG
 ‘I was pretty young.’
- (42) *mijro dad esas bāro lavutāris* (Per)
 my.NOM.SG.M father[NOM.SG.M] COP.PST.3 big.NOM.SG.M musician.NOM.SG.M
 ‘My father was a great musician.’
- (43) *mijro rom lāčho manuš* (Ser)
 my.NOM.SG.M husband[NOM.SG.M] good.NOM.SG.M human[NOM.SG.M]
 ‘My husband is a good man.’

The nominative marks the direct object of transitive verbs provided that the object refers to an inanimate referent (for marking an animate direct object, see 11.1.1.2):

- (44) *dava lovve* (UzhhR)
 give.FUT.1SG money.NOM.PL
 ‘I will give money.’

- (45) *one l'ikeren sombat* (Per)
 they.NOM keep.PRS.3PL Saturday[NOM.SG]
 'They keep (=observe) Saturday.'
- (46) *kames te dikhen e taborňa ?* (Khu)
 want.PRS.2SG NCOMP see.INF ART.NOM.SG.F settlement.NOM.SG.F
 'Would you like to see the Romani settlement?'
- (47) *čhivav o čajocis* (Ser)
 pour.PRS.1SG ART.NOM.SG.M tea.DIM.NOM.SG.M
 'I will pour a bit of tea.'

The nominative direct object may also include lower animals, such as fish, although the accusative used to mark the animate direct object is attested as well (see 11.1.1.2 for more details).

In addressing, phrases with a dependent possessive pronoun tend to be assigned the nominative rather than the vocative. The case alignment of addressing phrases with a possessive pronoun may, however, depend on the gender and number categories. In a 30-minute long fairy tale narrative of a Serednie speaker, the nominative phrases consistently occur with the feminine head determined by a possessive pronoun (48), while the vocative occurs with the masculine and plural heads (49). That it is the presence of a possessive pronoun that triggers the nominative alignment is corroborated by the fact that feminine nouns with no determiner consistently occur in the vocative in the same text (50).

- (48) *mri romňi, lačharker* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 my.NOM.SG.F wife.NOM.SG.F make_the_bed[IMP.2SG]
 'My wife, make the bed!'

as against:

- (49) *mre romeja,*
 my.OBL.SG.M husband.VOC.SG.M
dža andro veš kaštenge (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 go[IMP.2SG] in forest woods.DAT
 'My husband, go to the forest for wood.'
- (50) *kirvije, tu slučajno na džanes?* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 godmother.VOC.SG.F you really NEG know.PRS.2SG
 'Godmother, don't you know by chance?'

Finally, the nominative serves as a prepositional case of nominals. In other words, non-pronominal phrases headed by a preposition are assigned the nominative, e.g. *andr-o kher* [in-NOM.SG.M house] ‘in the house’, *angal e škola* [in_front_of ART:NOM.SG.F school] ‘in front of the school’, *paž mijri daj* [beside my mother] ‘in presence of my mother’, etc. See 11.2 for more details.

11.1.1.2 Accusative

As discussed in 4.1, the accusative is in fact the zero-marked Layer I oblique stem, which otherwise serves as a base for attaching the Layer II case suffixes, although several nouns and pronouns possess an accusative form that is different from the oblique stem (cf. Elšík 2000a: 13).

Functions of the accusative in Eastern Uzh Romani are common in other Central Romani dialects and likely reflect a Proto-Romani legacy (cf. Matras 2002: 85–87; Elšík and Matras 2006: 73). First, in line with its conventional label, the accusative marks the animate direct object of transitive verbs:

- (51) *sikav la terňa* (UzhhR)
 show[IMP.2SG] ART.OBL bride.ACC.SG.F
 ‘Show the bride!’
- (52) *kamav mijre phralen mijre pheñen* (UzhhS)
 love.PRS.1SG my.OBL.PL brother.ACC.PL my.OBL.PL sister.ACC.PL
 ‘I love my brothers and sisters.’
- (53) *le le čhajōra* (Per)
 take[IMP.2SG] ART.OBL girl.DIM.ACC
 ‘Take the little girl!’
- (54) *oj rodzinkerlas le čhavōren* (Khu)
 she.NOM give_birth.ITER.IPF/POT.3SG ART.OBL child.DIM.ACC.PL
 ‘She was giving birth to children.’
- (55) *dikhel le benges the le romes* (Ser)^{RDž}
 see.PRS.3SG ART.OBL devil.ACC.SG.M and ART.OBL devil.ACC.SG.M
 ‘S/he sees the devil and the Rom.’

Nouns for animals are also included in the grammatically animate class and are therefore marked by the accusative in the direct object function. However, the nominative sporadically occurs for some lower animals, such as fish; cf. (59) with (60).

(56) *holmi bikenen, grajen čerinen, bālen* (Uzhhr)
 cloth.NOM.PL sell.PRS.3PL horse.ACC.PL exchange.PRS.3PL pig.ACC.PL

‘They sell the clothes [and] exchange the horses [and] the pigs.’

(57) *ov lidžal tel e khak le kaxña* (Per)^{LQCR}
 he.NOM carry.PRS.3SG under ART armpit ART hen.ACC.SG.F

‘He is carrying the hen under his armpit.’

(58) *e lisic'a na xal aňi le packānen,*
 ART fox.NOM.SG.F NEG eat.PRS.3SG not_even ART rat.ACC.PL
aňi le žamben (Khu)^{LQCR}
 not_even ART frog.ACC.PL

‘The fox eats neither rats nor frogs.’

(59) *me xund'om mijra perša māčha* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 I.NOM catch.AOR.1SG my.OBL.SG.F first.OBL.SG.F fish.ACC.SG.F

‘I caught my first fish.’

as against

(60) *me xund'om peskeri perši māčhi* (Per)^{LQCR}
 I.NOM catch.AOR.1SG REFL.GEN first.NOM.SG.F fish.NOM.SG.F

‘I caught my first fish.’

Second, the accusative is the most common way to mark the possessor of both alienable and inalienable items in predicative possessive (‘have’) constructions (see 11.1.1.6 and 11.2.1.2 for marking the temporary possessor).

(61) *le romen but graja verdana hin* (Uzhhr)
 ART Rom.ACC.PL many horse.NOM.PL carriage.NOM.PL COP.PRS.3

‘Roma have many horses and carriages.’

(62) *man hin phral* (Per)
 I.ACC COP.PRS.3 brother[NOM.SG.M]

‘I have a brother.’

(63) *le romen nič nāne* (Khu)
 ART Roma.ACC.PL nothing.NOM NEG.COP.PRS.3

‘Roma have nothing.’

(64) *pāndž čhave hin la čha mijra* (Ser)
 five[NOM] child.NOM.PL COP.PRS.3 ART daughter.ACC.SG.F my.ACC.SG

‘She has five children, that daughter of mine.’

Furthermore, the accusative marks the recipient of the verb *d-* ‘to give’, although the dative recipient occurs as well (see 11.1.1.3).

(65) *džanenas* *manušes* *govđi te* *den* (UzhhS)
 know.IPF/POT.3PL human.ACC.SG.M advice NCOMP give.INF

‘They knew how to give the man advice.’

(66) *de* *rukavički* *man* (Per)
 give[IMP.2SG] glove.NOM.PL I.ACC

‘Give me the gloves.’

(67) *t’* *uv’ahas* *man* *varesej* *lovve,*
 if COP.IRR.3SG I.ACC some.NOM.PL money.NOM.PL
me *tut* *diňomas* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 I.NOM you.ACC give.IRR.1SG

‘If I had had some money, I would have given [it] to you.’

Finally, the accusative serves to mark the external possessor of the verb *dukha-* ‘to hurt, to feel pain’:

(68) *man* *dukhal* *o* *nakh* (common)^{LQCR}
 I.ACC hurt.PRS.3SG ART nose.NOM.SG.M

‘My nose hurts.’

(69) *te* *on* *ijdž* *na* *māt’ilahas,*
 if they.NOM yesterday NEG get_drunk.IRR.3PL
adād’ive *len* *na* *dukhangl’il’ahas* *o* *šejro* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 today they.ACC NEG hurt.IRR.3SG ART head.NOM.SG.M

‘If they had not got drunk yesterday, their head would not have hurt today.’

11.1.1.3 Dative

The dative (*-ke/-ge*) marks the indirect object of most transitive verbs, such as ‘to make’ (70), ‘to buy’ (71), ‘to sell’ (72), ‘to show’ (73), ‘to build’ (74), ‘to send’ (75), etc. Semantically, these dative phrases usually refer to beneficiaries or recipients.

(70) *kode* *palal* *kerde* *lenge* *jek* *bitovka* (UzhhR)
 there.SPEC in/to_the_back make.AOR.3PL they.DAT one apartment_house

‘There in the back they made an apartment house for them.’

- (71) *me cind'om tuke nejve kamaš'li* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 I.NOM buy.AOR.1SG you.DAT new shoe.NOM.PL
 'I have bought new shoes for you.'
- (72) *amen leske bikend'am o motoris* (Per)
 we.NOM he.DAT sell.AOR.1PL ART car
 'We sold him the car.'
- (73) *oj sikavel peskara čhajōrake*
 she.NOM show.PRS.3SG REFL.GEN daughter.DIM.DAT
peskeri nejvi angruš'ni (Per)^{LQCR}
 REFL.GEN new ring
 'She shows her little daughter her new ring.'
- (74) *bāro kher lake strojind'a* (Khu)
 big house she.DAT build.AOR.3SG
 'He built a big house for her.'
- (75) *me bičhad'om l'il mijra simjake* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 I.NOM send.AOR.1SG letter my family.DAT
 'I sent a letter to my family.'

The dative also marks the beneficiary and recipient of numerous intransitive verbs:

- (76) *me lake phenā* (Per)
 I.NOM she.DAT tell.FUT.1SG
 'I'll tell her.'
- (77) *ov amenge brexinel* (Per.Khu)^{LQCR}
 he.NOM we.DAT lie.PRS.3SG
 'He tells us a lie.'
- (78) *me tuke pal'ikerav* (UzhhS)
 I.NOM you.DAT thank.PRS.1SG
 'I thank you.'
- (79) *ov na gejl'a te sovgāl'inen le ungrege* (UzhhS)
 he NEG go.AOR.3SG NCOMP serve.INF ART Hungarian.DAT.PL
 'He did not go to serve the Hungarians.'

The dative is also optionally used in marking the recipient of 'to give', where it competes with the accusative (see 11.1.1.2).

- (80) *dine mang' o čhave kadā telefonos* (Ser)
 give.AOR.3PL I.DAT ART child.PL this.SPEC phone
 'The children gave me this telephone here.'

The dative serves to mark the experiencer of the body or emotional states.

- (81) *mange šil* (common)^{LQCR}
 I.DAT cold
 'I am cold.'
- (82) *mange bida laha* (Uzhhs)
 I.DAT trouble she.INST
 'I have troubles with her.'
- (83) *savo tuke pre dzeka ?* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 which you.DAT on mood/liking
 'Which one do you like?'
- (84) *ade feder lenge esas te dživen, lovkeder* (Per)
 here better they.DAT COP.PST.3 NCOMP live.INF easy.COMPR
 'Here, they were living better off, more easily.'
- (85) *māro tuke suvñol* (Per)
 bread you.DAT be_dreamt.PRS.3SG
 'You are dreaming about bread.'
- (86) *amenge pes di'hol, odā trudnos' ejla* (Ser)
 we.DAT REFL be_seen.PRS.3SG DEM difficulty COP.FUT.3SG
 'It seems to us [that] it will be difficult.'

The dative is also used to mark the external possession of age, as in (87) and (88), body parts (89), names (90) and even kin relations, as in (91) to (93).

- (87) *keci tuke berš ?* (common)
 how_many you.DAT year
 'How old are you?'
- (88) *mange penda the trijn* (Uzhhr)
 I.DAT fifty and three
 'I am fifty three years old.'
- (89) *na rāgin tuke o naja* (Uzhhs.Ser)^{LQCR}
 NEG gnaw[IMP.2SG] you.DAT ART nail.PL

- ‘Don’t gnaw your nails.’
- (90) *sar tuk’ o nav ?* (Khu.Ser)^{LQCR}
 how you.DAT ART name
- ‘What is your name?’
- (91) *oj mange vnučka* (Per)
 she I.DAT granddaughter
- ‘She is a granddaughter of mine.’
- (92) *ov fajtos le govdiskereske* (Per)
 he family ART Govdi.GEN.DAT
- ‘He belongs to the family of Govdi.’
- (93) *kadā mijro šovgoris, leske phral* (Ser)
 this.SPEC my brother-in-law he.DAT brother
- ‘This is my brother-in-law. He is his (= my husband’s) brother.’

The dative marks the subject of impersonal modals, such as the necessity modals *kamp-e(l)* (94) and *musaj* (95), and optionally the (im)possibility modals *šaj* and *naši* (96); see 12.5.3.2 and 12.5.3.1 respectively for more details.

- (94) *mange la na kampe* (UzhhS)
 I.DAT she.ACC NEG be_needed.PRS
- ‘I don’t need her.’
- (95) *musaj leske sas te bikinen o taksis* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 must he.DAT COP.PST.3 NCOMP sell.INF ART car
- ‘He had to sell [his] car.’
- (96) *mange naši sas te phanden* (UzhhS)
 I cannot COP.PST.3 NCOMP close.INF
- ‘I couldn’t close [it].’

The dative marks the predicate nominals of verbs of change, such as *ačh-* ‘to become’ and *ker-* ‘to make’ (‘to turn into’), as in:

- (97) *ov hluxisal’ila,*
 he deaf.INCH.AOR.3SG
- vašodā ačhil’a hluxeske* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 therefore become.AOR.3SG deaf.DAT.SG
- ‘He went deaf; therefore, he became deaf.’

- (98) *on ačhile lāčhe cimborenge* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 they become.AOR.3PL good friend.DAT.PL
 ‘They became good friends.’
- (99) *kerd’a len so le duvjen barenge* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 make.AOR.3SG they.ACC COLL ART two.ACC stone.DAT.PL
 ‘She turned them into stones.’

Another function related to marking a change of state is the expression of an acquired role, as in the following sentences. This also comprises a common construction with the verb *l-* ‘to take’ and the dative noun *romňake*, which is used in the meaning ‘to marry (a woman)’.

- (100) *soske džan kirveske?* (UzhhS)
 why go.PRS.2PL godfather.DAT
 ‘Why do you stand as [his] godparent?’
- (101) *o gādžo gejl’a te sik’lon rašaske* (Per)
 ART nonRom go.AOR.3SG NCOMP learn.INF priest.DAT
 ‘The non-Rom went to study to become a priest.’
- (102) *mijro unuk la il’a romňake* (Khu)
 my grandson she.ACC take.AOR.3SG woman.DAT
 ‘My grandson married her.’
- (103) *ov kerel šoferiske* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 he do.PRS.3SG driver.DAT
 ‘He works as a driver.’

The meaning of an acquired role is closely related to a temporal function of the dative in referring to a life period:

- (104) *ov fejs nasvalkerdo sas cikneske* (UzhhS)
 he very ill.ITER COP.PST.3 little.DAT.SG.M
 ‘He was repeatedly very ill as a little boy.’
- (105) *the me cikňake darās* (Per)
 also I small.DAT.SG.F fear.IPF/POT.1SG
 ‘I, too, feared as a little girl.’
- (106) *dik, savi šukār sas čhake* (Khu)
 look[IMP.2SG] which beautiful COP.PST.3 girl.DAT.SG.F
 ‘Look how beautiful she was as a girl.’

Another temporal function of the dative is to mark the anterior distance ('XY ago'). The anterior distance is expressed through the dative-marked plain demonstrative pronoun *odā*, rarely *adā*, postposed after a time unit, e.g. *jek čhon oleske* [one month DEM.DAT] 'one month ago'. The structurally identical construction occurs in Ukrainian and Polish; cf. Ukrainian *один місяць тому*, Polish *jeden miesiąc temu* 'one month ago'.

(107) *štār berš aleske cikñōri salas* (UzhhS)
 four year this.DAT little.DIM.F.SG COP.PRS.2SG

'Four years ago, you were a little girl.'

(108) *duj berš oleske jek amerikancos av'la* (Per)
 two year DEM.DAT one American come.AOR.3SG

'Two years ago, an American came.'

The dative also occurs in spatial phrases as a postmodifier, specifying the localisation of the modified spatial notion, such as 'centre' or 'end', as in:

(109) *ko dživel āgor le fovroske?* (UzhhR)
 who live.PRS.3SG end ART town.DAT

'Who lives at the end of the town?'

(110) *amen dživahas andro centros le fovroske* (UzhhS)
 we live.IPF/POT.1PL in centre ART town.DAT

'We lived in the centre of the town.'

(111) *leskoro lāsos avka šund'olas*
 his voice thus be_heard.IPF/POT.3SG
až āgor le gaveske (Khu)^{LQCR}
 as_far_as end ART village.DAT

'His voice was heard as far as the end of the village.'

The dative also occurs in marking the possessor in possessive predication provided that there is some type of overtly expressed spatial specification, e.g. by a deictic adverb *ade* 'here':

(112) *me ča dikhav, so hin tuke ade* (Per)
 I only see.PRS.1SG what COP.PRS.3 you.DAT here

'I just see what you have here.'

- (113) *ade sas lak' o kher* (Khu)
 here COP.PST.3 she.DAT ART house
 'She had her house here.'

The dative is a common way of expressing the purpose 'for' of inanimate objects. The preposition *pal*, which is obligatory with animate objects, may sporadically occur instead (see 11.2.1.4).

- (114) *o david gejl'a povšinake* (UzhhS)
 ART David go.AOR.3SG sand.DAT
 'David went for the sand.'
- (115) *andre skl'epa džav cigarekl'enge* (Per)
 in shop go.PRS.1SG cigarette.DAT.PL
 'I am going to the shop for cigarettes.'
- (116) *somas me kaštenge* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 COP.PST.1SG I wood.DAT.PL
 'I went (literally: I was) for the firewood.'

The dative may also occur with a number of verbs in rather idiomatic meanings, e.g. with *radisa'uv-* 'take pleasure (in), to rejoice (in/at)'.

- (117) *o murša radisa'on pāl'enkake* (UzhhS)
 ART male.PL rejoice.PRS.3PL distilled_beverage.DAT
 'Guys take pleasure in the spirits.'

Finally, the dative acts as a prepositional case of certain prepositions, most notably of the preposition *važ* (see 11.2.2.1 for more details).

11.1.1.4 Ablative

The ablative (*-tar/-dar*) primarily denotes the origin or source of one's action or event, but it also has additional functions. In certain functions, especially in spatial phrases, it competes with prepositional phrases headed by separative prepositions, such as *andal*, *khatar* or *pal* (see 11.2), but in many other occurrences its replacement by a preposition is not possible.

The main function is to express the source in which the ablative is never replaced by a preposition, as in (118) to (125). Note that the ablative marks the source of disgust expressed by the reflexive verb *džungl'uv-* ‘to feel intense distaste, to loathe’ (121) as well as the participant of the verb ‘to ask’ who is inquired (122).

- (118) *ov čovrňa la bovra le čalādostar* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 he steal.AOR.3SG ART bride.ACC ART family.ABL
 ‘He stole the bride from her family.’
- (119) *on kapka le pāņestar imā hine zaučharde* (UzhhR)
 they a_bit ART water.ABL already COP.PRS.3PL covered
 ‘They are finally protected (literally: covered) from water a bit.’
- (120) *nāne sostar te poīnen* (UzhhR)
 NEG.COP.PRS.3 what.ABL NCOMP pay.INF
 ‘There is nothing to pay with.’ (Literally ‘from what to pay’)
- (121) *hin ajse manuša*
 COP.PRS.3 such human.PL
kāj pen džungl'on xočsostar (UzhhS)
 REL REFL.PL loathe.PRS.3PL whatever.ABL
 ‘There are such people who loathe anything.’
- (122) *phučkerās le mamatar* (Per)
 ask.ITER.IPF/POT.1SG ART mother.ABL
 ‘I was repeatedly asking my mother.’
- (123) *sa lestar zaile* (Per)
 all he.ABL take_away.AOR.3PL
 ‘They took everything away from him.’
- (124) *oj mā adej sikl'i'la amendar* (Khu)
 she already here learn.AOR.3SG we.ABL
 ‘She has already learned [it] from us.’
- (125) *aven gādže, cinen amendar o val'ki* (Khu)
 come.PRS.3PL nonRom.PL buy.PRS.3PL we.ABL ART adobe.PL
 ‘Non-Roma come [and] buy adobes from us.’

Furthermore, the ablative marks the reason of a state or of an action, as in:

- (126) *oj za'ovl'isal'i'la le ladžabnastar* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 she turn_red.AOR.3SG ART bashfulness.ABL

- ‘She turned red because of bashfulness.’
- (127) *sostar o kamašli sa xevlarde hine?* (Uzhhs)
 what.ABL ART shoe.NOM.PL all pierced COP.PRS.3PL
 ‘What is the cause (literally: from what) all the shoes are pierced?’
- (128) *ov amendar zadiňal’ila* (Per)
 he we.ABL go_mad.AOR.3SG
 ‘He has gone mad because of us.’
- (129) *ov muvl’a varesej džung nasval’ipnastar* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 he die.AOR.3SG some nasty illness.ABL
 ‘He died of a certain nasty illness.’
- (130) *o bala lake teje gejl’a la ximijatar* (Ser)
 ART hair.NOM.PL she.DAT down go.AOR.3SG ART chemotherapy.ABL
 ‘Her hair fell out because of chemotherapy.’

The ablative also marks the cause of feelings and psychological states, such as those expressed by the verbs *ladža-* ‘to be ashamed (of)’, *asa-* ‘to laugh (at)’ and *dara-* ‘to fear (of)’.

- (131) *me lestar man ladžaňom* (Uzhhs)
 I he.ABL I.ACC feel_ashamed.AOR.1SG
 ‘I felt ashamed of him.’
- (132) *xund’a mandar te asan* (Per)
 begin.AOR.3SG I.ABL NCOMP laugh.INF
 ‘He began laughing at me.’
- (133) *me man perumendar darav* (Ser)^{RDž}
 I I.ACC thunder.ABL.PL fear.PRS.1SG
 ‘I am afraid of thunders.’

The ablative is used to mark the material or substance of which an item is made.

- (134) *adi angrušni kerdo zlatostar* (UzhhsR)^{LQCR}
 this ring made gold.ABL
 ‘This ring is made of gold.’
- (135) *oj tād’a zumin ārminatar the purumatar* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 she cook.AOR.3SG soup cabbage.ABL and onion.ABL
 ‘She made a soup from cabbage and onion.’

The ablative occurs in a prolicative meaning ('by way of') with body parts, e.g. in combinations with predicates of 'to hold' or 'to pull':

- (136) *oj la xund'a kãke vastestar* (Per)
 she she.ACC catch.AOR.3SG thus.SPEC hand.ABL
 'She grasped her hand this way.'
- (137) *ov cirňa la čha balendar* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 he pull.AOR.3SG ART girl.ACC hair.ABL.PL
 'He pulled a girl by [her] hair.'

The ablative is an option to mark the standard of comparison (138), see also 10.1.3, and is used in the partitive function (139):

- (138) *jek onukas lestar hin cikneder* (Ser)
 one grandson he.ABL COP.PRS.3 small.COMPR
 'One grandson is younger than he.'
- (139) *on penge othode le texanestar* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 they REFL.DAT.PL hide.AOR.3PL ART food.ABL
 'They hid something of the food for themselves.'

The ablative occurs in spatial phrases to express separation or motions to leave.

- (140) *le burendar pejl'a jek prajti* (Per)^{LQCR}
 ART bush.ABL.PL fall.AOR.3SG one leaf
 'A single leaf fell from the bush.'
- (141) *dža het lestar* (Khu)
 go[IMP.2SG] away he.ABL
 'Go away from him!'
- (142) *me džav het tumendar* (Ser)
 I go.PRS.1SG away you.PL.ABL
 'I am leaving you.'

The proper locality names, such as towns and villages, are usually marked by the ablative to indicate origin:¹³²

- (143) *lakero dad pālovčistar* (UzhhR)
 her father Pavlovce.ABL
 ‘Her father is from Pavlovce nad Uhom (a Slovak village).’
- (144) *mijri daj sas sobrancatar,*
 my mother COP.PST.3 Sobrance.ABL
a mijro dad sas adārik perečīnatar (Per)
 and/but my father COP.PST.3 from_here Perechyn.ABL
 ‘My mother was from Sobrance (a Slovak town), while my father was from here, from Perechyn.’
- (145) *ov av’la munkāčīstar* (Ser)
 he COME.AOR.3SG Mukachevo.ABL
 ‘He came from Mukachevo.’

Note that the separative spatial adverbs, such as ‘from outside’, ‘from above’, etc., are most commonly expressed by ablative forms of spatial adjectives, e.g. *avrunestar* ‘from outside’ (*avruno* ‘outer’), *oprunestar* ‘from bottom’ (*opruno* ‘upper’), etc.; see 9.3 for more details.

The ablative also occurs in temporal phrases. The most conspicuous temporal function of the ablative is to express the simultaneous relation of clock time (‘at XY o’clock’). Since the time unit (*ovra* ‘hour’) may be omitted, ablative marking may occur on the numeral, as in (146) and (148), or on another quantity figure (147).

- (146) *av’lom khejre dešujekhatar* (UzhhS)
 come.AOR.1SG home eleven.ABL
 ‘I came home at 11.’
- (147) *kecendar aveha* (UzhhS)
 how_many.ABL come.FUT.2SG
 ‘At what time will you come?’

¹³² The ablative does not normally occur with proper names of neighbourhoods, settlements or countries, which are usually combined with the preposition *pal* and less commonly with *andal* (see 11.2.1.1 and 11.2.1.4). However, the ablative form *radvankatar* ‘from Radvanka’ is optionally used alongside the prepositional phrase *pal e radvanka*.

- (148) *me ušav eft' ovrendar,*
 I get_up.PRS.1SG seven hour.ABL.PL
a adā'dive ušil'om šovvendar (Ser)^{LQCR}
 and/but today get_up.AOR.1SG six.ABL
 'I get up at 7 o'clock, but today, I got up at 6.'

Furthermore, the ablative occurs in expressing the posterior duration ('since XY'), including that of temporal adverbs, such as *ijdžestar* 'since yesterday' (cf. *ijdž* 'yesterday'), *kanākestar* 'since now' (*kanāke(s)* 'now'), *tajsastar* 'since tomorrow' (*tajsa* 'tomorrow') and *tosārastar* 'since morning' (*tosāra* 'morning').

- (149) *oxtendar dži štār (Uzhhs)*
 eight.ABL TERM four
 'Since eight [o'clock] till four [o'clock].'
- (150) *oj dešuštāre beršendar adaj hiñi (Khu)*
 she fourteen year.ABL.PL here COP.PRS.3SG.F
 'She has been here since she was 14.'
- (151) *ole časostar mā amen xund'am (Ser)*
 DEM time.ABL already we begin.AOR.1PL
pre služeña te phiren
 on worship NCOMP go_often.INF
 'Since that time, we have started attending worship.'

Less commonly, the ablative marks the simultaneous relation of age ('at the age of XY, at XY years of age'), especially in Uzhhorod and Perechyn:¹³³

- (152) *lakeri čhaj zaphārisal'ila dešupāndže beršendar (Per)^{LQCR}*
 her daughter get_pregnant.AOR.1SG fifteen year.ABL.PL
 'Her daughter got pregnant at the age of 15.'

The ablative also occurs in marking the noun modifier of several nouns in a possessive-like relation in which the modified noun is further classified or qualified, such as

¹³³ In Khudlovo and Serednie, the inessive prepositional phrases headed by *a(nd)re* seem to be more common in expressing the simultaneous relation of age, e.g. *aro dešušov berš* 'at the age of 16' (see 11.2.1.1).

kapki nakhestar [drops nose.ABL] ‘nose drops’. The ablative noun modifier usually comes after the modified noun, cf. also:

- (153) *e kleja la bicig'atar* (UzhhS)
 ART key ART bicycle.ABL
 ‘The bicycle key.’
- (154) *imar nāne drab dandendar?* (Per)
 already NEG.COP.PRS.3 pill tooth.ABL.PL
 ‘Isn’t there a remedy (pill) for teeth anymore?’

Finally, the ablative occurs in certain lexicalised forms. The most conspicuous example is the plural ablative *jākhendar*, of the feminine noun *jakh* ‘eye’, which is used for the meaning of ‘evil eye’. It is a loan translation of dialectal Slavic forms for ‘evil eye’, cf. vernacular Slovak *zočí*, from the phrase *z očí* ‘from eyes’.

- (155) *te o šābl'ikos taš'l'ila,*
 if ART safety_match sink.AOR.3SG
akor vareko diña jākhendar (UzhhS)
 then somebody give.AOR.3SG eye.ABL.PL
 ‘If the safety match sank, then [it means] somebody cast the evil eye.’
- (156) *xuña jākhendar varesave manušestar* (UzhhS)
 catch.AOR.3SG eye.ABL.PL some human.ABL
 ‘S/he was hit by the evil eye from some person.’

11.1.1.5 Instrumental

The instrumental (*-ha/-ca*) has two primary functions. The first is to express the proper instrument or means by or with which an action is performed.

- (157) *uxand'a pes la kang'aha* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 comb.AOR.3SG REFL ART comb.INST
 ‘She combed her hair (literally: herself) with a comb.’
- (158) *adaleha mā ñiko pes na foglalkozinel* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 DEM.INST already nobody REFL NEG handle.PRS.3SG
 ‘Nobody occupies himself with this any longer.’

- (159) *čāl'ard'om les bandurkenca* (Per)
 feed.AOR.3SG he.ACC potatoe.INST.PL
 'I fed him with potatoes.'
- (160) *tovereha mār'da le gādžes* (Khu)
 ax.INST beat.AOR.3SG ART nonRom.ACC
 'He beat the non-Rom with an axe.'
- (161) *te na zaxinen salad'aha* (Ser)^{RDž}
 NCOMP NEG shit.PRS.3PL flyspeck.INST
 'May they (= flies) not shit [it] with flyspeck.'

The instrumental may be used with some primary transitive verbs, such as 'to throw' or 'to hurl', to highlight the tool of the action rather than its direct object, as in (162). Therefore, this construction is semantically different from the basic transitive construction with the direct object, as exemplified in (163):

- (162) *na icarde kole bareha* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 NEG hurl[IMP.2SG] that.SPEC stone.INST
 'Don't hurl (with) that stone.'

as against:

- (163) *tu icardeha kodā bar dži oki sejra*
 you hurl.FUT.2SG that.SPEC stone.NOM TERM DEM.CNTR side
prig e rika? (Ser)^{LQCR}
 across/through ART river
 'Will you hurl that stone across the river to the other side?'

The other primary function of the instrumental is to express the comitative relation, i.e. accompaniment, including associations.

- (164) *oj av'la vaj tranda barātkenca* (Per)^{LQCR}
 she come.AOR.3SG about thirty female_friend.INST.PL
 'She came with about thirty female friends.'
- (165) *dža pes laha bājin* (Per)
 go[IMP.2SG] REFL she.INST play[IMP.2SG]
 'Go play with her.'

- (166) *mijri pheñ leha dživel* (Khu)
 my sister he.INST live.PRS.3SG
 ‘My sister lives with him.’
- (167) *ov bešela tuha, pijela tuha čajocis* (Ser)
 he sit.FUT.3SG you.INST drink.FUT.3SG you.INST tea.DIM
 ‘He will be sitting with you; he will drink some tea with you.’

Furthermore, the occurrence of the instrumental in constructions with several verbs is related to the comitative function, such as ‘to speak (to somebody)’ (168), (169), ‘to meet (somebody)’ (170) and ‘to dispute, quarrel (with somebody)’ (171).

- (168) *baredereha vakerās* (UzhhR)
 big.COMPR.INST speak.IPF/POT.1SG
 ‘I was talking to a boss.’
- (169) *od’a ov imā le čhavenca na vakerel romanes* (Per)
 there he already ART child.INST.PL NEG speak.PRS.3SG Romani.ADV
 ‘There he no longer speaks Romani to his children.’
- (170) *i stričind’a mā oj pes leha, kale čaha* (Khu)
 and meet.AOR.3SG already she REFL he.INST this.SPEC boy.INST
 ‘And she already met him, this boy.’
- (171) *ov ņikaha pes na konfliktinel* (Ser)
 he nobody.INST REFL NEG dispute.PRS.3SG
 ‘He does not quarrel with anybody.’

See also the following sentences for the occurrence of the instrumental with various verbs.

- (172) *o terno čhibāl’inel phurederenca* (UzhhS)
 ART young be_cheeky.PRS.3SG old.COMPR.INST.PL
 ‘A young [person] is cheeky to elder [people].’
- (173) *angomiš amenca avri thod’al* (UzhhS)
 a_while_ago we.INST out put.AOR.2SG
 ‘A while ago, you deceived us.’
- (174) *ňiko na interesinel pes le dživipnaha* (Per)
 nobody NEG interest.PRS.3SG REFL ART life.INST
 ‘Nobody is interested in life.’

In addition, the instrumental occurs in various adverbial phrases in several derived functions. The occurrence of the instrumental in phrases that express the manner by which an action is accomplished, including transportation, is related to the proper instrument function.

- (175) *pajiš verdanenca džanas khejre* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 then carriage.INST.PL go.IPF/POT.3SG home
 ‘Then they went home by carriages.’
- (176) *kotorencia davkerava, bo na bijrinav jekhwareste*
 piece.INST.PL give.ITER.FUT.1SG becauseNEG manage.PRS.1SG at_once
te odden (Uzhhs)
 NCOMP give_back.INF
 ‘I will deliver [it] in pieces because I’m not able to give [it] back at once.’
- (177) *verdaneha grajeha phirlas pal o gādže* (Per)
 carriage.INST horse.INST go_often.IPF/POT.3SG over ART nonRom.PL
 ‘He was frequenting the non-Roma with the cart and the horse.’
- (178) *na dža avri šernange šejreha* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 NEG go[IMP.2SG] outside bareheaded head.INST
 ‘Don’t go out bareheaded.’ (Literally: ‘with the bareheaded head’.)

The instrumental may also have a spatial function to express a path through which a subject is moving (perlative).

- (179) *oj džalas teje runkoha* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 she go.IPF/POT.3SG down slope.INST
 ‘She was descending the slope.’
- (180) *gādžo nesas honno le dromeha*
 nonRom NEG.COP.PST.3 able ART road.INST
te predžan lincate (Ser)
 NCOMP cross.INF Lintsi.LOC
 ‘A non-Rom wasn’t able to go through the road to Lintsi.’

The instrumental may occur in temporal phrases to express the duration of an action.

- (181) *khelenas rataha ajci, hoj lengero dad*
 dance IPF/POT.3PL night.INST so_much FCOMP their father

- džalas te previrinen lengere kamaš'li* (UzhhS)
 go.IPF/POT.3PL NCOMP check.INF their shoe.PL
 'They were dancing through the night so much that their father was checking their shoes.'
- (182) *čhonenca munkāčiste are špitā'la ličinlas pes* (Ser)
 month.INST.PL Mukachevo.LOC in hospitalcure.IPF/POT.3SG REFL
 'For months, he was undergoing treatment in a hospital in Mukachevo.'

The temporal phrase with the instrumental also occurs in comparative sentences to express time differences. In non-temporal sentences, a prepositional phrase headed by *pre* normally occurs as a marker of comparative differences (see 10.1.3).

- (183) *kampi'la te phenen duje kurkenca sigeder* (UzhhS)
 be_needed.AOR NCOMP say.INF two week.INST.PL soon.COMPR
 'It should have been said two weeks earlier.'

11.1.1.6 Locative

The locative (*-te/-de*) is a restricted case in Eastern Uzh Romani. In fact, it represents an inflectional case category only in pronouns, which are marked by the locative in prepositional phrases, e.g. *andre kaste* [in who.LOC] 'in whom', *khatar late* [from she.LOC] 'from her', *pre savorende* [on all.LOC] 'on everybody', etc. (for more details, see 11.2). Thus, the locative is primarily a prepositional case of most prepositions.

There are also rare non-prepositional occurrences of locative pronouns. In Radvanka, the locative is attested as a marker of the temporary pronominal possessor in predicative possession (184), for which the phrase headed by the preposition *ke* is otherwise used (see 11.2.1.2). A locative pronoun with no preposition also occurs in special interrogative constructions introduced by the thing interrogative *so* 'what', which have peculiar meanings 'what is wrong with XY' (185).

- (184) *pališ oj axal'ila, hoj nāne late*
 then she understand.AOR.3SG FCOMP NEG.COP.PRS.3 she.LOC
tārca (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 wallet
 'Then she realised that she didn't have the wallet.'
- (185) *so tute, čhaje ?* (UzhhS)
 what you.LOC girl.VOC.SG
 'What's wrong with you, girl?'

For nouns, the locative is no longer a productive case, and the absolute majority of nouns are incapable of forming the locative case. The only exception is a specific category of the proper names of towns and villages, which have locative marking in non-prepositional spatial phrases for either stative or directive meanings. Inessive prepositional phrases may also occur, in particular with remote and less familiar locations (see 11.2.1.1).

- (186) *od'a xustoste hin phērdo vlaxi* (UzhR)
 there Khust.LOC COP.PRS.3 full Vlax_Rom.PL
 'There in Khust, there are lots of Vlax Roma.'
- (187) *sa mukavkerde o khera ade,*
 all leave.ITER.AOR.3PL ART house.PL here
avka denašle prahate kašate braťislavate (UzhS)
 thus run.AOR.3PL Prague.LOC Košice.LOC Bratislava.LOC
 'Everybody left their houses here, and thus they ran away to Prague, Košice [and] Bratislava.'
- (188) *but roma pregejle ungvārate te dživen* (Per)
 many Rom.PLmove.AOR.3PL Uzhhorod.LOC NCOMP live.INF
 'Many Roma have moved to live in Uzhhorod.'
- (189) *antalovcate but slovāka hin* (Khu)
 Antalovtsi.LOC many Slovak.PL COP.PRS.3
 'There are many Slovaks in Antalovtsi.'
- (190) *ov sas l'incate are skl'epa* (Ser)
 he COP.PST.3 Lintsi.LOC in shop
 'He was in a shop in Lintsi.'

In contrast, neighbourhoods and settlements are usually marked by prepositional phrases, in particular by those headed by *pre* (see 11.2.1.3). However, the morphological locative *radvankate* is an alternative to the more common prepositional phrase *pre radvanka* ('in/to Radvanka'). The only country name attested in a locative form is *rosijate* or *rusijate* 'in/to Russia'.

Otherwise, the locative of nouns is attested in rather adverbialised and greatly lexicalised forms, such as *romeste*, from the noun *rom* 'husband', which is specifically used in reference to married women (see (191) and (192)). Another adverbialised locative noun is *bokhate* in Shakhta, from the feminine noun *bokh* 'hunger', which is used as a modifier of the verb *mer-* 'to die' to render the meaning 'to die of hunger, to starve' (see 9.2).

(191) *oj romeste* (common)
 she husband.LOC
 ‘She is married.’

(192) *ola duj čhaja geje romeste* (Uzhhs)
 DEM.PL two girl.PL go.AOR.3PL husband.LOC
 ‘Those two girls got married.’

The locative also sporadically occurs in certain fixed idiomatic phrases, such as *čhon ke čhoneste* ‘month in, month out; month after month’ (193). Note that the locative noun in this type of idiom is headed by a preposition, although nouns normally never take the locative case in prepositional phrases. Another example of a lexicalised prepositional phrase with the locative noun is temporal *ke ratate* or *ke rāfate* (cf. *rāfi* ‘evening, night’), which means ‘towards evening, early evening’.

(193) *džanahas hoj sar te tāven, so te keren,*
 know.IPF/POT.1PL FCOMP how NCOMP cook.INF what NCOMP do.INF
sar odi kopejka te ulaven, hod’ t’ ejl
 how DEM Kopek NCOMP divide.INF FCOMP NCOMP COP.PRS.SBJV.3SG
texan, čhon ke čhoneste (Khu)
 food month.NOM at/to month.LOC
 ‘We knew how to cook, what to do [and] how to divide [even] the Kopek to have a food month after month.’

11.1.1.7 Genitive

The genitive (*-ker-/ger-*, optionally *-kor-* in the NOM.SG.M agreement forms *-kor-o*)¹³⁴ marks the adnominal possessor within a noun phrase in which the possessor agrees with its head through the so-called ‘Suffixaufnahme’; see 4.1.3 and 11.1 for more details.

(194) *l-es-ker-i* *daj,*
 3-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.SG.F mother[NOM.SG.F]
l-es-ker-o *dad*
 3-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.SG.M father[NOM.SG.M]
n’ adej uv’ile (Uzhhr)

¹³⁴ See 6.1.1.2 for the irregular first- and second-person genitives.

NEG here be_born.AOR.3PL

‘His parents (literally: his mother, his father) were not born here.’

(195) *kāj thod'al*

where put.AOR.2SG

le čhaj-or-a-ker-e kamaš'li ? (Per)

ART.OBL girl-DIM-OBL.SG.F-GEN-NOM.PL shoe.NOM.PL

‘Where have you put the shoes of the girl?’

(196) *pališ l-a-kor-o phral dodžang'la,*

then 3-OBL.SG.F-GEN-NOM.SG.F brother[NOM.SG.M] come_to_know.AOR.3SG

mijr-a d-a-kor-o phral-ōr-'

my-OBL.SG.F mother-OBL.SG.F-GEN-NOM.SG.M brother-DIM-NOM.SG.M

ož oj adaj dživel (Khu)

FCOMP she here live.PRS.3SG

‘Then her brother – the brother of my mother – found out that she was living here.’

For the semantic properties of genitives in Romani, Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2000) discussed the differentiation of anchoring and non-anchoring genitive adnominals. Both types are found in Eastern Uzh Romani. The anchoring genitive adnominals are used to identify the referent of the nominal head, e.g. *le phral-es-ker-i romñi* [ART brother-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.SG.F wife.NOM.SG.F] ‘brother’s wife’, *le devl-es-ker-i ruš* [ART God-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.SG.F anger.NOM.SG.F] ‘God’s anger’, *la d-a-ker-e holmi* [ART mother-OBL.SG.F-GEN-NOM.PL cloth.NOM.PL] ‘mother’s clothing’, including the inanimate referents, such as *le vudar-es-ker-i ručka* [ART door-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.SG.F handle.NOM.SG.F] ‘the handle of the (specific) door’. In contrast, the non-anchoring genitives do not identify the head referent because they do not refer to any specific possessor. They rather qualify or classify the head nominal by providing its description or characteristics, and in this respect, they are more similar to adjectives (cf. Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2000: 141, 145), e.g. *barval'a-ker-i pohoda* [wind-OBL.SG.F-GEN-NOM.SG.F weather.NOM.SG.F] ‘windy weather’, *phāb-en-ger-o sokos* [apple-OBL.PL-GEN-NOM.SG.M juice.NOM.SG.M] ‘apple juice’, *rejz-o-s-ker-e pijra* [copper-CLASS-OBL.SG.F-GEN-NOM.PL pot.NOM.PL] ‘copper pots’, *la koz-a-ker-o ciral* [ART goat-OBL.SG.F-GEN-NOM.SG.M cheese.NOM.SG.M] ‘goat cheese’. Some of these non-anchoring genitive adnominals may even compete with adjectival derivations, e.g. *kozikano ciral*, which are discussed in 5.2.

Non-anchoring genitives also involve special descriptive phrases in which the genitive adnominal is modified by an adjectival or numeral attribute. The attribute, as a modifier of a

non-nominative form, occurs in the oblique case and agrees with the genitive adnominal in the number and gender categories, e.g. *kijk-e jākh-en-ger-i rakli* [blue-OBL.PL eye-OBL.PL-GEN-NOM.SG.F girl.NOM.SG.F] ‘blue-eyed girl’, *jekh-a jakh-a-ker-o rom* [one-OBL.SG.F eye-OBL.SG.F-GEN-NOM.SG.M Rom.NOM.SG.M] ‘one-eyed Rom’, *biš-e berš-en-ger-o čha* [twenty-OBL.PL year-OBL.PL-GEN-NOM.SG.M son.NOM.SG.M] ‘twenty-year-old son’.

- (197) *mijro ujcus bār-e nakh-es-kor-o* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 my uncle big-OBL.SG.M nose-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.SG.M
 ‘My uncle is big-nosed.’

Phrases in which the genitive is modified by a numeral or another quantifier are common; they often indicate the age of the head referent, e.g. *jekhe čhoneskero čhavōro* ‘one-month-old child’, *penda beršengero* ‘fifty years old’, *keci kurkengero* ‘how many weeks old’. Any other type of measure or quantity function may occur as well, e.g. *duje litrengero caklos* ‘bottle of two litres’, *jekha sinakeri fala* ‘one-coloured wall’, *bute sinengero palācis* ‘multi-coloured carpet’. See also the following sentences:

- (198) *ov dikhl'a jekh-e pindr-es-ker-a*
 he see.AOR.3SG one-OBL.SG.M foot-OBL.SG.M-GEN-OBL.SG.F
phuvr-a bab-a (UzhR)^{LQCR}
 old-OBL.SG.F grandmother-ACC.SG.F
 ‘He saw a one-footed old woman.’
- (199) *bištajštār-e berš-en-gor-o ejla,*
 twenty_four-OBL.PL year-OBL.PL-GEN-NOM.SG.M COP.FUT.3SG
sar les mukena avri (Khu)
 how he.ACC release.FUT.3PL out
 ‘He will be 24 years old when they release him.’
- (200) *strojinel duj-’ etāž-en-gor-o kher* (Khu)
 build.PRS.3SG two-OBL.PL storey- OBL.PL-GEN-NOM.SG.M house[NOM.SG.M]
 ‘He builds a two-storey house.’

Sometimes, the numeral ‘one’ may be omitted, and the genitive form alone expresses a single item. In sentence (201), the genitive *rublakero* refers to an item that has a price of a single unit of the currency. It fulfils the role of an inanimate direct object:

- (202) *ov bešelas paž l-a-te* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 he sit.IPF/POT.3SG beside(PREP) 3-OBL.SG.F-LOC
 ‘He was sitting beside her.’

Another non-spatial preposition, the causal *važ* (11.2.2.1), combines with a dative dependent pronoun. This preposition also commonly occurs with locative pronouns, which indicates an analogy to most other prepositional phrases. See the following pair of elicited sentences:

- (203) *važ l-es-ke zanasva'il'as* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 for(PREP) 3-OBL.SG.M-DAT get_ill.AOR.3SG
 ‘S/he got ill because of him.’

as against:

- (204) *važ l-a-te zanasva'il'om* (UzhhsR)^{LQCR}
 for(PREP) 3-OBL.SG.F-LOC get_ill.AOR.1SG
 ‘I got ill because of her.’

The highest degree of diversity occurs in privative prepositional phrases (see 11.2.3) in which the dependent pronoun is attested in three different cases: genitive, which is the most conservative option, locative and dative. The genitive, as in *bi l-es-ker-o* [without 3-OBL.SG.M-GEN-NOM.SG.M] ‘without him’, is more likely to occur with personal pronouns than with other pronouns and in Uzhhorod it is more common with the inherited preposition *bi* than with the borrowed *bez*. The thing pronoun *so*, which lacks a genitive form (see 6.2.1.1), is attested with the locative case (Uzhhorod, Perechyn, Khudlovo), as in *bi s-os-te* [without what-OBL-LOC], and the dative case (Uzhhorod, Serednie), e.g. *bi s-os-ke* [without what-OBL-DAT], in privative phrases. The universal pronoun *savoro* never occurs in the genitive if headed by a privative preposition. See also the variation in the following sentences:

- (205) *mange skučnones bice l-a-kor-o* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 I.DAT sad.ADV without(PREP) 3-OBL.SG.F-GEN-NOM.SG.M
- (206) *mange skučno bice l-a-ke* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 I.DAT sad.ADV without(PREP) 3-OBL.SG.F-DAT
- (207) *mange skučno bez l-a-te* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 I.DAT sad.ADV without(PREP) 3-OBL.SG.F-LOC

‘I feel sad without her.’

Based on the phonological properties of prepositions, a distinction must be made between vocalic prepositions, which end in a vowel /e/ (e.g. *andre* ‘in’), and consonantal prepositions, which end in a consonant (e.g. *tel* ‘under’); privative prepositions represent a special case, which is left apart for this moment. Some consonantal prepositions also tend to become vocalic in the idiolects of certain speakers, in particular in Perechyn, e.g. *pal* > *pale*, *prikal* > *prikale* and *važ* > *važe*. These consonantal prepositions become vocalic by analogy with other vocalic prepositions in /e/, which manifests itself in the form of the preposition in phrases with pronominal dependents, e.g. *pal jekāvreste* ~ *pale jekāvreste* ‘after one another’ recorded from a speaker in Perechyn.

Importantly, vocalic prepositions integrate the definite article of a NP, e.g. *andr-o kher* [in-ART.NOM.SG.M house.NOM.SG.M] ‘in the house’ (see 11.1 for more details). Since these vocalic prepositions end in /e/ in their basic, neutral form (with no article), the preposition with the incorporated feminine article *e* is identical to its neutral form, e.g. *andr-e xolov* [in-ART.NOM.SG.F trousers.NOM.SG.F] ‘in(to) the trousers’. Alternatively, it can be stated that prepositions in non-pronominal prepositional phrases inflect for gender and number, showing agreement with their dependents, as in the glossing of the following sentences:

- (208) *odala* *rokone* *denaškerde* *andr-o* *veš* (Per)^{LQCR}
 DEM.PL dog.PL run.ITER.AOR.3PL in-SG.M forest[NOM.SG.M]
 ‘Those dogs ran into the forest.’
- (209) *mange kampil* *te* *džan* *andr-e* *skl'ep-a* (Per)^{LQCR}
 I.DAT be_needed.PRS NCOMP go.INF in-SG.F shop-NOM.SG.F
 ‘I need to go in the shop.’

11.2.1 Spatial and temporal prepositions

Table 71 presents the common spatial prepositions in Eastern Uzh Romani with their basic functional classification and meanings. The classification of prepositions and the terminological framework of Elšík and Matras (2006) is followed.¹³⁶ More detailed functional descriptions of prepositions are given below in the sections beginning with 11.2.1.1. Prepositions are strikingly similar to spatial adverbs, and certain prepositions, such as *andre*, are even identical to adverbs in form (see 9.3.1).

¹³⁶ Cf. in particular Elšík and Matras (2006: 241).

Table 71: Spatial prepositions

FUNCTION	FORM	TRANSLATION
INESSIVE	<i>andre (are, ande)</i>	‘in’
INESSIVE SEPARATIVE	<i>andal</i>	‘out of’
ADESSIVE	<i>ke</i>	‘at, to’
ADESSIVE SEPARATIVE	<i>khatar</i>	‘from’
CONTACT	<i>pre</i>	‘on’
CONTACT SEPARATIVE	<i>pal</i>	‘from (the top of)’
INFERIOR	<i>tel</i>	‘under’
POSTERIOR	<i>pal</i>	‘behind’ also: ‘over’, ‘about’, ‘for’
ANTERIOR	<i>angal (angle)</i>	‘in front of’
MEDIAL	<i>maškar</i>	‘among, between’
PROXIMATE	<i>paž</i>	‘beside’
PERLATIVE	<i>prig</i>	‘across, through’

As the comparison with the adpositional system reconstructed by Elšík and Matras (2006: 241) for Late Proto-Romani shows, the majority of Eastern Uzh Romani spatial prepositions are inherited from Proto-Romani, and most reconstructed Proto-Romani adpositions find their reflexes in Eastern Uzh Romani. Still, there are no reflexes of the oppositive **mamuj* ‘opposite’, the perlative **perdal* ‘across, through’, and the circumlative **trujal* ‘around’ in Eastern Uzh Romani, and there are no adessive prepositions **te* and **tar*. Note that the contact separative preposition is identical to the posterior preposition *pal*, although historically, these were different prepositions that have merged due to the erosion of the contact separative **opral* (or **upral*) > *pal* (see also 11.2.1.4).

There are no dedicated temporal prepositions in Eastern Uzh Romani. Temporal phrases are normally headed by spatial prepositions, which is why temporal meanings will be discussed in connection with the primary spatial meanings of prepositions. The only exception of a specific temporal preposition is the borrowed *pos’i* in Khudlovo and Serednie, which is discussed in 11.2.1.10.

The following sections provide more detailed descriptions of prepositions. Separative prepositions are examined in a single section along with their non-separative counterparts with the exception of the contact separative *pal*, which is discussed in connection with the formally identical posterior preposition *pal* rather than with the contact preposition *pre*. It

should be noted that the overview of Eastern Uzh Romani prepositions presented is not exhaustive. There are some rarer loan prepositions attested in particular varieties that are not discussed.

11.2.1.1 Inessive prepositions *andre* and *andal*

The inessive preposition *andre* ‘in(to)’ mostly maintains its conservative form identical to that of the adverb ‘inside, inward’. However, in Khudlovo and Serednie, it also has the optional form *are*, while in both Uzhhorod varieties, the form *ande* is sometimes encountered, both showing different types of simplification of the consonant cluster /ndr/. The counterpart separative preposition ‘out of, from’ is invariably *andal*.

The preposition *andre* expresses containment of an object within a closed space (inessive) or its motion thereinto (illative). It may also be used with town and some country names as an alternative to the locative noun phrases in *-te* (see 11.1.1.6), e.g. *kijevste ~ andro kijevs* ‘in/to Kyiv’, *rusijate ~ andre rusija* ‘in/to Russia’. Most country names are marked by this preposition in spatial adverbials.

- (210) *skiden pen od'a andre khangejri* (UzhhR)
gather.PRS.3PL REFL.PLthere in church
‘They gather themselves there in the church.’
- (211) *od'a ande ungriko hin graja* (UzhhR)
there in Hungary COP.PRS.3 horse.PL
‘There, in Hungary, there are horses.’
- (212) *mind'a la andre mindž ruginā* (Per)
immediately she.ACC in vagina kick.FUT.1SG
‘I will immediately kick her in the vagina!’ (swearing)
- (213) *il'a o tover, čhinda are leste* (Khu)
take.AOR.3SG ART axe cut.AOR.3SG in he.LOC
‘He took the axe [and] drove into him.’
- (214) *me lidžav le grajes aro x'ivos* (Ser)
I lead.PRS.1SG ART horse.ACC in stable
‘I’ll lead the horse into the stable.’
- (215) *andro lāčho ilo o dejl dživel* (Ser)
in good heart ART God live.PRS.3SG
‘In a good heart, the God lives.’

The preposition *andre* may be combined with body-part nouns in a contact meaning ('on'):

- (216) *oj čumind'a les andre čhamola* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 she kiss.AOR.1SG he.ACC in cheek
 'She kissed him on the cheek.'
- (217) *are men lake figinlas lāncos* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 in neck she.DAT hang.IPF/POT.3SG chain
 'A chain was hanging on her neck.'

Furthermore, the preposition *andre* occurs in a number of idiomatic and/or contact-induced constructions. For example, it occurs in the phrase *andro host'i* 'on a visit', which is a semicalque of the Ukrainian prepositional phrase *в зочмі* (Russian *в зочму*) (218). The inessive preposition also holds the object function 'about' in the meaning 'to care ABOUT something/somebody', expressed by a negative sentence with the impersonal verb-predicate *xa-* 'to eat' and the oblique-marked semantic subject (219). In sentences with the verb *mer-* 'to die', the preposition is commonly used with the noun *bokh* 'hunger' (*andre/ande/are bokh*) to express the meaning 'to die of hunger, to starve' (220); see also 11.1.1.6.¹³⁷

- (218) *tu čak av'al andro host'i* (UzhhS)
 you only come.AOR.2SG in visit
 'You have only come to visit [us].'
- (219) *man na xal andre lende nič* (Per)
 I.ACC NEG eat.PRS.3SG in they.LOC nothing
 'I don't care about them.'
- (220) *mijre čhavōre khejre meren are bokh* (Khu)
 my child.DIM.PL home.ADV die.PRS.3PL in hunger
 'My children are starving at home.'

In temporal phrases, the inessive preposition serves to mark the simultaneous adverbial phrases with the names of the months (e.g. Uzhhorod *andro augustušis* 'in August'). In Khudlovo and Sereďnie, the inessive phrase also occurs with the most recent East Slavic loans for the days of the week, e.g. *aro četvėrk* 'on Thursday' (see 9.4.1), and in

¹³⁷ In Shakhta, the adverbialised locative form *bokhate* is used instead (see 9.2).

expressing the simultaneous relation of age (the ablative occurs in Uzhhorod and Perechyn; 11.1.1.4).

- (221) *aro dešutrin berš xund'om*
 in thirteen year start.AOR.1SG
te pijkeren te sivinkeren (Ser)
 NCOMP drink.ITER.INF NCOMP smoke.ITER.INF
 ‘At the age of 13, I started drinking and smoking.’

The preposition *andal* is used in the meaning of separation or detachment. It may also occur with proper names of towns and villages (223) and in a partitive meaning (224) as an alternative to the ablative case.

- (222) *tüñin andal mijro kher* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 get_out[IMP.2SG] out_of my house
 ‘Get out from my house!’
- (223) *avla andal e poltava* (Ser)
 came.AOR.3SG out_of ART Poltava
 ‘He came from Poltava.’
- (224) *the oj xāl'a andal odi māčhi* (Ser)^{RDZ}
 also she eat.AOR.3SG out_of DEM fish
 ‘She, too, ate [something] out of that fish.’

11.2.1.2 Adessive prepositions *ke* and *khatar*

The adessive preposition *ke* (‘at, to’) and its separative counterpart *khatar* (‘from’) display no variation in Eastern Uzh Romani. Note that *khatar* is identical in form to the separative and perlocative place interrogative ‘whence, which way’.

The preposition *ke* marks an adjacent localisation of an object to the spatial object of the dependent NP, such as a position at someone’s place or motion thereto (‘to(wards)’). The preposition *ke* commonly occurs with the terminative particle *dži* (see 9.6.2) to express the terminative adessive ‘up to’ (228).

- (225) *ke kaste salas pālovciste ?* (UzhhR)
 at/to who.LOC COP.PST.2SG Pavlovce_nad_Uhom.LOC
 ‘Whom did you visit in Pavlovce nad Uhom (a Slovak village)?’ (Literally ‘At whose place were you in Pavlovce nad Uhom?’).

- (226) *džav ke peskeri rodzina* (UzhhR)
 go.PRS.1SG at/to REFL.GEN family
 ‘I go to my own family.’
- (227) *ko roma pes phenel* (UzhhS)
 at/to Roma REFL say.PRS.3SG
 ‘Among the Roma, people say.’ (Literally: ‘At Roma’s places it is said’; figuratively: ‘The Roma say...’).
- (228) *gejlom tuha dži ke bār* (UzhhS)
 go.AOR.1G you.INST TERM at/to fence
 ‘I went with you up to the fence.’

There is a noteworthy function of the preposition *ke* in marking the possessor NP in the predicative possession, i.e. in constructions of the notion ‘to have’. As in other Central Romani dialects, the possessor is commonly marked by the accusative (11.1.1.2), but a prepositional phrase headed by *ke* occurs in temporary possession (‘to have something at temporary possession’), typically with the dependent noun for ‘money’. Sporadically, it is even attested in some abstract possessive domains, such as possession of a particular language, as in (232) and (233).

- (229) *so sas ke lende o lovve,*
 what COP.PST.3 at/to they.LOC ART money
sa sa sa ile (UzhhR)
 all all all take.AOR.3PL
 ‘They took [from them] absolutely everything they had with them, including money.’
- (230) *hin ke tu xurde?* (UzhhS)
 COP.PRS.3 at/to you change(coins)
 ‘Do you have any change [at the moment with you]?’
- (231) *phend’a, džala khejre, mind’a dikhela*
 say.AOR.3SG go.FUT.3SG home immediately see.FUT.3SG
či hin ke menša lovve (Per)
 whether COP.PRS.3 at/to Mensha money
 ‘He said that he would go home and immediately see, whether Mensha has [some] money [at immediate disposal].’
- (232) *ajso barikano vakeribe ke lende* (Per)
 such proud speak.NMLS at/to they.LOC
 ‘They have such a haughty way of speaking.’

- (233) *ke sakoneste āver čhib* (Khu)
 at/to every.LOC other language
 ‘Everyone has a different language.’
- (234) *čirla k’ amende nesas telefonos* (Ser)
 long_ago at/to we.LOC COP.PST.3 telephone
 ‘In the past, we didn’t have a telephone.’

Interestingly, this type of a prepositional phrase is also attested in the possessor-related recipient marking of the verb of giving, but once again, this only occurs in the specific meaning of the recipient whose control over the handed item is intended to lead to a temporary possession:

- (235) *de ke leste* (Uzhhs)
 give[IMP.2SG] at/to he.LOC
 ‘Hand [it] to him [tools while fixing something].’
- (236) *diňom ke romňi o lovve,*
 give.AOR.1SG at/to woman ART money
mi cinel mange tovāris (Uzhhs)
 OPT buy.PRS.3SG I.DAT commodity
 ‘I’ve given the money to the woman to buy the goods for me.’ (That is: I am the owner of the money and just handed the money to the woman so that she can exchange the money for the goods and then return the goods to me.)

The adessive preposition *ke* also occurs in temporal phrases that indicate the proximity of a time period, as in *ko dešuduj ovri* ‘towards twelve o’clock’. Furthermore, *ke* marks adverbial phrases of the anterior duration (‘till, until’), as in (237). The terminative particle *dži* ‘up to’ often co-occurs with the preposition *ke* to indicate the anterior duration; see 9.6.2 for more details.

- (237) *ke vojna are jek dživnas savore* (Ser)
 at/to war in one live.IPF/POT.3PL all.PL
 ‘Until the war, they all lived together.’

The separative preposition *khatar* expresses separation from someone's place (238). It is not common in temporal phrases, but it is rarely attested in the posterior duration with nouns, as in *khatar e vojna* 'since the war' attested in Radvanka.

- (238) *tu kecendar khatar late gej'la het?* (UzhS)
 you at_what_time from she.LOC go.AOR.2SG away
 'At what time did you leave her (literally: did you go from her)?'

11.2.1.3 Contact preposition *pre*

The contact preposition 'on' is *pre*, while its separative counterpart is *pal*, which is discussed in the next section. The preposition *pre* sporadically occurs with the assimilated consonant cluster as *pe*, most commonly in the data from Radvanka, but even in Radvanka, *pe* is rarer than *pre*. More interestingly, the preposition has an optional form with the initial vowel *opre* in Khudlovo, which is identical to the adverb *opre* 'above', as well as to the form of the contact preposition **opre* reconstructed by Elšík and Matras (2006: 241) for the common ancestor of Romani dialects.¹³⁸ Still, it is unlikely that the Khudlovo variety maintains the form of the preposition from Proto-Romani, along with the aphaeretic form *pre*. It rather seems that in Khudlovo, *pre* competes with the adverb *opre* grammaticalising into a new adposition, which leads to a restoration of the seemingly more conservative form.

The contact preposition *ke* locates an object on the top surface of a spatial object of the dependent NP, e.g. *pre phuv* 'on earth, on the ground, on soil', *pro skamin* 'on the table', *pro šejro* 'on the head', etc.

- (239) *thod'om tut pro than* (UzhS)
 put.AOR.1SG you.ACC on bed
 'I put you on the bed.'
- (240) *keren opro kher o šiferis* (Khu)
 do.PRS.3PL on house ART slate
 'They are fixing the slate on the house.'
- (241) *nāne pre soste te tāven o texan* (Ser)^{RDZ}
 NEG.COP.PRS.3 on what.LOC NCOMP cook.INF ART food
 'There is nothing (= no stove) on which to cook the food.'

¹³⁸ I am inclined to reconstruct the Proto-Romani contact preposition as **upre* based on Indo-Aryan forms, such as OIA *upari* and Hindi *ūpar*. The form *upre* is still common in many Romani dialects, including some Central dialects, as an adverb 'above'.

The preposition *ke* also heads phrases with dependent names of neighbourhoods, settlements and places within a broader locality, e.g. *pre radvanka* ‘in Radvanka’, *pre močāra* ‘in the Romani settlement of Mochara’, *pro tāboris* (alongside *andro tāboris*) ‘in a Romani settlement (generally)’, Uzhhorod *pro pijacis*, Perechyn Khudlovo Serednie *pro bazāris* ‘in the market’. It may also occur with names of the nearest countries, such as *pre ukrajina* ‘in Ukraine’, *pro čexi* ‘in (Czecho)slovakia’, *pro slovensko* ‘in Slovakia’ (mainly in Radvanka), *pre ungriko* ‘in Hungary’, although in this domain, *pre* alternates with the inessive preposition (*andre ungriko*).

In addition to its primary contact meaning, the preposition extends its function to the directive opposition ‘against’ to express contrary direction or physical opposition:

- (242) *ov rozdenaš'la pes pre fala* (UzhhS.Per.Khu.Ser)^{LQCR}
 he start_to_run.AOR.3SG REFL on wall
 ‘He started to run against the wall.’

Contact prepositional phrases often appear to be pattern borrowings of phrases with the contact preposition *na* in local Slavic languages, e.g. *pro ňebos* ‘in the sky’ is modelled after Slavic phrases that literally mean ‘on the sky’ (Slovak/Czech *na nebi*, Ukrainian *на небі*, Russian *на небе*). Other examples include *pro gav* ‘in a village, in the countryside’ (cf. Slovak *na dedine*, dialectal Ukrainian *на селі*), as in (243), and the occurrence of *pre* in figurative functions extended from its spatial reference, such as *pre buv'ti* ‘at/to work’ (244) (cf. Ukrainian *на роботі/на роботу*, Russian *на работе/на работу* ‘at/to work’)¹³⁹ and phrases with dependent names for musical instruments governed by the verb *bašav-* ‘to play’ (245) (cf. Slovak *hrať na*, Ukrainian *зрати на*).

- (243) *vlāsno pheñ pro gav dživel* (UzhhR)
 own sister on village live.PRS.3SG
 ‘[My] full sister is living in a village.’
- (244) *me pre buv'ti gej'lom* (Ser)
 I on work go.AOR.1SG
 ‘I went to work.’

¹³⁹ In Uzhhorod, the inessive phrase *andre buv'ti*, which is closer to West Slavic in its structure (cf. Slovak *v robote* ‘at work’) and to Hungarian (*munkában*), is also common.

- (245) *on bašaven pre jónika* (Ser)
 they play.PRS.3PL on keyboard
 ‘They play the keyboard.’

The preposition *pre* also has an object function of the predication ‘to ride’ (246), which matches the common function of *na* in Slavic languages (cf. Slovak *jazdit’ na*, Ukrainian *їздити на*, Russian *кататься на*) and expresses the compensative ‘for’ in ‘to exchange something FOR something’ (247), which corresponds to the function of *na* in local Slavic (cf. in Ukrainian *поміняти на*, also in Polish *wymienić na*, ‘to exchange for’).

- (246) *čirla pro verdana phirnas* (UzhhR)
 long_ago on carriage.PL go_often.IPF/POT.3PL
 ‘In the past, they rode the carriages.’
- (247) *ov čerind’a ola kamaš’li*
 he change.AOR.3SG DEM.PL shoe.PL
pro nejve kamaš’li (UzhhS)
 on new shoe.PL
 ‘He changed those shoes for the new shoes.’

The prepositional phrase *pre dzeka* with the borrowed dependent noun *dzeka* ‘liking, mood’ occurs in constructions with the dative experiencer (see 11.1.1.3) to express the meaning ‘to like’.

- (248) *mange pre dzeka odala holmi* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 I.DAT on mood/liking DEM.PL cloth.PL
 ‘I like those clothes.’

The contact preposition *pre* also has a range of temporal functions. For example, it is used in simultaneous time references to life events, public festivals and holidays, e.g. *pro bijav* ‘at the wedding ceremony’, *pro bovňa* ‘at the christening party’, *pre karāčoňa* ‘at Christmas’ (*karāčoňa* ‘Christmas’ from Hungarian *karácsony*), *pro mangavipe(n)* ‘at the betrothal’, *pro pārušāgos* ‘at the funeral’, etc. The same preposition is also used in reference to war time, i.e. *pre vojna* ‘at war’ (*vojna* ‘war’ from Slavic), to the weekend, as in *pro vixodne* or *pro vixodna* ‘at the weekend’ (*vixodne* or *vixodna* ‘weekend’; cf. Ukrainian *на вихідних*, but Russian *в выходные*), to the noon, as in *pro dijlos* ‘at the noon’, and optionally

in reference to midnight, as in *pre jepažrat* ‘at midnight’, for which a different preposition *pal* is used as well, i.e. *pal jepažrat*. The preposition also marks the simultaneous adverbial phrase ‘in the spring’ *pre vesna* (cf. Ukrainian *на весні*), in Uzhhorod alternatively with a different loanword *pre jāra* (cf. Slovak *na jar*), which is the only season expression that may occur in a prepositional phrase. For the other seasons, one-word adverbs are used instead (9.4.1).

- (249) *majinel t’ aven pre dovol’enka kanākes* (UzhhR)
 should.PRS.3SG NCOMP come.INF on holiday now
 ‘S/he should come on holiday now.’

The preposition *pre* also marks the atelic extent (‘for XY’) provided that the predicate conveys an idea of moving to a specific place (‘to come/go somewhere FOR a specific time’), as in (250). Finally, it is common in expressing a non-specific and recurring time period (a day, a week, a month, a year) during which a regular action, such as receiving a salary, takes place, as in (251).

- (250) *pro keci d’ives tumen avlan?* (Khu.Ser)^{LQCR}
 on how_many day you.PL come.AOR.2PL
 ‘For how many days have you.PL come?’
- (251) *xutkerās pro čhon the penda* (Khu)
 get.ITER.IPF/POT.1SG on month also fifty
 ‘I was receiving [a salary of] even fifty [roubles] a month.’

Finally, the preposition *pre* heads temporal phrases with the differential adjective *āver* ‘other’ (see 6.5.1), in reference to a future period of time, e.g. *pr’ āver berš* ‘next year’, *pr’ āver kurko* ‘next week’, *pr’ āver ňilaj* ‘next summer’, etc. (cf. Slovak *na budúci rok* ‘next year’, *na budúci týždeň* ‘next week’, etc.).

11.2.1.4 Contact separative and posterior preposition *pal*

The consonantal preposition *pal* occurs in various spatial, temporal and other meanings. Its broad semantic range is partly due to the origin of *pal* in two different prepositions that have merged: a contact separative preposition (‘from the top of’) and a posterior preposition (‘behind’).

First, the preposition represents a separative counterpart to the contact preposition *pre* (see 11.2.1.3 above). It expresses the separation or detachment of an object from the top

surface ('from the top of'), e.g. *pal o kher* 'from the top of the house', *pal o skamin* 'from the table', *pal o šejro* 'from the head'. In general, the separative *pal* is used with dependent NPs that would be headed by *pre* in the stative and directive meanings, e.g. *pal e radvanka* 'from Radvanka' (versus *pre Radvanka* 'in Radvanka'), *pal o tāboris* 'from a Romani settlement' (versus *pro tāboris* 'in a Romani settlement'), *pal e ukrajina* 'from Ukraine', *pal o čexi* 'from (Czecho)slovakia', *pal o ňebos* 'from the sky', *pal e buvŕi* 'from work', etc.

- (252) *kotorencia perkerel pal leste o mas* (UzhhS)
 piece.INST.PL fall.ITER.PRS.3SG from he.LOC ART meat
 'The flesh is falling down from him in pieces.'
- (253) *palal murdarde jekhe gādžes,*
 in/to_the_back kill.AOR.3PL one.OBL.SG.M nonRom.ACC.SG.M
čhide pal e phurd aro pāñi (Khu)
 throw.AOR.3PL from ART bridge in water
 'In the back they killed a non-Rom, they threw [him] from the bridge into the water.'

The preposition *pal* is also used figuratively in phrases to refer to different branches of the family ('from the maternal/paternal side'), as in:

- (254) *pal o dad e simjá adārik,*
 from ART father ART family from_here
a pal e daj sas tārkañatar e simjá (Khu)
 and/but from ART mother COP.PST.3 Trakany.ABL ART family
 'From the father's side, the family was from here, but from the mother's side, the family was from Trakany (a village in Slovakia).'

The second function of the preposition *pal* is to mark a posterior localisation or a sequence ('behind').

- (255) *oj vijgig pal leste džalas* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 she everywhere behind he.LOC go.IPF/POT.3SG
 'She followed him everywhere.' (Literally: 'She was walking behind him everywhere.')
- (256) *othov tut pal o šifoneris* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 hide[IMP.2SG] you.ACC behind ART wardrobe
 'Hide yourself behind the wardrobe.'

In the posterior function, *pal* is partly equivalent to the Slavic posterior preposition *po* and, like the latter, it may express sequential motion over a space or over a location, e.g. *pal o fovros* ‘over the town’ (alongside ‘from the town’), *pal o gāva* ‘over the villages’ (alongside ‘from villages’), *pal o svetos* ‘over the world’ (alongside ‘from the world’). Related to this meaning is the goal meaning in (258), which refers to travelling associated with gradual visits of various people.

- (257) *o roma pāñi vedricaha hordinnas,*
 ART Rom.PL water bucket.DIM.INST carry.IPF/POT.3PL
pal o xāra čhivkernas opre (Khu)
 over ART pit.PL throw.ITER.IPF/POT.3PL up
 ‘The Roma were carrying water in little buckets, scattering [the water] over the holes.’

- (258) *verdaneha, grajeha phirlas*
 carriage.INST.SG.M horse.INST.SG.M go_often.IPF/POT.3SG
pal o gādže, pal o gāva (Per)
 over ART nonRom.PL over ART village.PL
 ‘With a carriage [and] with a horse, he was travelling [to visit various] non-Roma over the countryside.’

With the verb *dikh-* ‘to see’ *pal* is used to express the meaning ‘to watch over’:

- (259) *pal o čhave na dikhen (Uzhhr)*
 over ART child.PL NEG see.PRS.3PL
 ‘They don’t watch over [their] children.’

The goal function of *pal* is further extended to express the purpose ‘for’ with human objects, as in (260) to (262), and the object of the notion ‘to marry somebody’ (263).

- (260) *lakoro phral sas adaj pal late (Khu)*
 her brother COP.PST.3 here for she.LOC
 ‘Her brother came here to take her.’ (Literally: ‘Her brother was here for her.’)
- (261) *gejle on pal peskeri daj (Ser)^{Rdž}*
 go.AOR.3PL they for REFL mother
 ‘They went for their mother.’

(262) *bičhad'a pal leste le sluhen* (Ser)^{Rdž}
 send.AOR.3SG for he.LOC ART servant.ACC.PL
 'He sent the servants for him.'

(263) *oj gejl'a romeste*
 she go.AOR.3SG husband.LOC
pal o romaduno čhavōro (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 for ART Romani boy
 'She married a Romani boy.'

It may also express a purpose of inanimate objects (264), competing with dative marking (265):

(264) *e phuvrōri gejl'a andro veš pal e čār* (Per)^{LQCR}
 ART old.DIM.F go.AOR.3SG in forest for ART grass/herb

as against:

(265) *jek phuvri gejl'a aro veš čārake* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 one old.F go.AOR.3SG in forest grass/herb.DAT.SG.F
 'An old woman went to the forest for the herb.'

Another non-spatial function of *pal* is that of a referential function 'about' with verbs such as 'to think', 'to speak', 'to write', 'to read', 'to know', etc.:

(266) *one kanāke duminen pal o lovve*, (Per)
 they now think.PRS.3PL about ART money
 'Now they think about money.'

(267) *kezdinde te vakeren pal o dejl* (Per)
 start.AOR.3PL NCOMP speak.INF about ART God
 'They started to speak about the God.'

(268) *od'a pal o roma pisinel* (Per)
 there about ART Rom.PL write.PRS.3SG
 'There he writes about Roma.'

(269) *me egenās pal e sval'ava* (Per)
 I read.IPF/POT.1SG about ART Svaliava
 'I was reading about Svaliava (a town in Transcarpathian Ukraine).'

(270) *lakeri daj ņizvesno, aňi na del pal peste*
 her mother missing not_even NEG give.PRS.3SG about REFL.LOC

te džanen

(Khu)

NCOMP know.INF

‘Her mother is missing, [she] even doesn’t let [us] know about herself.’

In the temporal reference, the preposition *pal* is used in marking the posterior duration ‘since’ with some dependent nouns, e.g. *pal e vojna* ‘since the war’. In Uzhhorod and Perechyn, it marks the posterior sequence ‘after’, as in *pal o deš ovri* ‘after ten o’clock’ and *pal o dijlos* ‘in the afternoon’ (literally ‘after the noon’ with the dependent noun *dijlos* ‘noon’ from Hungarian *dél*). In Khudlovo and Serechnie, a different preposition *pos’li* is used in the posterior sequence (see 11.2.1.10).

- (271) *pal kodā vesekedijšis amen ačhil’am rušle* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
after that.SPEC quarrel we become.AOR.1PL angry.PL
‘After that quarrel we became angry.’

- (272) *zalačhar pal peste o than* (Per)^{LQCR}
make_bed[IMP.2SG] after REFL.LOC ART bed
‘Make the bed after you get up (literally: after yourself)!’

11.2.1.5 Inferior preposition *tel* (plus *telal*)

The consonantal preposition *tel* ‘under’ expresses a vertical localisation of an object underneath a ground object of the dependent NP. In Radvanka, the preposition *tel* has an optional form *tol* used by some speakers if it is combined with the masculine or plural article *o*, e.g. *tol o skamin* ‘under the table’, *tol o vasta* ‘under the hands’. In other words, *tel* may show regressive vowel assimilation with the article within the same PP, which indicates a close phonological cohesion between the preposition and the article that follows it. Phrases with the unassimilated preposition, such as *tel o skamin*, in Radvanka occur as well.

- (273) *tel o šejro leske tho’da kovlo zalavkos* (Uzhh.Per.Khu)^{LQCR}
under ART head he.DAT put.AOR.3SG soft pillow
‘S/he put a soft pillow under his head.’

- (274) *tol o skamin sas o kokala* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
under ART table COP.PST.3 ART bone.PL
‘There were bones under the table.’

- (275) *sa zaxurd’ola tel mande* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
all fall_apart.FUT.3SG under I.LOC
‘Everything will fall apart under me.’

In addition to its primary spatial function, *tel* occurs in temporal phrases of the telic extent, which describe the length of a bounded situation ('during/within XY'; (276)), and in those of the posterior distance ('in XY'), as in (277) and (278). Example (279) suggests both readings.

- (276) *kode palal kerde lenge jek bitovka,*
 there in/to_the_back make.AOR.3PL they.DAT one apartment_house
al'e tel o efa berš igen zničinde odā (UzhR)
 but under ART eight year very destroy.AOR.3PL DEM
 'They made an apartment house for them there in the back, but within eight years, they have destroyed it to a great extent.'
- (277) *tel o pāndž minuti ejla oxto* (UzhS)
 under ART five minute.PL COP.FUT.3SG eight
 'It is 7:55.' (Literally: 'In five minutes, it will be eight').
- (278) *imā tel o trin berš il'a la o jančus* (Per)
 already under ART three year take.AOR.3SG she.ACC ART Yanchu
 'In no more than three years, Yanchu married her.'
- (279) *tel jek ovra ov ņerňisal'ila avri* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 under one hour he sober.INCH.AOR.3SG out
 'In (or: within/during) one hour, he sobered up.'

The separative counterpart of the inferior preposition, *telal* 'from under', is attested in Uzhhorod:

- (280) *telal o jiv o prajta kide avri* (UzhS)
 from_under ART snow ART leaf.PL pick[IMP.2SG] out
 'Pick up the leaves from under the snow.'

11.2.1.6 Anterior preposition *angal*

The preposition *angal* 'in front of, before', which is also a vocalic preposition *angle* in Khudlovo and Sereďnie, expresses an anterior localisation of an object ('in front of'). The preposition is also used in a common phrase *angal o dejl*, literally 'in front of the God', during swearing or in other religious-related references (283).

- (281) *angal* *peste* *ispidelas* *e* *kočija* (Uzhh.Khu)^{LQCR}
in_front_of REFL.LOC push.IPF/POT.3SG ART pram
‘In front of her(self), she was pushing a pram.’
- (282) *angal* *e* *sklepa terđolas* *varesov* *manuš* (Ser)^{LQCR}
in_front_of ART shop stand.IPF/POT.3SG some human
‘Some man was standing in front of the shop.’
- (283) *anglo* *dejl* *tuke* *phenav* (Khu)
in_front_of God you.DAT say.PRS.1SG
‘I am saying it to you in front of the God.’

The preposition *angal* is also figuratively used in the opposite meaning, e.g. Uzhhorod Perechyn *angal o cintejrjs*, Khudlovo Serednie *angal o temeto(v)s*, ‘in front of the cemetery’ > ‘opposite the cemetery’.

11.2.1.7 Medial preposition *maškar* (plus *maškāral*)

The preposition *maškar* ‘among, between’ expresses medial localisation between two objects or among multiple objects provided that it heads a single noun phrase (‘between X’, ‘among Y’; see (284) and (285)). In combination with the coordinated noun phrases (‘between X and Y’), a different preposition *paž* is encountered in the data (see 11.2.1.8 below).

- (284) *oj* *terđolas* *maškar* *lende* (UzhhS.Khu.Ser)^{LQCR}
she stand.IPF/POT.3SG among/between they.LOC
‘She was standing between them.’
- (285) *maškar* *o* *gādže* *dživnas* *one* (Per)
among/between ART nonRoma live.IPF/POT.3PL they
‘They lived among the non-Roma.’

The preposition *maškar* is also used in a figurative non-spatial reference, such as to express various affairs or relations that occur between or among people.

- (286) *muršikano* *vakeribe* *maškar* *lende* *hin* (UzhhR)
male.ADJ speak.NMLS among/between they.LOC COP.PRS.3
‘There is a male discussion among them.’
- (287) *maškar* *adala* *duj* *phrala*
among/between this.PL two brother.PL

- (292) *kade paž e školka dživnas* (Per)
 here.SPEC beside ART little_school live.IPF/POT.3PL
 ‘They lived right here by the little school.’
- (293) *paž e daj paž o phral teje xudenas len* (Khu)
 beside ART mother beside ART brother down catch.IPF/POT.3PL they.ACC
 ‘In the presence of the mother [and] in the presence of the brother, they were raping them.’

Furthermore, the preposition *paž* has a function of a medial preposition ‘between’ when it is combined with coordinated noun phrases (‘between X and Y’). Two types of constructions occur in the data. First, *paž* introduces each noun phrase, which indicates that there are two prepositional phrases coordinated by the conjunction *the* ‘and’ (294). The other construction consists of a single preposition that heads a prepositional phrase with two coordinated noun phrases (295).

- (294) *paž mijro skamin the paž mijro than*
 beside my table and beside my bed
nāne bāro mestos (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 NEG.COP.PRS.3 big place
 ‘There is no large place between my table and my bed.’
- (295) *paž o skamin the o than*
 beside ART table and ART bed
nāne bāro than (Khu)^{LQCR}
 NEG.COP.PRS.3 big place
 ‘There is no large place between the table and the bed.’

The related preposition *pašal* occurs in Khudlovo and Serednie in the circumlative and sequentive meanings ‘around’ and ‘along, past’, e.g. *pašal e rika* ‘along the river’, *pašal o kher* ‘past the house’. In Uzhhorod and Perechyn, only *paž* occurs in these functions.

- (296) *bešle pašal o skamin* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 sit.AOR.3PL around ART table
 as against:
- (297) *bešle paž o skamin* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 sit.AOR.3PL beside ART table
 ‘They sat around the table.’ (~ ‘They sat beside the table.’)

The preposition *paž* is not common in temporal phrases, but it heads phrases with ethnic and country names in the figurative meaning ‘during the rule of XY, under the rule of XY’. This function is derived from that of ‘in the presence of’ (see (293) above).

- (298) *paž o rusi nesas sabano*
 beside ART Russian.PL NEG.COP.PST.3 allowed
te vakeren pal o dejl (UzhhS)
 NCOMP speak.INF about ART God
 ‘Under the rule of Russians, it was not allowed to speak about the God.’

11.2.1.9 Perlative preposition *prig*

While all spatial prepositions discussed thus far have been inherited from Late Proto-Romani, the perlative relation (‘across, over, through, via’) is marked by a loan preposition *prig*, which rarely occurs as *preg*. The form of this preposition has similar counterparts in South Slavic languages (cf. *preko* ‘across, through’ in Serbo-Croatian), but it occurs in some vernacular North Slavic dialects as well; cf. ‘East Slovak *prik/prek* especially east of Michalovce’, cited by Kopečný et al. (1973: 174). Thus, *prig* is likely to have been borrowed from local Slavic dialects of the Slovak-Ukrainian border area.

- (299) *merkin pre tu,*
 be_careful[IMP.2SG] on you
te džas prig o drom (UzhhR)
 if go.PRS.2SG across/through ART road
 ‘Look out when you go across the road.’
- (300) *od’a prig o drom man xunde o mujale* (Khu)
 there across/through ART road I.ACC catch.AOR.3PL ART police
 ‘There, across the road, the police caught me.’
- (301) *mijri čhajōri daral pes*
 my daughter fear.PRS.3SG REFL
te predžan prig e phurd (Ser)^{LQCR}
 NCOMP cross.INF across/through ART bridge
 ‘My daughter is afraid to go across the bridge.’
- (302) *na čhiven man preg e bār* (Ser)^{RDZ}
 NEG throw.IMP.2PL I.ACC across/through ART fence
 ‘Don’t throw me over the fence!’

In Perechyn, the preposition also occurs in a form *prikal*, which is otherwise used in the benefactive and causal meanings (see 11.2.2.2).

- (303) *cikñisarde peske o drom prikalo brehos* (Per)^{LQCR}
 small.FACT.AOR.3PL REFL.DAT ART road throughART slope
 ‘They shortened their journey through the slope.’

In addition, the common East Slavic perlocative preposition *čerez* (cf. Russian/Ukrainian *чepeз*) is also sporadically used by some speakers.

11.2.1.10 Temporal preposition *posli*

The preposition *posli* is the only dedicated temporal preposition in Eastern Uzh Romani. It is borrowed from the East Slavic **poslě* (cf. dialectal Ukrainian (Rusyn) *носли*, Russian *после* ‘after’).¹⁴⁰ The preposition is common in Khudlovo and Sereďnie and rare in Perechyn in expressing the posterior sequence ‘after’, e.g. *posli deš ovri* ‘after ten o’clock’, *posli o dijlos* (also attested without the article as *posli dijlos*) ‘in the afternoon’. The preposition does not occur in Uzhhorod, where the posterior sequence is expressed by the inherited preposition *pal* (see 11.2.1.4). In contrast to spatial prepositions, *posli* is attested with dative pronominal NPs, as in (305).

- (304) *posli odā veskedijšis amen ačhil’am vragenge* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 after DEM quarrel we become.AOR.1PL enemy.DAT.PL
 ‘After the quarrel, we became enemies.’
- (305) *zalačhar posli tuk’ o than* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 make_bed[IMP.2SG] after you.DAT ART bed
 ‘Make the bed after you get up (literally: after yourself).’

11.2.2 Causal and benefactive prepositions

The following sections discuss two important non-spatial prepositions, viz. causal *važ*, which continues the Late Proto-Romani benefactive-goal preposition **važ* (cf. Elšík and Matras 2006: 223), and a causal-benefactive preposition that occurs in various forms, such as *prikal*, *prigal*, *pringal*, *prekal*, *pregal* and *prengal*, all of which seem to be derived from the perlocative prepositions *prik* (*prig*) or *prek* (*preg*) (see 11.2.1.9). The reconstructed Late Proto-Romani

¹⁴⁰ In Standard Ukrainian, the preposition has a slightly different form *після*, which cannot be the source of the Eastern Uzh Romani *posli*.

causal preposition **astjal* (cf. Elšík and Matras 2006: 223) is not reflected in Eastern Uzh Romani.

11.2.2.1 Preposition *važ*

The preposition *važ*, which also occurs as a vocalic preposition *važe* in Perechyn, has several functions often expressed by ‘for’ in English, viz. the cause, representation (‘on behalf of’), support, compensation (price) and substitution. In some of these functions, it corresponds to the Slavic preposition *za* and is often used in contexts in which *za* occurs in the local Slavic languages in its non-spatial reference.

First, it expresses the cause for which an action is done or a state is experienced, such as ‘to beat’, ‘to harass’, ‘to punish’, etc. ‘FOR something or somebody’, ‘to thank FOR something’, ‘to die FOR something or somebody’, ‘to be in a prison FOR (a crime)’, etc.

- (306) *važ lenge kanāke skuren le romen ade* (UzhhR)
 for they.DAT now harass ART Roma.ACC.PL here
 ‘For (because of) them, they harass the Roma here now.’
- (307) *pal’ikerav tuke važ savoro* (UzhhS)
 thank.PRS.1SG you.DAT for all
 ‘I thank you for everything.’
- (308) *o dejl važ amenge muv’la* (UzhhS)
 ART God for we.DAT die.AOR.3SG
 ‘The God died for (because of/on behalf of) us.’
- (309) *but roma bešle važ lenge are t’urma* (Khu)
 many Rom.PL sit.AOR.3PL for they.DAT in prison
 ‘Many Roma went to prison for (because of) them.’

Furthermore, *važ* expresses the role of responsibility, as in constructions with psych verbs *dara-* ‘to be afraid FOR’ (310) and *ladža-* ‘to feel ashamed FOR’, and with the verb *odvičin-* ‘to be responsible FOR’ (311). The expression of support in (312) and (313) is related to the meaning of responsibility. Note in (312) that *važ* also occurs in constructions with the plain copula verb in the meaning ‘to be on the side/in support of’.

- (310) *me daraňom važ tu, bo tu šārgisal’l’al* (UzhhS)
 I fear.AOR.1SG for you because you yellow.INCH.AOR.2SG
 ‘I was afraid for you because you turned yellow.’

- (311) *o baronos važ amenge odvičinel* (Uzhhs)
 ART baron for we.DAT be_responsible.PRS.3SG
 ‘The baron (community spokesman) is responsible for us.’
- (312) *hin lāche, a hin nalāche,*
 COP.PRS.3 good.PL and/but COP.PRS.3 bad.PL
hin ož važ o roma hine,
 COP.PRS.3 FCOMP for ART Rom.PL COP.PRS.3PL
zaačhen važ o roma (Khu)
 advocate.PRS.3PL for ART Rom.PL
 ‘There are good [people] and there are bad [people]; there are [people of such a kind] that they are on the side of the Roma, they stand up for the Roma.’
- (313) *na preživin, me man zaručinā važ tuke* (Ser)
 NEG worry[IMP.2SG]I I.ACC guarantee.FUT.1SG for you.DAT
 ‘Don’t worry, I will stand security for you.’

The preposition *važ* also expresses the price or the reward:

- (314) *oj khelelas važ o lovve* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 she dance.IPF/POT.3SG for ART money
 ‘She was dancing for money.’
- (315) *ranše važ o pāndž kopejki*
 in_the_past for ART five kopek.PL
buločka cinahas amenge (Khu)
 bread_roll buy.IPF/POT.1PL we.DAT
 ‘In the past, we used to buy a bread roll for five kopeks (for us).’
- (316) *barvalo gādžo akor del važ jek val’ka rubl’a* (Khu)
 rich nonRom then give.PRS.3SG for one adobe rouble
 ‘A rich non-Rom then gives a rouble (hryvnia) for one adobe brick.’

In addition, the preposition *važ* has other functions closely related to those discussed. For example, it has a compensative function in ‘to exchange FOR’, where it competes with the contact preposition *pre* (11.2.1.3):

- (317) *odā thav delas, čerinlas važ o patava* (Per)
 DEM thread give.IPF/POT.3SG exchange.IPF/POT.3SG for ART rag.PL
 ‘He was supplying that thread, exchanging it for rags.’

It may also express the substitute ‘instead of’.

(318) *a mange šaj važ late te potphenen?* (UzhR)
 and/but I.DAT can for she.LOC NCOMP suggest.INF
 ‘And may I suggest [it] instead of her?’

(319) *važ lake majind'al tu mandarte phučen* (UzhS)^{LQCR}
 for she.DAT should.AOR.2SG you I.ABL NCOMP ask.INF
 ‘Instead of her you should have asked me.’

Another development of *važ* is the proper causal function ‘because of, due to, owing to’. It is this function in which *važ* competes with the causal-benefactive preposition *pregal*, etc. discussed in the following section 11.2.2.1. Based on the data, this competition occurs in Uzhhorod more often than in the other varieties (compare the following sentences with those in (324) to (329) below).

(320) *važ late zanasva'il'om* (UzhR)^{LQCR}
 for she.LOC get_ill.AOR.1SG
 ‘I got ill because of her.’

(321) *amen majind'am te užaren važ o brišind* (UzhS)^{LQCR}
 we have_to.AOR.1PL NCOMP wait.INF for ART rain
 ‘We had to wait because of the rain.’

In Perechyn, and rarely elsewhere, the preposition *važ(e)* is also used in a time reference to the telic extent (‘during, within’; see (322)) and to the posterior distance (‘in’; see (323)). See 11.2.1.5 for *tel* in these functions.

(322) *ov važe jek rāti kerlas bišthajpāndž košāra* (Per)
 he for one night do.IPF/POT.3SG twenty_five basket.PL
 ‘During one night, he was making twenty five baskets.’

(323) *mā važo štār d'ives amen ejla motoris* (Per)^{LQCR}
 already for four day we.ACC COP.FUT.3 car
 ‘In no more than four days, we will have a car.’

11.2.2.2 Preposition *prekal*, *pre(n)gal*, etc.

The other causal preposition, which also has additional benefactive functions, occurs in a number of forms that are similar and probably related to the perlicative preposition *prik/prig* or *prek/preg* (11.2.1.9).¹⁴¹ All the forms of the causal preposition end in /al/, while they differ mainly in the voice of the intervocalic velar stop. In Perechyn, Khudlovo and Serednie, the stop is voiceless, giving the forms of the preposition *prikal* (predominantly in Perechyn) or *prekal* (predominantly in Khudlovo and Serednie). In Uzhhorod, the intervocalic velar stop of the preposition is voiced, i.e. *prigal* or *pregal*. In Radvanka, moreover, the preposition often occurs with a nasal as *pringal* or *prengal*.¹⁴² In Perechyn, the preposition is also rarely attested as a vocalic preposition *prikale*.

This preposition is glossed as ‘for the sake of’ because it combines the causal meaning of ‘because of, due to, owing to’ with the benefactive meaning ‘for’. In its causal meaning, the preposition competes with *važ* (see 11.2.2.1 above). The following examples represent elicited translations of two source sentences; compare them with those in (320) and (321) above, where they occur with the preposition *važ*.

- | | | | | |
|-------|-----------------|--------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| (324) | <i>pringal</i> | <i>leste</i> | <i>zanasva'il'a</i> | (UzhhR) ^{LQCR} |
| | for_the_sake_of | he.LOC | get_ill.AOR.3SG | |
| (325) | <i>prikal</i> | <i>leste</i> | <i>oj zanasva'il'a</i> | (Per) ^{LQCR} |
| | for_the_sake_of | he.LOC | she get_ill.AOR.3SG | |
| (326) | <i>prekal</i> | <i>leste</i> | <i>oj zanasva'il'a</i> | (Khu.Ser) ^{LQCR} |
| | for_the_sake_of | he.LOC | she get_ill.AOR.3SG | |
| | | | ‘She got ill because of him.’ | |

- | | | | | |
|-------|-----------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------------------|
| (327) | <i>amen majind'am</i> | <i>te</i> | <i>užaren</i> | |
| | we have_to.AOR.1PL | NCOMP | wait.INF | |
| | <i>pregal</i> | <i>o</i> | <i>brišind</i> | (UzhhS) ^{LQCR} |
| | for_the_sake_of | ART | rain | |
| (328) | <i>amen mušind'am</i> | <i>te</i> | <i>užaren</i> | |
| | we have_to.AOR.1PL | NCOMP | wait.INF | |
| | <i>prikal</i> | <i>o</i> | <i>brišind</i> | (Per) ^{LQCR} |
| | for_the_sake_of | ART | rain | |

¹⁴¹ Note that the East Slavic preposition *čerez* (Russian/Ukrainian *чepeз*) has both causal and perlicative functions.

¹⁴² The Radvanka forms with the nasal have their identical counterparts in some Western Uzh varieties, in particular in Pavlovce nad Uhom and in some neighbouring localities.

- (329) *amen mušind'am prekal o brišind*
 we have_to.AOR.1PL for_the_sake_of ART rain
t' užaren (Ser)^{LQCR}
 NCOMP wait.INF
 'We had to wait because of the rain.'

Second, the preposition has an extended meaning to the benefactive function. An intermediate stage of this development may be seen in the following ambiguous examples, which allow both causal and benefactive readings:

- (330) *pregal o roma kerde* (UzhR)
 for_the_sake_of ART Rom.PL make.AOR.3PL
 'They made [it] for the sake of the Roma.'

- (331) *mi dživav pregal o čalādos* (UzhS)
 OPT live.PRS.1SG for_the_sake_of ART family
 'May I live for the sake of my family.'

- (332) *ov sa pregal tute,*
 he all for_the_sake_of you.LOC
sa tuke dela od'a (UzhS)
 all you.DAT give.FUT.3SG there
 'He [will do] everything for the sake of you, he will give everything to you.'

In contrast, the following examples present the unambiguous benefactive interpretation of the preposition:

- (333) *and'al odi pokriva prigal odi gādži?* (UzhS)^{LQCR}
 bring.AOR.2SG DEM nettle for_the_sake_of DEM nonRom.F
 'Have you brought the nettle for the (non-Romani) woman?'

- (334) *kadā igen bāri pa'iv prekal amende,*
 this.SPEC very big honour for_the_sake_of we.LOC
hoj tumen amen viskind'an (Ser)^{LQCR}
 FCOMP you.PL we.ACC invite.AOR.2PL
 'This is a great honour for us that you.PL invited us.'

11.2.3 Privative prepositions

Eastern Uzh Romani is quite diverse regarding the forms of the privative preposition ‘without’, although all forms resemble each other, at least for their common initial labial stop /b/.

The most conservative privative preposition is *bi*, which continues a preposition borrowed from an Iranian language (cf. Persian *bī*), as in Shakhta *bi mijro* ‘without me’. In this form, *bi* occurs in Uzhhorod, especially in the data of the Shakhta variety, and in Serednie. It differs from the vocalic prepositions discussed above in that it ends in /i/ and does not incorporate the article, e.g. *bi o drab* [without ART.NOM.SG.M pill.NOM.SG.M] ‘without the pill’, never **bo drab*.

In Perechyn, optionally in Serednie, the preposition occurs as *bije* with the final vowel /e/, which is likely due to an analogy with the other vocalic prepositions, such as *andre*, e.g. Perechyn *bije tute*, Serednie *bije tute* ‘without you’ (as against Shakhta *bi tijro*), and Perechyn *bije soste* ‘without what’ (as against Shakhta *bi soste*, Serednie *bi soske*). Like other prepositions in /e/, *bije* integrates the values of the definite article, as in Perechyn *bij-o tabl'etk-i* [without-NOM.PL pill-NOM.PL] ‘without pills’ (as against Shakhta *bi o drab-a* [without ART.NOM.PL pill-NOM.PL]).¹⁴³

In both Uzhhorod varieties, the common Slavic preposition *bez* is also sporadically encountered, e.g. *bez tijro* ‘without you’. In Radvanka, ‘without’ is also *biz*, which has probably developed through the contamination of the inherited form *bi* by the Slavic preposition *bez*, e.g. *biz tute* ‘without you’.

The most unusual form, whose etymology is not that clear, is *bice*, which occurs in Khudlovo and in Serednie.

(335) *gejle od'a bice mijro* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 go.AOR.3PL there without I.GEN
 ‘They went there without me.’

(336) *amen bāril'am bico dad* (Ser)
 we big.INCH.AOR.1PL without father
 ‘We grew up without a father.’

¹⁴³ It must be conceded that the surface pronunciation of *bi o draba* is in fact [bi.jo dra.ba] with the palatal glide used to prevent hiatus between the preposition and the article. It cannot be ruled out that this combination of *bi* with noun phrases introduced by the article serves as a starting point for generalisation of *bije* even in phrases with pronouns.

The occurrence of all privative prepositions in the Eastern Uzh Romani varieties is summarised in Table 72.

Table 72: Privative prepositions

	Shakhta	Radvanka	Perechyn	Khudlovo	Serednie
<i>bi</i>	+	+	–	–	+
<i>bije</i>	–	–	+	–	+
<i>bez</i>	+	+	–	–	–
<i>biz</i>	–	+	–	–	–
<i>bice</i>	–	–	–	+	+

12 ASPECTS OF VERB SYNTAX

This chapter is devoted to important aspects of verb syntax, such as morphosyntactic alignment, subject agreement on verbs and clausal negation. In addition, optative constructions and syntactic modifications of verbs with the help of other verbs, nouns, adjectives, pronouns and adverbs are discussed. The final subchapter provides a detailed overview of various modals and their functions.

12.1 Morphosyntactic alignment and subject agreement

Romani is a nominative-accusative language: the most agent-like argument of a transitive clause has the same coding as the sole argument (subject) of an intransitive clause and, at the same time, is distinguished from the most patient-like argument (animate direct object) of a transitive clause. In the following examples, the subject arguments of both transitive and intransitive clauses are underlined, and the object argument is in bold:

- (1) *sar* *tu* *av-eh-a*,
how 2SG.NOM come-2SG-FUT
akor *me* ***tut*** *dikh-av-a* (UzhhS.Khu)^{LQCR}
then 1SG.NOM 2SG.ACC see-1SG-FUT
'If you come, then I will see you.'
- (2) *me* *dživ-av* *tejle* (UzhhR.Per.Khu.Ser)^{LQCR}
1SG.NOM live-1SG below
'I live downstairs.'

The subject may be expressed by a nominative noun phrase, as in the examples above with pronominal noun phrases (see also 11.1). In addition, it is obligatorily coded on the verb via person and number inflection. The object is not cross-referenced on the verb in Eastern Uzh Romani.

A peculiar subject-verb agreement occurs in clauses in which the subject is occupied by the borrowed nouns meaning 'people', such as *nijpos* from Hungarian *nép* and *ludos* from Slavic *lud*. Although *nijpos* and *ludos* are formally singular, they trigger plural agreement on the verb:¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴ Note in (3) that the dependent modifier of *nijpos* within a single noun phrase, viz. *vařesave*, is also plural. See 11.1 for more details.

- (3) *varesave l'ud-os terd'-on* (Per)^{LQCR}
 some people-NOM.SG stand-3PL
 ‘Some people are standing.’
- (4) *o nijp-os kāke dikh-en-as, rov-en-as, stradin-n-as* (Khu)
 ART people-NOM.SG thus.SPEC see-3PL-REM weep-3PL-REM suffer-3PL-REM
 ‘The people were looking in such a specific way, they were crying [and] suffering.’

Furthermore, there are two types of intransitive constructions in which the verb has the default 3SG form and does not agree with the subject at all.

The first instance pertains to clauses in which the subject refers to a body part and a dative external possessor occurs in the clause as an experiencer of a state that is beyond the control of the possessor’s referent. See the following sentences in which the verb is in the default 3SG form, even though the subject noun phrase is in the plural.

- (5) *o jākh-a mange za-āsmīn-d'-a* (UzhR)^{LQCR}
 ART eye-NOM.PL I.DAT AKT-be_filled_with_tears-PFV-3SG
 ‘My eyes suddenly filled with tears.’
- (6) *mange āsvīn-el o jākh-a* (Khu.Ser)^{LQCR}
 I.DAT be_filled_with_tears-3SG ART eye-NOM.PL
 ‘My eyes are streaming.’
- (7) *mang' o vast-a l'ipin-l-as pes pro dubos* (UzhS)
 I.DAT ART hand-NOM.PL stick-3SG-REM REFL.SG on tree
 ‘My hands were sticking to the tree.’
- (8) *o bal-a lake teje gej-l'-a la ximijatar* (Ser)
 ART hair-NOM.PL she.DAT down go-PFV-3SG ART chemotherapy.ABL
 ‘Her hair fell out because of chemotherapy.’

The other kind of construction with no person and number agreement is possessive predication. Eastern Uzh Romani lacks a special possessive verb ‘to have’. Instead, the TAM categories are expressed through the copula that is in the 3SG verb form, irrespective of the person and number categories of the grammatical subject (possessee) of the clause. See example (9) in which the present-tense copula has the third-person form *hin*, even though the subject noun phrase (possessee) is the second-person pronoun *tu* (and the accusative possessor is the first-person pronoun). In (10) and (11), the nominative subject is a plural noun phrase, but the future copula has the 3SG form.

- (12) *mi avav zdravo* (Uzhhs)
 OPT be.PRS.SBJV.1SG healthy
 ‘May I be healthy.’ (‘I hope I am healthy.’)
- (13) *odi čhaj pes mi othovel* (Per)^{LQCR}
 DEM girl REFL OPT hide.PRS.3SG
 ‘May the girl hide herself.’ (‘The girl must hide herself.’)
- (14) *odala čhaja pes mi othovkeren* (Per)^{LQCR}
 DEM.PL girl.PL REFL OPT hide.ITER.PRS.3PL
 ‘May the girls hide themselves.’ (‘The girls must hide themselves.’)

The optative particle *mi* also occurs in first-person interrogative clauses to express an offer or a suggestion:

- (15) *mi dav saxar ?* (Ser)
 OPT give.PRS.1SG sugar
 ‘Shall I give [you] sugar?’

In the second person of affirmative clauses, the function of an optative particle is fulfilled by the non-factual complementiser *te* (see 13.2.1).

- (16) *t’ ejs zdravo* (Uzhhs)
 NCOMP be.PRS.SBJV.2SG healthy
 ‘May you be healthy.’ (‘I hope you are healthy.’)

Furthermore, the non-factual complementiser occurs in negative clauses, irrespective of the person category:

- (17) *te n’ avav nasvalo* (Uzhhs)
 NCOMP NEG be.PRS.SBJV.1SG ill
 ‘May I not be sick.’ (‘I hope I am not sick.’)
- (18) *ñigda te na nasval’ol* (Uzhhs)
 never NCOMP NEG ill.INCH.PRS.3SG
 ‘May he never get sick.’ (‘I hope he never gets sick.’)
- (19) *te na othoven pen ola čhaja* (Per)^{LQCR}
 NCOMP NEG hide.PRS.3PL REFL.PL DEM.PL girl.PL
 ‘May the girls not hide themselves.’ (‘The girls must not hide themselves.’)

- (20) *te na khandes ade* (Khu)
 NCOMP NEG stink.PRS.2SG here
 ‘May you not stink here.’ (‘Don’t stink here.’)

Sentence (21) consists of an affirmative clause expressing permission followed by a negative one of prohibition, with two different particles introducing the verb:

- (21) *mi kiden, čak te na phagerkeren* (UzhhR)
 OPT gather.PRS.3PL only NCOMP NEG break.ITER.PRS.3PL
 ‘May they feel free to collect [the fruits], but they mustn’t break [the branches].’

Finally, *te* is used when it is combined with the irrealis verb, even in affirmative third-person clauses. Such a construction of *te* plus the irrealis verb expresses a counterfactual optative, i.e. a wish that is contrary to reality.

- (22) *mijri romñi te uvlahas* (UzhhS)
 my wife NCOMP COP.IRR.3SG
 ‘I wish she was my wife.’

12.2.2 Optative copula *mije*

In the third-person existential and copular clauses, a special optative copula *mije* ‘let/may it be’ is used in place of both the optative marker and the verb ‘to be’. The form *mije* has developed from the optative phrase consisting of the particle *mi* and the subjunctive copula in the third person **avel*, which also yielded the existing 3SG subjunctive copula *ejl* (see 3.3.2), i.e. by **mi avel* > **mi el* > **mijel* > *mije*.¹⁴⁶ The form *mije* occurs in both singular and plural and is also commonly used as an affirmative discourse particle with the meaning of acceptance or approval ‘okay, may it be so’ (see 9.6.3).

- (23) *mije tijri vol’a* (UzhhS)
 OPT.COP your will
 ‘May [it] be your will!’
- (24) *mije sar manuša* (UzhhS)
 OPT.COP how human.PL
 ‘May [they] be like people!’

¹⁴⁶ Cf. a similar apocope in the modal *kampe* < *kampel* (see 12.5.3.2).

- (25) *mindik tuke* *mije* *bax* (Per)^{LQCR}
 always you.DAT OPT.COP happiness
 ‘May you always be happy!’
- (26) *mije* *kade* (Khu)
 OPT.COP here.SPEC
 ‘May [it] be right here.’ (‘Put it here!’)

12.3 Syntactic modifications of verbs

In this section, various kinds of syntactic modifications of verbs that supplement the morphological derivations (see 3.5) are described. More specifically, I deal with productive valency-changing periphrases and with various composite predicates, such as those expressing a change of state (‘to become XY’) and complex atmospheric expressions. In the end, lexical-aspectual (aktionsart) modifications of verbs by means of spatial and some other adverbs are discussed.

12.3.1 Valency-increasing periphrases

Although there is a causative morphology in Eastern Uzh Romani, it is not productive for verbs (see 3.5.1). However, the increase of the valency may be achieved with the help of the control verb *d-* ‘to give’. In such constructions, *d-* expresses causation of an event or action referred to by its infinitive complement, and the causee is encoded as a recipient (see 11.1.1.2. and 11.1.1.3). Sometimes, it may lead to ambiguous interpretation, as in:

- (27) *ko* *tut* *dela* *te* *pijen ?* (Per)
 who you.ACC give.FUT.3PL NCOMP drink.INF
 ‘Who will give you [something] to drink?’ ~ ‘Who will make you drink?’

Causative constructions with *d-* are very common and productive. They may express permission and an appeal to somebody to do something, as in the following:

- (28) *den* *te* *labaren* (UzhhS)
 give.IMP.2PL NCOMP burn.INF
 ‘Let [me] light (literally: burn) a cigarette.’
- (29) *me* *tuke* *kamav* *te* *den* *te* *axal'on* (UzhhS)
 I you.DAT want.PRS.1SG NCOMP give.INF NCOMP understand.INF
 ‘I want to make you understand.’

- (30) *tu na diňal mange*
 you NEG AOR.2SG I.DAT
aňi jekhes te len (Uzhhs)
 not_even one.ACC.M NCOMP take.INF
 ‘You haven’t made me take even a single one.’
- (31) *ňikaska na del te kosāl’inen* (Per)
 nobody.DAT NEG give.PRS.3SG NCOMP scythe.INF
 ‘S/he doesn’t let anybody scythe.’

12.3.2 Valency-decreasing periphrases

As discussed in (3.5.1.3), valency-decreasing morphology is limited to some inherited verb bases but is not productive. The productive means of decreasing the valency in today’s language is reflexivisation. In other words, transitive verbs may decrease their number of arguments and acquire an intransitive meaning when their direct object is coded as a reflexive pronoun (see 6.1.2). In contrast to the semantic reflexivisation, when only the number of participants is decreased, the reflexive intransitivisation leads to a decrease of the number of grammatical arguments as well. See the following two examples. In (32), which is a semantically reflexive sentence, the direct object of the transitive verb *phanle* ‘they closed’ is the plural reflexive pronoun *pen* expressing the referential identity with the subject coded in the verb form. There are two grammatical arguments in the sentence: the agent in *phanle* and the patient in *pen*, but both refer to a single (collective) participant ‘they’. Sentence (33) is formally reflexive but semantically non-reflexive: there is a single participant referred to by *savore bāra* ‘all bars’ and a single argument (subject) of the sentence. Here, the plural reflexive pronoun *pen* does not express that the subject performs an action on itself, but that the action is performed with no object affected.

- (32) *phanle pen andre* (Uzhhs)
 close.AOR.3PL REFL.PLinside
 ‘They have closed themselves (in a room).’
- (33) *savore bāra phanden pen deš ovrendar andre* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 all bar.PL close.PRS.3PL REFL.PLten hour.ABL.PL inside
 ‘All bars close at ten o’clock.’

Valency-decreasing reflexive constructions borrow the pattern of decreasing the valency of Slavic languages and are common with borrowed verbs. See the following pair of

an accusative clause with the verb *končín-* ‘to finish’ in (34) and a reflexive clause with the same verb in (35).

(34) *me končind'om e škola* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 I end.AOR.1SG ART school
 ‘I finished school.’

(35) *o jevend končind'a pes* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 ART winter end.AOR.3SG REFL
 ‘The winter ended.’

Reflexive periphrases also occur with inherited verbs for which an anticausative derivation is available and both derivational and analytic means may compete with each other as exemplified by the following pair of elicited translations of the intransitive clause, ‘At night, the window opened up’. While in the translation (36) from Radvanka, the anticausative derivation *phutersal'uv-* ‘to open’ (intransitive) is used, the Perechyn translation contains the reflexive periphrasis of the transitive verb *phuter-* ‘to open (something)’ (37):

(36) *rāti e blaka phutersal'ila avri* (UzhR)^{LQCR}
 night[ADV] ART window open.ITR.AOR.3SG out
 ‘At night, the window opened up.’

as against:

(37) *rāti e blaka pes phuterd'a avri* (Per)^{LQCR}
 night[ADV] ART window REFL open.AOR.3SG out
 ‘At night, the window opened up.’

Still, there tend to be certain semantic differences in using an anticausative verb and a reflexive periphrasis, which are connected to a degree of agentivity of the action. The anticausative or inchoative derivation typically refers to a spontaneous or unintended action that is low on an agentivity scale, often with an inanimate subject. In contrast, the reflexive periphrasis of a transitive verb usually refers to a deliberate action with an agent participant who causes the situation. See the following pair of spontaneous sentences uttered by a single speaker of the Shakhta variety: example (38) with an inanimate subject contains the inchoative derivation *mel'al'uv-* ‘to get dirty’, while in (39), which has an animate subject, the same speaker resorted to the transitive verb *mel'ar-* ‘to make dirty’ in a reflexive periphrasis.

- (38) *na thov ode, bo mel'al'ola* (UzhhS)
 NEG put[IMP.2SG] there because get_dirty.FUT.3SG
 ‘Don’t put [it] there, because [it] will get dirty.’ (about a bag)
- (39) *mel'areha tut!* (UzhhS)
 make_dirty.FUT.2SG you.ACC
 ‘You will get dirty!’

In the same way as the meaning of some anticausative verbs may shift from that of their transitive bases, the formally reflexive transitive verb with the intransitive interpretation may acquire a rather different meaning. A pair of the transitive verb *rodzin-* ‘to give birth to’ and its reflexive periphrasis *rodzin- pes* meaning ‘to be born’ is perfectly predictable, some other pairs are far less predictable and indicate a degree of lexicalisation of the reflexive counterpart of the transitive verb. The transitive verb *mār-* has a range of related meanings, such as ‘to beat, to punish’ and the like. As a reflexive verb, it acquires a reciprocal meaning ‘to fight, to wrestle’ (see 6.1.3) or, with an adverbial phrase headed by the preposition *pre*, it becomes an intransitive expression for the meaning ‘to look like, to resemble’:

- (40) *pre menša pes mārel* (Per)
 on Mensha REFL beat.PRS.3SG
 ‘[She] looks like Mensha.’

In this connection, a mention should be made of formally reflexive verbs with an intransitive meaning that lack their transitive counterparts (*reflexive tantum*). Such semantically non-reflexive verbs with obligatory reflexive marking exist in Slavic languages, where they often affect (but are not restricted to) psych verbs; cf. Slovak *smiat' sa*, Ukrainian *сміятися* ‘to laugh’ (**smiat'*, **сміяти*), Slovak *bát' sa*, Ukrainian *боятися* ‘to fear’ (**bát'*, **бояти*), Slovak *hanbiť sa* ‘to be ashamed’ (**hanbiť*), but also, for example, the verb ‘to ask’, as in Slovak *pýtat' sa* ‘to ask’. Due to contact with Slavic, reflexive marking of some of these verbs may occur in their Eastern Uzh Romani counterparts. In all varieties, the obligatory *reflexive tantum* verb is that of ‘to feel ashamed’, which invariably occurs in a reflexive periphrasis (3SG *ladžal pes*; **ladžal*):

- (41) *na ladža tut* (common)
 NEG feel_ashamed[IMP.2SG] you.ACC
 ‘Don’t be shy.’

- (42) *od'a on' imā ladžan pes,*
 there they already feel_ashamed.PRS.3PL REFL
kaj one o roma (Per)
 inasmuch_as they ART Rom.PL
 'There they already feel ashamed that they are Gypsies.'
- (43) *medik cikhōro čhavōro mišto,*
 until/while little.DIM boy.DIM well
a ejla bāro, ov pes ladžala (Ser)
 and/but COP.FUT.3SG big he REFL feel_ashamed.FUT.3SG
 'While he is a little child, it's okay, but he will be adult [and] he will feel ashamed.'

With respect to other psych verbs, such as *asa-* 'to laugh' and *dara-* 'to fear, to be afraid', and the verb *phuč-* 'to ask', there is a certain variability across the dialect region. On the basis of the data, these verbs are rarely or almost never reflexive in Uzhhorod, while more commonly attested in reflexive periphrases in the *gāvutune* varieties. Still, their reflexive marking may be optional even in a single idiolect, as is shown in the following spontaneous sentences, which were uttered by a single speaker shortly after one another.

- (44) *on mā daran pen t'urmatar* (Khu)
 they already fear.PRS.3PL REFL.PLprison.ABL
 'They are already afraid of prison.'
- (45) *a kanāke mā daran* (Khu)
 and/but now already fear.PRS.3PL
 'And now they are already afraid.'

12.3.3 Analytic inchoatives

Although there are productive morphological inchoatives derived from adjective and some noun bases in Eastern Uzh Romani (see 3.5.2.2), periphrases of a predicative nominal with the verb *ačh-* 'to become' may be employed instead of an inchoative derivation. See the following pair of elicited sentences:

- (46) *mijra kirvakere čhave esas barvale,*
 my godmother.GEN child.PL COP.PST.3 rich.NOM.PL
ale nadočirla čōrisal'ile (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 but recently poor.INCH.AOR.3PL

- (47) *mijra kirvakere čhave sas barvale*
 my godmother.GEN child.PL COP.PST.3 rich.NOM.PL
abo kanāke načirla čhōre ačhile (Khu)^{LQCR}
 but now recently poor.NOM.PL become.AOR.3PL
 ‘The children of my godmother were rich, but they have recently become poor.’

Both inchoative derivation and inchoative periphrasis exist side by side even within a single variety. It seems that while the emphasis is on the change of state in the inchoative derivation, the analytic inchoative rather highlights the consequence of such a change:

- (48) *ov ŋemisal’ila,*
 he mute.INCH.AOR.3SG
vašodā ačhil’a ŋemeske (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 therefore become.AOR.3SG mute.DAT.SG
 ‘He went mute and therefore became mute.’

Note that the nominal predicate with the verb *ačh-* is marked either as nominative (47) or as dative (48).

There are certain lexicalised periphrases with the inchoative meaning that contain a verb other than *ačh-*. For example, the meaning ‘to become pregnant’ is commonly expressed by the adjective *phāri* ‘heavy, pregnant’ in a composite predicate with the verb *zadža-* (aktionsart modification of *dža-* ‘to go’; see 3.5.1.5.9), as in (49), although the morphological inchoative (*za-*)*phāruv-* or (*za-*)*phārisal’uv-* also occurs, as in (50).

- (49) *lakeri čhaj phāri za-gejl’a*
 her daughter pregnant AKT-go.AOR.3SG
dešušove beršendar (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 sixteen year.ABL.PL
 ‘Her daughter got pregnant at the age of sixteen.’

- (50) *lakeri čhajōri mā za-phāril’a*
 her daughter.DIM already AKT-pregnant.INCH.AOR.3SG
aro dešušov berš (Ser)^{LQCR}
 in sixteen year
 ‘Her little daughter already got pregnant at the age of sixteen.’

12.3.4 Other composite predicates

Alongside the analytic inchoatives discussed above, there are a number of other periphrastic expressions that consist of a verb with a more general meaning (light verb) and a nominal part. Such composite or verbo-nominal predicates are similar to conjunct verbs of Indo-Aryan languages (e.g. Burton-Page 1957); cf. Hindi *kām karnā* [work do.INF] and Eastern Uzh Romani *ker- buv'i* [do work] ‘to work’ (literally in both languages ‘to do work’). Some composite predicates in Eastern Uzh Romani may exist alongside a simple verb of the same meaning, as in Perechyn, where *ker- pheras* [do joke] competes with a loan verb *šutkin-* ‘to joke’, or in Radvanka, where the meaning ‘to be dreamt about’ may be expressed either by the denominal middle verb *suvňuv-* (51) or by the periphrasis with the verb *dža-* ‘to go’ (52):

- (51) *mange suvňil'a pal e mama* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 I.DAT dream.ITR.AOR.3SG about ART mother
- (52) *mange suvno gej'la pal e mama* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 I.DAT dream go.AOR.3SG about ART mother
 ‘I dreamt about [my] mother.’

Some composite predicates are used in a specific meaning other than the corresponding derivation. For example, the factitive derivation *cixisar-* from the adjective *cixo* ‘quiet, silent’ is used in reference to humans in the meaning ‘to make quiet, to quieten’, while a periphrasis of the comparative adjective *cixeder* ‘quieter’ with the transitive verb *ker-* or *muk-* is used in reference to an acoustic medium (radio or TV set) in the meaning ‘to lower, to turn down’. An adverbial comparative may also occur in the same function, as in the following spontaneous sentence:

- (53) *muk kapka teleder, jāňom* (UzhhR)
 leave[IMP.2SG] a_bit lower girl.VOC
 ‘Turn [it] down a bit, girl.’

Only composite predicates exist for atmospheric expressions, such as ‘to rain’, ‘to snow’ and ‘to hail’.¹⁴⁷ Three light verbs may occur in atmospheric predicates in Eastern Uzh Romani: *d-* ‘to give’, *per-* ‘to fall’ and *dža-* ‘to go’. The verb *d-* ‘to give’ with the dummy

¹⁴⁷ But not ‘to blow (about wind)’, which is invariably expressed by the simple verb *phurd-* ‘to blow’, as in sentence example (54).

subject is the most conservative option in such constructions, as it occurs in other Romani dialects and is the most common option in Central Romani in general; see (54), (55) and (56). Note that in Khudlovo (55) and in Sereďnie (56), the atmospheric predicates with the verb *d-* are reflexive.

- (54) *jevende vaj o jiv del,*
 winter.ADV or ART snow give.PRS.3SG
vaj e barval' phurdel (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 or ART wind blow.PRS.3SG
 'In the winter, it is either snowy or windy.'
- (55) *avri del pes o lejgos* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 outside give.PRS.3SG REFL ART ice
 'It is hailing outside.'
- (56) *delas pes o brišind* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 give.IPF/POT.3SG REFL ART rain
 'It was raining.'

The employment of the verb *per-* 'to fall' is shared with some Romani varieties in the easternmost parts of Slovakia and is the most common option in the data from Perekhyn, though it also occurs elsewhere.

- (57) *šaj perel o brišind* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 can fall.PRS.3SG ART rain
 'It may rain.'
- (58) *xund'a te peren jiv* (Per)^{LQCR}
 begin.AOR.3SG NCOMP fall.INF snow
 'It has started to snow.'

The third option, the verb *dža-* 'to go' occurs only with the notion of 'raining', as in (59) (compare it with (56) above). It is a calque of the atmospheric predicates in East Slavic languages (cf. Russian *uđem doždь* [go.PRS.3SG rain] 'It is raining').

- (59) *džalas o brišint* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 go.IPF/POT.3SG ART rain
 'It was raining.'

12.3.5 Adverbial modifications

Eastern Uzh Romani makes use of verbal prefixes borrowed from Slavic language in various lexical-aspectual (aktionsart) modifications of verbs (see 3.5.1.5). Besides such prefixes, certain adverbs are also used in a similar function. The system of adverbial modifiers of verbs is closer to Hungarian, in which verbs may be combined with adverbial particles ('preverbs'; cf. Kenesei et al. 1998: 329), and also resembles the system of phrasal verbs in English. For example, the adverb *opre* 'up' adds the sense of completeness to the verb *xa-* 'to eat' in a similar way as the English 'to eat up':

- (60) *me tut xava opre* (UzhhS)
 I you.ACC eat.FUT.1SG up
 'I will eat you up.'
- (61) *ov il'a k'ake koropka švābl'ika,*
 he take.AOR.3SG thus.SPEC box safety_match.PL
xā'l'a opre andre bari xol'i (Per)
 eat.AOR.3SG up in big anger
 'He took a box of matches this way and ate [it] up in rage.'

As discussed in (3.5.1.5), the pool of aktionsart prefixes in Eastern Uzh Romani is smaller than in the North Slavic languages, and some Slavic prefixes that have not been borrowed are consistently calqued by Romani adverbs. This also holds true for Slavic loan verbs, e.g. the pair of *lič'in-* 'to heal, to treat (medically)' and *lič'in- avri* 'to cure' is modelled on the Slavic pattern, such as *liečit' > vy-liečit'* in Slovak, but with the help of the inherited adverb *avri* 'out(side)', even though the base verb is borrowed from Slavic.

Adverbial modifiers of verbs mainly draw upon spatial adverbs, although there are differences in terms of the frequency of various adverbs in such modifications. One of the very common modifiers is *avri* 'out', which occurs in two basic functions. First, it indicates movement 'outwards' when used with motion verbs, as in *čhiv- avri* 'to throw out, to get rid of, to dismiss' (see (69) below) and *dža- avri* 'to go out, to leave' (also figuratively 'to go to the toilet'). Second, it is used to express completeness or exhaustion of an action, as in *pij- avri* 'to drink up, to drink to completion', *xud- avri* 'to catch all the items, to fish out', etc. Both these functions overlap with functions of the prefix *vy-* in North Slavic (cf. Slovak *vy-hodit'* 'to throw out', *vy-jst'* 'to go out', *vy-pit'* 'to drink out', *vy-chytat'* 'to catch everything'),

independent adverb with an autonomous meaning. The other form *sembe* occurs in Eastern Uzh Romani as a loan adverb ‘opposite’ and modifies verbs in a way exemplified in (65).

- (64) *duvar trival kampe leske te phenen, vitka vitka,*
 twice thrice be_needed.PRS he.DAT NCOMP tell.INF Vitka Vitka
akor ov lel ejstre (Ser)
 then he take.PRS.3SG AKT
 ‘It is necessary to address him twice or thrice, “Vitka, Vitka”, [only] then will he take notice.’
- (65) *ov avelas sembe mange* (UzhhS.Khu)^{LQCR}
 he come.IPF/POT.3SG opposite I.DAT
 ‘He was coming to meet me.’ (Literally: ‘He was coming opposite to me.’)

While the meaning of adverbial modifications may be predictable with motion and posture verbs in their basic meanings, as in *dža- opre* ‘to go up’ and *beš- tejle* ‘to sit down’, such modifications also lead to various figurative and less predictable meanings. For example, *dža- tejle* is not only used in the meaning ‘to go down’ but also in the meanings ‘to become cheaper (to go down in price)’, ‘to get off’ (from a bus), ‘to set’ (about the sun), ‘to elapse, to expire’, etc. (see also (66), while *l- tejle* means ‘to demolish’ and ‘to take a photo’ (67) in addition to its basic meaning ‘to take down’. In fact, semantic modifications are hardly predictable with most verbs and often occur in lexicalised meanings, such as *xud- tejle* ‘to rape’, which consists of the base verb *xud-* ‘to catch’ plus the adverb *tejle* ‘down’ (68).

- (66) *hlavno mi džal tejle adi bida* (UzhhS)
 importantly OPT go.PRS.3SG down this trouble
 ‘I wish this trouble was over.’ (Literally: ‘Importantly, may this trouble go down.’)
- (67) *le man tejle* (UzhhS.Per.Khu)^{etr}
 take.IMP.2SG I.ACC down
 ‘Take a photo of me.’
- (68) *tejle xutkernas le čhajōren o ņemci (...),*
 down catch.ITER.IPF/POT.3PL ART girl.DIM.ACC.PL ART German.PL
paž e daj paž o phral tejle xudenas len,
 beside ART mother beside ART brother down catch.IPF/POT.3PL they.ACC
pre ladž kernas lenca (Khu)
 on shame do.IPF/POT.3PL they.INST

‘They were repeatedly raping the girls, the Germans (...), they were raping them in the presence of their parents, they disgraced them.’

The adverbial modifier may be separated from the verb by another word, as in example (69), where the extraessive adverbial modifier *avri* is detached from the base verb *čhiv-* ‘to throw’ by the non-factual complementiser (infinitive particle) *te*. It may also be placed before as well as after a verb, and the same holds true for participles of such modified verbs, as in (70) and (71).

(69) *o manuš man kamel andal e buv’i*
 ART human I.ACC want.PRS.3SG out_of ART work
avri te čhiven (UzhhS)
 out NCOMP throw.INF
 ‘The man wants to dismiss me from the job.’

(70) *andre phanle samas* (UzhhS)
 in close.PTCP COP.PST.1PL
 ‘We were imprisoned.’

(71) *od’a pisime andre* (Per)
 there write.PTCP in
 ‘It is written (recorded) there.’

An adverbial modifier may compete with an aktionsart prefix to modify the verb in the same semantic way. For example, the meaning ‘to burn down (completely)’ may be expressed either by the prefixal modification *(i)z-labuv-* (see 3.5.1.5.8) or by the adverbial modification *labuv- avri*. Both options are recorded even in an idiolect of a single speaker, although various speakers probably prefer one or the other option. Such a preference may also be subject to dialectal variation, which seems to be the case of another notion ‘to tell on, to turn in (to the authorities)’, based on the verb *d-* ‘to give’. In Uzhhorod, the adverbial modification *d- tejde* has been consistently documented, while in all *gāvutune* varieties, the prefixal modification *iz-d-* seems to be more common. The preference may also bear relation to the second language of an individual speaker or, more specifically, to the degree and frequency of speaking Hungarian. The verb *učhar-* ‘to cover’ is commonly used with the aktionsart prefix *z-*, i.e. *z-učhar-* ‘to completely/perfectly cover, to blanket’ in Shakhta as well as in the other varieties, yet a single consultant of the Shakhta variety who speaks Hungarian in her family

on a daily basis conveyed the meaning by the adverbial modification *učhar- andre*, which matches the pattern of the Hungarian verb form *be-borít* [in(to)-cover].

Occasionally, two different adverbs may even be used to modify a verb in the same function. The loan verb *kapčĭn-* ‘to button, to switch (on)’ may be modified by means of either the extraessive adverb *avri* ‘out’ (*kapčĭn- avri*) or the inferior adverb *tejle* ‘down’ (*kapčĭn- tejle*) to express the meaning ‘to switch off’. Two different adverbial options may also co-exist with a prefixal modification, giving rise to three largely synonymous verbs, as, for example, *bāruv- avri*, *bāruv- opre* and *pod-bāruv-* for ‘to grow up’. See also the two following spontaneous sentences that have the identical meaning, with different adverbial modifiers of the factitive verb *bārar-* ‘to make bigger’.

(72) *me la bārarđom opre* (Per)
 I she.ACC big.FACT.AOR.1SG up

(73) *me la avri bārarđom* (Khu)
 I she.ACC out big.FACT.AOR.1SG
 ‘I have brought her up.’

Like aktionsart prefixes, adverbial modifiers may change valency of a verb base. The motion verb *phir-* ‘to go often, to walk, to ride’ becomes a transitive verb ‘to tread (a path), to wear out (shoes)’ if prefixed by *tejle* ‘down’. Another example is the psych verb *asa-* ‘to laugh’, which is transitivised by the adverb *avri* into the meaning ‘to make fun of, to ridicule’, as in:

(74) *leskere barāta les asane avri* (UzhR)^{LQCR}
 his friend.PL he.ACC laugh.AOR.3PL out
 ‘His friends made fun of him.’

12.4 Negation

Clausal negation is achieved through the inherited verb negator *na*. In contrast to many other Romani dialects (cf. Matras 2002: 189; Boretzky and Igla 2004: 135–137), there are no distinct negators sensitive to the mood of the verb. The original imperative negator (prohibitive) *ma* is no longer used in any Eastern Uzh Romani variety. See the following sentences from Khudlovo:

- (75) *oj na dživel ade* (Khu)
 she NEG live.PRS.3SG here
 ‘She doesn’t live here.’
- (76) *na av ade!* (Khu)
 NEG come[IMP.2SG] here
 ‘Don’t come here!’
- (77) *te na araves teje* (Khu)
 NCOMP NEG knock.PRS.2SG down
 ‘May you not knock [it] down!’ (‘I hope you don’t knock [it] down.’)
- (78) *vakerās pal o til’ifonos la mamaha*
 speak.IPF/POT.1SG over ART telephone ART mother.INST
ungrika, ež on te na axal’on (Khu)
 Hungarian.ADV FCOMP they NCOMP NEG understand.PRS.3PL
 ‘I spoke to my mother over the phone in Hungarian so that they don’t understand.’

As in many other Romani dialects that are in contact with Slavic language, a negative pronoun must be accompanied by verb negation:

- (79) *te na mukes ko roma ñikhaj*
 NCOMP NEG leave.PRS.2SG at/to Rom.PL nowhere
ñisavo holmos (Uzhhs)
 no clothing
 ‘May you not leave any clothing anywhere at Roma’s places.’ (‘I hope you don’t leave any clothing anywhere at Roma’s places.’)
- (80) *ñič le romenge na kerde* (Per)
 nothing ART Roma.DAT.PL NEG do.AOR.3PL
 ‘They didn’t harm Roma.’ (Literally: ‘They didn’t do anything to Roma.’)

The verb itself may be omitted if it can be understood from the context, for example because it has been expressed in the previous clause. In such a case, the negator often occurs in a ‘strengthened’ form *naa* with double vowel [naʔa], which is otherwise used as a negative utterance particle (‘no’) in response to polar questions (see 9.6.3).

- (81) *ov xal mas, a ov naa* (Khu)
 he eat.PRS.3SG meat and/but he no
 ‘He eats meat, while he (another one) doesn’t.’

In Radvanka, the speaker who makes use of the apocopic past copula *esa* (see 3.3.1) also has the identically reduced negative copula *nesa*, as in (87). The speakers with the take-over of the 2PL copula *sanas* in the 3PL resort to its regular negation by *na*, as in (88).

- (87) *ov nesa khejre* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 I NEG.COP.PST.3 home
 ‘He was not at home.’
- (88) *on na sanas khejre* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 they NEG COP.PST.2/3PL home
 ‘They were not at home.’

In negative clauses, only the negator may occur instead of the negative copula *nāne* (see 3.3.1 about omission of the third-person present indicative copula).

- (89) *odā na tijri daj* (Ser)^{RDZ}
 DEM NEG your mother
 ‘It’s not your mother.’

In negative existential sentences with the animate pronominal subject, two competing ways of marking the subject occur. First, the pronominal subject may have nominative marking (90), like in affirmative sentences. Second, the pronominal subject may have accusative marking (91). The latter option is an innovation triggered by the genitive marking of the subject noun phrase in East Slavic negative constructions (92). However, it still seems to be less common in terms of frequency than the more conservative option and, in contrast to East Slavic, is limited to the pronominal subjects and almost does not occur in the persons other than the third person.

- (90) *od’a mā nāne ņiko* (Per)
 there already NEG.COP.PRS.3 nobody.NOM
 ‘No one is there any longer.’
- (91) *kanāke ade ņikas nāne* (Per)
 now here nobody.ACC NEG.COP.PRS.3
 ‘There is nobody here now.’

Cf. in Ukrainian:

- (92) *myt hikozo hemaε* (Ukrainian)
 here nobody.GEN NEG.COP.PRS.3
 ‘There is nobody here.’

The following sentences were uttered by a single speaker shortly after one another and clearly show interchangeability of both ways of subject marking:

- (93) *me tuke sikavā o mozis, kāj les nāne* (UzhhS)
 I you.DAT show.FUT.1SG ART film where he.ACC NEG.COP.PRS.3
 ‘I’ll show you a film where he doesn’t appear (literally: he is not).’
- (94) *āke ov imā nāne* (UzhhS)
 right_here he already NEG.COP.PRS.3
 ‘Here, he is no longer present (literally: he is not).’

12.5 Modal and phasal expressions

In this section, I will deal with modal and phasal expressions in Eastern Uzh Romani. As discussed by Elšík and Matras (2009) in their comparative study about modals in Romani dialects (cf. also Boretzky 1996b), Romani modals can be classified on the basis of subject marking as either personal modals, such as *kam-av* [want-1SG] ‘I want’, or impersonal modals, which lack subject marking, such as *šaj* ‘can’. Personal modals are inflected as consonantal verbs (3.2.1.1.1), while the impersonal modals are rather uninflected particles – with the exception of an impersonal modal *kampe(l)* ‘be needed’, which marks the TAM categories (12.5.3.2). With uninflected modals, the subject and TAM categories are encoded elsewhere in the sentence. Since the modalised verb in Eastern Uzh Romani is often in an infinitive form, the subject and TAM categories are rarely marked on the modalised verb, and rather occur on a copula auxiliary, or, in the case of the subject, on an independent noun phrase. A more detailed survey of Eastern Uzh Romani modals and their morphosyntactic properties follows.

12.5.1 Volition

As in other North Central Romani dialects, as well as in most dialects outside the Balkans (cf. Boretzky and Igla 2004: 82; Elšík and Matras 2009: 278), volition is expressed through the verb *kam-* of Iranian origin. In Eastern Uzh Romani, *kam-* is a polysemous verb that has a number of related meanings, such as ‘to love’, ‘to desire’, ‘to like’, ‘to owe’, in addition to its

modal meaning ‘to want’. Negation of volition is achieved by the regular clausal negation (97). The modalised verb has the infinitive form introduced by the non-factual complementiser (see also 3.4.3 and 13.2.1). On manipulation clauses headed by the verb *kam-*, see 13.3.8.

- (95) *kamav te tāven šax* (UzhhR)
 want.PRS.1SG NCOMP cook.INF cabbage_soup
 ‘I want to cook a cabbage soup.’
- (96) *tu kames savoro te džanen* (Per)
 you want.PRS.2SG all NCOMP know.INF
 ‘You want to know everything.’
- (97) *na kamle avri te aven* (Khu)
 NEG want.AOR.3PL out NCOMP come.INF
 ‘They didn’t want to come out.’

The verb *kam-* is also attested in a meaning closer to prediction rather than to the intentional wish. In (98), *kam-* occurs in a past-time reference and refers to a prediction that has not come true:

- (98) *ov kamla te meren* (Per)
 he want.AOR.3SG NCOMP die.INF
 ‘He was about to die./ He was going to die.’ (About a seriously sick person who finally recovered.)

The 3SG verb form *kamel* in a reflexive periphrasis expresses less agentive volition. In such a construction, the subject is expressed by the dative noun phrase and is closer to an experiencer:

- (99) *na kamel pes mange te džan* (UzhhS)
 NEG want.PRS.3SG REFL I.DAT NCOMP go.INF
 ‘I am not experiencing a desire to go./ I do not want to go.’

12.5.2 Possibility

The category of modal possibility is rather broad, comprising various modal domains, such as situational possibility (‘something may happen’ depending on the situation), epistemic possibility (‘something may happen’ according to someone’s knowledge or evidence), deontic

possibility or permission ('to be allowed'), and ability, which in turn may be internal to the participant ('to know how to do, to have knowledge/capability') or depending on external circumstances ('to be able') (cf. van der Auwera and Plungian 1998).

12.5.2.1 Possibility modals *šaj* and *naši*

Two basic possibility modals in Eastern Uzh Romani have been inherited from Proto-Romani: affirmative *šaj* 'can, may' of Iranian origin and negative *naši* 'cannot, may not' developed from Late Proto-Romani **našti* of disputed origin (see Boretzky and Iglá 2004: 182; Elšík and Matras 2009: 280). Both are impersonal and uninflected particles that mainly serve to express situational possibility, but are also used in epistemic and deontic domains and in ability (see below for more specialised modals used in these latter domains).

Two kinds of constructions occur with *šaj* and *naši*. The most common type consists of the modalised proposition conveyed by a finite verb that expresses the subject and TAM categories. It is this type that is common in the expression of situational possibility, although it may also be found in the other domains (see below).

- (100) *xočko šaj avel andre* (UzhhS)
 anybody can come.PRS.3SG inside
 'Anybody can enter.'
- (101) *šaj menk dživd'ila* (UzhhS)
 can still live.AOR.3SG
 '(S)he could have still been living.'
- (102) *naši leha gej'al?* (UzhhS)
 cannot he.INST go.AOR.2SG
 'Can you not have gone with him?'
- (103) *me len šaj stričinav* (Ser)
 I they.ACC can meet.PRS.1SG
 'I can meet them.'

The other type is a construction with the non-finite modalised verb (infinitive). The TAM marking in constructions with the infinitive is achieved through the copula, which is omitted in the present indicative (see (104), (105)), while the subject is either overtly marked on a dative noun phrase, as in (105), (107), or there is zero subject in case of generic, non-specific modal subjects, as in (104), (106). It follows that constructions that convey propositions of general validity, irrespective of time and agent, lack both the copula and

‘Maybe they will even sell [it] to you.’

Furthermore, there is a grammaticalised phrase *šaj ejl*, literally ‘it can be’ (112), which is a pattern borrowing of phrases used in Slavic languages, such as local Ukrainian (Rusyn) *може быти* and Russian *может быть* [may.3SG COP.INF]. In Serednie, the Slavic phrase occurs even as a matter borrowing (113).

(112) *šaj ejl zanasvaʕuvava* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 can COP.PRS.SBJV.3SG get_sick.FUT.1SG
 ‘Maybe I will get sick.’

(113) *možed bit’ ov brexind’as* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 maybe he lie.AOR.3SG
 ‘Maybe he told a lie.’

In Radvanka, the Slovak particle *asi* is also used by some speakers:

(114) *on asi kanākes avle khejre* (UzhhR)
 they maybe now come.AOR.3PL home
 ‘Maybe they have come home now.’

As for the epistemic impossibility, the negated ability modals *džan-* (in Uzhhorod), *bijrin-* (in Perechyn) and *honno* (in Serednie), which will be discussed below, are attested alongside *naši*:

(115) *on na džanenas t’ ejn andre jekh* (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 they NEG know.IPF/POT.3PL NCOMP COP.INF in one
 ‘They cannot have been together.’

(116) *one mā na bijrinen te ejn andro mestos* (Per)^{LQCR}
 they already NEG manage.PRS.3PL NCOMP COP.INF in place
 ‘They may no longer be at the place.’

(117) *on nesas honno pre jek than t’ ejn* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 they NEG.COP.PST.3 able on one place NCOMP COP.INF
 ‘They cannot have been in a single place.’

12.5.2.3 Deontic possibility (permission)

The deontic possibility or permission is also expressed through *šaj*:

- (118) *šaj man čumides čak andre čham* (UzhhS.Per.Khu)^{LQCR}
 can I.ACC kiss.PRS.2SG only in cheek
- (119) *šaj čumides man čak are čhamola* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 can kiss.PRS.2SG I.ACC only in cheek
 ‘You may kiss me just on the cheek.’

The negative permission, i.e. prohibition (‘not to be allowed’), may be expressed by *naši* (see (105) and (107) above) or by a modal particle *sabano* ‘allowed’ in a construction with the negative third-person copula. The form *sabano* is from *sabadno*,¹⁴⁸ which is known from other Central dialects as a regular morphological integration (see also 5.1.2.1) of the Hungarian adjective *szabad* ‘free, permissible; may’ (cf. Körtvély 2009). The subject in constructions with *sabano* is expressed by a dative noun phrase, while the modalised verb is in the infinitive.

- (120) *le romenge nesas sabano*
 ART Roma.DAT.PL NEG.COP.PST.3 allowed
od’a te džan te pijen (Khu)
 there NCOMP go.INF NCOMP drink.INF
 ‘The Roma were not allowed to go there to drink.’

The particle *sabano* is not normally used in affirmative sentences. Still, in very special contexts, like in questioning someone’s claim of authority, the affirmative *sabano* with no negative copula does occur:

- (121) *a tuke sabano te sивinen?* (UzhhS)
 and/but you.DAT allowed NCOMP smoke.INF
 ‘And you may smoke?!’ (A reply to an assertion that the speaker is not allowed to smoke.)

The participle of the verb *domuk-* ‘to allow’ (an aktionsart modification of *muk-* ‘to leave’; see 3.5.1.5.1), i.e. *domuklo*, is also attested in expressing the deontic impossibility in the same type of construction as *sabano*.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. the regular assimilation of *-dn-* to *-n(n)-* in another modal *hodno > honno* discussed below.

- (122) *leske na sas domuklo*
 he.DAT NEG COP.PST.3 allow.PTCP
ke late te phiren (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 at/to she.LOC NCOMP go_often.INF
 ‘He was not allowed to visit her.’

In Perechyn, there is also a finite prohibitive verb *našmin-* ‘not to be allowed’, which is also known from Romani dialects in East Slovakia. It is a loan verb based on the Slavic root *smi-* ‘to be allowed’ (cf. dialectal East Slovak *śmiec*, Polish *śmieć*) with the fused negative particle *na*.¹⁴⁹

- (123) *tu našmines te xan* (Per)^{LQCR}
 you not_be_allowed.PRS.2SG NCOMP eat.INF
 ‘You may not eat.’ (‘You are not allowed to eat.’)

Finally, the negated modals of weak necessity *majin-* ‘should’ and *kampe(l)* ‘be needed’ (see 12.5.3 below) may also express prohibition:

- (124) *tuke na kampe t’ ejn napasno* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 you.DAT NEG be_needed.PRS NCOMP COP.INF annoying
 ‘You may not be annoying.’
- (125) *kanākestar tu na majines te xan* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 now.ABL you NEG should.PRS.2SG NCOMP eat.INF
 ‘Since now, you may not eat’

12.5.2.4 Ability

In the modal domain of ability, two subdomains should be distinguished: participant-internal ability or capability (‘to know how to, to have knowledge/capability of doing an action’) and participant-external ability (‘to be able’), which depends more on external circumstances. Both subdomains may be distinguished by using different modal expression, although it is not always the case.

As in other domains of possibility, the modal particles *šaj* and *naši* may be used in expressing the ability, in particular in the participant-external ability. In Khudlovo, *šaj* and

¹⁴⁹ There is no affirmative form **šmin-* in Romani.

naši are documented not only in the participant-external ability (126), but also in the meaning of capability (127), (128):

- (126) *the amen šaj skidas amāre romen* (Khu)
 also we can gather.PRS.1PL our Roma.ACC.PL
 ‘We, too, can gather our Roma together.’
- (127) *tu šaj keres kl’epačiha?* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 you can do.PRS.2SG hammer.INST
 ‘Can you work with a hammer?’
- (128) *me tuke naši phenav* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 I you.DAT cannot tell.PRS.1SG
 ‘I cannot tell you.’

Apart from *šaj* and *naši*, three other modals serve to express the meaning of ability in Eastern Uzh Romani: *džan-* ‘to know’, *bijrin-* ‘to manage’ and *honno* ‘able’. They partly overlap in their functions, but their employment is susceptible to dialectal and perhaps also idiolectal differences. As a preliminary, see the different modals in elicited translations of a sentence ‘Can you lend me the car?’:

- (129) *tu mange džanes te den kejčen*
 you I.DAT know.PRS.2SG NCOMP give.INF loan
o motoris? (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 ART car
- (130) *tu bijrines mange te pozičinen*
 you manage.PRS.2SG I.DAT NCOMP lend.INF
o motoris? (Per)^{LQCR}
 ART car
- (131) *tu sal honno mange te den kejčen*
 you COP.PRS.2SG able I.DAT NCOMP give.INF loan
o motoris? (Ser)^{LQCR}
 ART car
 ‘Can you lend me the car?’

The first of these modals, the personal verb *džan-*, is an inherited Indo-Aryan verb with the basic meaning of internal cognition ‘to know’. As a modal, it is used in the

participant-internal capability meaning ‘to know how to, to have knowledge/capability of’ in all varieties of Eastern Uzh Romani (132), (133). In Uzhhorod, moreover, *džan-* is used in the participant-external meaning, as in (134), (135), and (in the meaning of inability) (136).

- (132) *tu džanes te keren čokanoha?* (Per)^{LQCR}
 you know.PRS.2SG NCOMP do.INF hammer.INST
 ‘Can you work with a hammer?’
- (133) *igen džanenas slovātika te vakeren* (Khu)
 very know.IPF/POT.3PL Slovak.ADV NCOMP speak.INF
 ‘They could speak Slovak well.’
- (134) *a mā čak akor kana phuterde avri, kampi’a*
 and/but already only then when open.AOR.3PL out be_needed.AOR
kola pasporti kola savore,
 that.SPEC.PL passport.PL that.SPEC.PL all.PL
avka džan’lam te džan (UzhhS)
 thus know.AOR.1PL NCOMP go.INF
 ‘And only at that time when they opened [the border], those passports and all those [documents] were needed, so we could go.’
- (135) *kola rukone māsinen khatar okārik, kāj čak džanen* (UzhhS)
 that.SPEC.PL dog.PL crawl.PRS.3PL everywhere where only know.PRS.3PL
 ‘Those dogs are crawling everywhere, wherever they are able to.’
- (136) *na džanav nič te keren,*
 NEG know.PRS.1SG nothing NCOMP do.INF
le les pro vasta, mije ke tute (UzhhR)
 take.IMP.2SG he.ACC on hand.PL OPT.COP at you.LOC
 ‘I am not able to do anything (because of a child). Take him (= the child) in your arms, may he be with you (and not with me).’

The other two ability modals, *bjrin-* and *honno*, are borrowed. They are most commonly used in the meaning of ability in all varieties, including Uzhhorod, where they compete with *džan-*. The verb *bjrin-* originates in the Hungarian verb *bír* ‘to be able, to manage’, although its immediate source may be local Ukrainian (Rusyn) dialects, into which the Hungarian verb has also been borrowed. The verb is especially common in the data from Perechyn, where it is even attested in the internal capability meaning (137). The examples (139) and (140) show *bjrin-* in negative clauses, i.e. in expression of inability.

- (137) *oj mā bijrinel te egenen* (Per)^{LQCR}
 she already manage.PRS.3SG NCOMP count.INF
 ‘She already can count.’
- (138) *so bijrinel te pomožinen lāče laveha* (Uzhhs)
 what manage.PRS.3SG NCOMP help.INF good word.INST
 ‘What is he able to help with a good word?’
- (139) *na bijrinav te vakeren, xoť kamav* (Per)
 NEG manage.PRS.1SG NCOMP speak.INF though want.PRS.1SG
 ‘I am not able to speak, though I want to.’
- (140) *ov ajso slabo sas, hoj menk daže na bijrinlas*
 he such weak COP.PST.3 FCOMP still even NEG manage.IPF/POT.3SG
koropka šābl’iki te vazden (Ser)^{RDž}
 box safety_match.PL NCOMP lift.INF
 ‘He was so weak that he was even unable to lift a box of matches.’

The last ability modal is *honno*, an impersonal and uninflected modal borrowed from the Slavic (Czech-Slovak-Ukrainian) adjective *hoden/hodn-* ‘capable, worthy’.¹⁵⁰ Clauses with *honno* contain the obligatory copula that is marked for the person and number categories of the overt subject noun phrase, although impersonal constructions with the zero subject noun phrase also occur (146). The modalised verb has the infinitive form. Negation of *honno* is achieved through the copula negation (144). The modal *honno* is especially common in Sereďnie, where it even occurs in the internal capability meaning of ‘to know how to’ in addition to *džan-* (see (141), (142)).

- (141) *či esas honno tijro papus te genen*
 whether COP.PST.3 able your grandfather NCOMP read.INF
the te pisinen? (Ser)^{LQCR}
 and NCOMP write.INF
 ‘Did your grandpa know how to read and how to write?’
- (142) *oj hiňi honno te māren pes* (Ser)
 she COP.PRS.3SG.F able NCOMP beat.INF REFL
 ‘She can fight.’

¹⁵⁰ This loan modal also occurs in Western Uzh and Zemplín Romani dialects in East Slovakia, where it has a phonologically more conservative form *hodno*. Cf. above for the development of *sabano* from *sabadno* and see also 2.1.7.

- (143) *ov hino honno tuha te bešen cejlo d'ives* (Ser)
 he COP.PRS.3SG.M able you.INST NCOMP sit.INF whole day
 'He is able to sit with you all the day.'
- (144) *gādžo nesas honno le dromeħa*
 nonRom NEG.COP.PRS.3 able ART road.INST
te predžan l'incate (Ser)
 NCOMP cross.INF Lintsi.LOC
 'A non-Rom wasn't able to go through the road to Lintsi.'
- (145) *te ejħas honno* (UzhħS)
 if COP.POT.2SG able
 'If you were able.'
- (146) *ħisar nesas honno pes te dozvoħinen* (Per)
 in_no_way NEG.COP.PST.3 able REFL NCOMP reach_on_phone.INF
 'It was in no way possible to get [them] on the phone.'

The modal *honno* may even be combined with the basic possibility modals *šaj* (in the affirmative meaning) and *naši* (in the negative meaning). Interestingly, two kinds of constructions occur with such combined modals with respect to subject marking. First, the subject marking is on the indicative copula, while the modalised verb is in the infinitive, like in the constructions with the plain *honno*. This construction is attested only in interrogative sentences with the combined affirmative modal *šaj honno* (147), (148). Second, the modalised verb is finite and marks the subject categories, as in (149) with the combined negative modal *naši honno*.

- (147) *a tu šaj honno sal?* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 and/but you can able COP.PRS.2SG
 'And are you able?'
- (148) *kana šaj ejħa honno te aven?* (UzhħS)
 when can COP.FUT.2SG able NCOMP come.INF
 'When will you be able to come?'
- (149) *ħisar la naši honno arakhav* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 in_no_way she.ACC cannot able find.PRS.1SG
 'I am not able to find her in any way.'

To sum up, the expression of ability in Eastern Uzh Romani is quite complex, being subject to dialectal and perhaps also idiolectal differences. In addition to the basic possibility

particles *šaj* and *naši*, three other modals express some kind of ability: *džan-*, *bjrin-* and *honno*. The most common ability modal in both Uzhhorod varieties is *džan-* ‘to know’, which is in all varieties used in the meaning of capability ‘to know how to’, but only in Uzhhorod it is also used in the meaning ‘to be able’. In Perechyn, the loan verb *bjrin-* ‘to manage’ from either Hungarian or local Ukrainian is the most common ability modal, while in Serednie, it is the uninflected particle *honno* ‘able’ of Slavic origin. Although both are most commonly used in the meaning ‘to be able’, only in the respective varieties are they also attested as the capability modals. The data from Khudlovo are not straightforward in this respect since all the forms discussed are found in Khudlovo data with no clear preference for one or the other.

12.5.3 Necessity

Necessity modals in Eastern Uzh Romani mainly rely on loanwords, supplemented by one internally grammaticalised form that is shared with other North Central dialects. In the following sections, I will discuss the personal verbs that express necessity first, before dealing with impersonal modals.

12.5.3.1 Personal necessity modals

Two basic verbs of modal necessity are *majin-* and *mušin-*, both of which are borrowed from Slavic modal verbs. The verb *majin-* is a loan verb of the North Slavic possessive verb, cf. Slovak *mat’* (3SG *má*), Ukrainian *mamu* (3SG *має*), Polish *mieć* (3SG *ma*) ‘to have’ (also used in the modal meaning in Slavic). It serves to express weak necessity ‘should, ought to’:

- (150) *one majinen te duminen sar te siklon* (Per)
 they should.PRS.3PL NCOMP think.INF how NCOMP learn.INF
 ‘They should think [about] how to learn.’

The other verb *mušin-* is borrowed from the North Slavic necessity modal of German origin, cf. Ukrainian *mycumu* (1SG *муcumу*), dialectal East Slovak *mušec* (Standard Slovak *musiet’*), Polish *musieć*, etc. It is a modal of strong necessity ‘to have to, to be obliged to, must’:

- (151) *odā mijri daj, phenel,*
 DEM my mother say.PRS.3SG
me mušind’om mijra da te spasinen (UzhhS)
 I have_to.AOR.1SG my mother.ACC NCOMP save.INF

“‘It is my mother,” he says, “I had to save my mother.””

- (152) *hjába tuke na kamel pes,*
 although you.DAT NEG want.PRS.3SG REFL
tu mušines te džan (Ser)^{LQCR}
 you have_to.PRS.2SG NCOMP go.INF
 ‘Although you don’t want to, you have to go.’

In Uzhhorod and Khudlovo, *majin-* is also common in strong obligation, while *mušin-* is rather rare in the data. It therefore seems that *mušin-* is retreating in favour of *majin-*, which becomes the general participant-external necessity modal unconfined to weak necessity:

- (153) *daravkernas amen avri,*
 frighten.ITER.IPF/POT.3PL we.ACC out
majind’am amen adā te keren (Uzhhs)
 have_to.AOR.1PL we this NCOMP
 ‘They were terrifying us. We had to do this.’

- (154) *me som nasvalo,*
 I COP.PRS.1SG ill
no majinav te džan pre buv’i (Khu)
 but have_to.PRS.1SG NCOMP go.INF on work
 ‘I am ill, but I have to go to work.’

Both verbs *majin-* and *mušin-* are also used in epistemic necessity:

- (155) *tut majind’a t’ ejn* (Uzhhs)
 you.ACC have_to.AOR.3SG NCOMP COP.INF
 ‘You must have had [it].’

- (156) *one mušinde te mučinen pes avri* (Per)^{LQCR}
 they have_to.AOR.3PL NCOMP suffer.INF REFL out
 ‘They must have got tired.’

- (157) *no majinel sombatone mā t’ aven khejr’*
 PART should.PRS.3SG Saturday.ADV already NCOMP come.INF home
o rom mijro (Ser)
 ART husband my
 ‘Well, he must already come home on Saturday, that husband of mine.’

Negated verbs of necessity express lack of obligation (158). Note in (12.5.2.3) above that *majin-* may also express deontic impossibility, i.e. prohibition.

- (158) *on na majinen ajci te keren buv'i* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 they NEG have_to.PRS.3PL so_much NCOMP do.INF work
 'They don't have to work so much.'

In addition to *majin-* and *mušin-*, there is one more necessity verb of local Slavic origin in Eastern Uzh Romani, viz. *vol'in-* (cf. Ukrainian *воліти* 'to wish', Polish *woleć* 'to prefer'; cf. also Slovak *vôľa*, Ukrainian and Russian *воля* 'will'). It expresses the participant-internal necessity and is semantically close to the defective verb *kampe(l)* 'be needed' discussed in the next section. It is only attested in spontaneous speech data in reference to a past-time action that has not been realised ('counterfactual necessity'):

- (159) *vol'ind'am te džan ke maňa* (UzhhS)
 should.AOR.1PL NCOMP go.INF at/to Mania
 'We should have gone to Mania.' (But we didn't.)

- (160) *me na vol'ind'om te len kejčen* (UzhhS)
 I NEG should.AOR.1SG NCOMP take.INF loan
 'I shouldn't have taken the loan' (But I did.)

12.5.3.2 Impersonal necessity modals

Two impersonal necessity modals exist in Eastern Uzh Romani: *musaj* and *kampe(l)*.

The form *musaj* is an uninflected particle borrowed from local Ukrainian (Rusyn), where it is itself a loanword from the Hungarian *muszáj* (of ultimately German origin; cf. *muss sein* 'must be'). The modal *musaj* is preferred in strong necessity constructions of general validity with no time reference and sometimes even with no overt subject, as in (161). In personal constructions with *musaj*, the subject is expressed by a dative noun phrase, as in (162), (163), (164) and (165). If a past or future time reference has to be indicated, it is achieved through the third-person copula (163), (164); otherwise, the copula is missing. The modalised verb always occurs in the infinitive. Semantically, *musaj* expresses strong necessity and, therefore, competes with the personal verb *mušin-*. The particle *musaj* also occurs in negative clauses with the negator *na* to express absence of obligation; cf. (165) below with (158) above.

- (161) *kanāke vakeren čisto ukrajincika, bo musaj* (UzhhS)
 now speak.PRS.3PL pure Ukrainian.ADV because must
 ‘Now they speak pure Ukrainian because [they] must.’
- (162) *musaj mange sa te keren, te tāven texan,*
 must I.DAT everything NCOMP do.INF NCOMP cook.INF food
o dili te moren, sa (UzhhR)
 ART floor NCOMP wash.INF everything
 ‘I have to do everything, to cook food, to wash the floor, everything.’
- (163) *amenge musaj ejla pāle te visa'on* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 we.DAT must COP.FUT.3SG back NCOMP return.INF
 ‘We will have to return.’
- (164) *musaj leske sas te bikinen o taksis* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 must he.DAT COP.PST.3 NCOMP sell.INF ART car
 ‘He had to sell the car.’
- (165) *lenge na musaj ajci but buv'i te keren* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 they.DAT NEG must so_much much work NCOMP do.INF
 ‘They don’t have to do so much work.’

The other impersonal modal is *kampe(l)*, which is a de-volitive verb grammaticalised from a reflexive periphrasis of the verb *kam-* ‘to want’ (cf. Elšík and Matras 2009: 292). It is well known from other Central dialects and from Northern Transylvanian dialects (Boretzky and Iгла 2004: 185; cf. also Heuvel and Urech 2014: 55–56, footnote 20, 21). The modal *kampe(l)* is impersonal but inflected since it encodes TAM categories. The default present-tense form is either *kampel* or apocopic *kampe*; the apocopic form is more common in the data from Uzhhorod than in those from the other varieties. See Table 73 for its inflection.

Table 73: Inflection of the defective modal verb *kampe(l)* ‘be needed’

PRESENT INDICATIVE	<i>kampe(l)</i>
FUTURE	<i>kampela</i>
IMPERFECT, POTENTIAL	<i>kampelas</i>
AORIST	<i>kampil'a(s)</i>
IRREALIS	<i>kampil'ahas</i>

The subject in constructions with *kampe(l)* is encoded in a dative noun phrase, but impersonal constructions with the zero subject are also common (see (166), (170)). The modal *kampe(l)* has the meaning of participant-internal necessity ‘be needed’ (see (167) to (170)),

but it may also refer to weak obligation, as in (166). It takes both a verb complement, as in (166) and (169), and a nominal object, as in (167), (168) and (170). Note in (167) that the animate direct object of *kampe(l)* has accusative marking, like normal transitive verbs. Negation of *kampe(l)* is achieved by the regular negator *na* (167), (170).

(166) *izbi te po'inkeren kampe sako čhon* (UzhhR)
 flat.PL NCOMP pay.ITER.INF be_needed.PRS every month

‘It is necessary to pay for flats every month.’

(167) *mange la na kampe* (UzhhS)
 I.DAT she.ACC NEG be_needed.PRS

‘I don’t need her.’

(168) *mange kampi'ahas kajso* (UzhhS)
 I.DAT be_needed.IRR such.SPEC

‘I would have needed such a one.’

(169) *so tuke kampela te keren?* (Per)
 what you.DAT be_needed.FUT NCOMP do.INF

‘What will you need to do?’

(170) *ñi lovve na kampi'a* (Ser)
 not_even money NEG be_needed.AOR

‘Even money wasn’t needed.’

A mention should also be made of a modal adverb of epistemic necessity *točno* ‘certainly, surely’. It is an unadapted loanword of East Slavic *точно*, which may also occur with the adverbial marking as *točnonēs* (in Uzhhorod and Perechyn) or *točnān* (in Khudlovo and Serednie); see 9.1.1 and 9.1.2. Less frequently, adverbs of Hungarian origin, such as *bistošan* (from Hungarian *biztosan*) and *bizo* (from *bizony*), occur in the data.

(171) *točno avā paž tute mučime avri* (Per)
 certainly COP.FUT.1SG beside you.LOC trouble.PTCP out

‘I will certainly be tired in your presence.’

(172) *bizo len na thoven te bešen* (Khu)
 certainly they.ACC NEG put.PRS.3PL NCOMP sit.INF

‘They certainly don’t imprison them.’ (Literally: ‘...don’t put them to sit’.)

12.5.4 Phasal verbs

Two phasal concepts are lexicalised through special verbs in Eastern Uzh Romani: beginning and cessation. Verbs for these concepts, ‘to begin’ and ‘to stop, to discontinue’ respectively, are consonantal verbs that take an infinitive complement.

In the meaning ‘to begin, to start’, two verbs compete in all Eastern Uzh varieties. The first one is *xud-*, a polysemous verb with a number of other meanings, such as ‘to catch’, ‘to grasp’, ‘to get’, and ‘to obtain’. The other is a Hungarian loan verb *kezdin-* (cf. Hungarian *kezd*), which only means ‘to begin, to start’. Although a preference for each verb seems to be associated with particular speakers, a number of speakers have been recorded using both variants.

(173) *me xund'om te roven* (Per)
 I start.AOR.1SG NCOMP weep.INF
 ‘I started to weep.’

(174) *me kezdind'om te vakeren* (Per)
 I begin.AOR.1SG NCOMP speak.INF
 ‘I began to talk.’

For ‘to stop, to discontinue’, the verb *preačh-* or its contracted form *pračh-* is used in all varieties. The verb represents an aktionsart modification of *ačh-* ‘to become, to remain, to stay, etc.’ (see 3.5.1.5) and is modelled after Slavic equivalents, such as Slovak *pre-stáva* ‘s/he ceases’, Ukrainian *nepe-cmauae* ‘s/he ceases’. Similar formations exist in other Eastern dialects of North Central Romani.

(175) *pračhila te den o brišind* (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 stop.AOR.3SG NCOMP give.INF ART rain
 ‘It stopped raining.’

(176) *preač te māren le čhaven* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 stop[IMP.2SG] NCOMP beat.INF ART child.ACC.PL
 ‘Stop beating the children.’

Since there is no special phasal verb ‘to continue’ in Eastern Uzh Romani, continuance can only be indicated by means of the phasal adverb *menk* ‘still’ (< Hungarian *még*). See 9.5 for more details about this phasal adverb and about another phasal adverb (*i)mā* ‘already’.

13 COMPLEX SYNTACTIC CONSTRUCTIONS

This chapter describes devices used in combining phrases, clauses and sentences into larger units. The most important types of linking constructions in Romani are complementation, adverbial subordination, relativisation and coordination. In addition, a marginal serial-verb construction is present in Eastern Uzh Romani and will be discussed first.

13.1 Serialisation

Constructions of serial verbs are marginal in Romani, although evidence of serialisation that involves the verbs of motion exists in various dialects (cf. Matras 2002: 176). In Eastern Uzh Romani, serialisation is common in imperative predicates provided that the first member is a motion verb, such as *dža-* ‘go’ or *av-* ‘come’. Both serial verbs are usually juxtaposed; however, note in (4) that they may also be split by components of the verb phrase:

- (1) *av beš tuke* (UzhhR)
come[IMP.2SG] sit[IMP.2SG] you.DAT
‘Come sit down.’
- (2) *dža šulav opre kode* (UzhhS)
go[IMP.2SG] sweep[IMP.2SG] up there.SPEC
‘Go sweep [it] up there.’
- (3) *avas thovas texan pro skamin* (UzhhS)
come.IMP.1PL put.IMP.1PL food on table
‘Let’s go put the meal on the table.’
- (4) *dža pes laha bājin* (Per)
go[IMP.2SG] REFL she.INST play[IMP.2SG]
‘Go play with her.’
- (5) *dža phen lake, mi avel andre* (Khu)
go[IMP.2SG] tell[IMP.2SG] she.DAT OPT come.PRS.3SG in
‘Go tell her to come in.’
- (6) *so arad’a teje, dža dik* (Ser)
what knock_down.AOR.3SG down go[IMP.2SG] see[IMP.2SG]
‘What has he thrown down? Go look.’

A construction of serial verbs also occurs in non-imperative clauses, particularly in (but not restricted to) the future-time reference:

- (7) *o manuša avle kerde buvti* (UzhhR)
 ART human.PL come.AOR.3PL do.AOR.3PL work
 ‘People came [and] did their work.’
- (8) *me džā solgāl’inā tuke* (UzhhS)
 I go.FUT.1SG serve.FUT.1SG you.DAT
 ‘I will go serve you.’
- (9) *me džā predžā man* (Khu.Ser)^{LQCR}
 I go.FUT.1SG take_a_walk.FUT.1SG I.ACC
 ‘I am going for a walk.’

Apart from motion verbs, idiomatic serialisation of the imperative verbs *xa* ‘eat’ and *čāl’uv* ‘eat fill’ is used to indicate that someone should enjoy his or her meal.

- (10) *xa čāl’uv mro čha* (Khu)
 eat[IMP.2SG] eat_fill[IMP.2SG] my son
 ‘Enjoy your meal, my son.’

13.2 Complementation

This section discusses the basic features of sentential complementation. Sentential complements are understood here to be propositions that function in the role of the argument of the verb predicate (Givón 1990: 515; cf. also Noonan 2007). In Romani in general, complement clauses are introduced by special particles or complementisers, whose forms and functions in the Eastern Uzh varieties are the primary topics of the discussion. Next, this subchapter briefly describes the integration of question complements (polar or yes/no complements and question-word complements), which are usually not analysed within the range of complementation in Romani descriptions. In contrast, purpose and manipulation clauses are discussed as adverbial clauses in (13.3.8), though they make use of mechanisms that are employed in complementation and are often discussed in close associations with complementation in the descriptions of Romani morphosyntax (cf. e.g. Matras 2002, 2004).

As discussed by Matras (1999b: 17–20; 2004), the structure of Romani complementation adheres to the typical model of Balkan languages. One of the Balkan-like features of Romani complementation is a split in formal representations between non-factual or unreal events expressed by complement predication on the one hand and between factual or real events on the other hand. More specifically, this split is indicated in the choice of a specific complementiser used to introduce these complements based on their independent

truth value: a non-factual predication mainly involves complements of modal verbs, while a factual predication includes epistemic complements of cognition utterance verbs (cf. Givón 1990: 517).¹⁵¹ In Late Proto-Romani, where this distinction is assumed to have been triggered by contact with Greek, the two complementisers were **te* for the non-factual complements and **kaj* for the factual complements.

In present-day Romani dialects, the non-factual complementiser *te* and its phonological variants are largely stable, while the factual complementiser *kaj* is often replaced by borrowings (cf. Elšík and Matras 2006: 61, 178–181 and elsewhere). This also holds true for Eastern Uzh Romani, in which the factual complementiser displays a diversity of forms that heavily rely on borrowings. Another innovation, which is shared with other Central dialects, is the loss of subject agreement between the main proposition and the non-factual complement by what is referred to as a ‘new infinitive’ (cf. Boretzky 1996a and 3.4.3 for details regarding the Eastern Uzh Romani infinitive). For the discussion on complementisers in purpose and manipulation clauses, including the combination of two complementisers in a complex form, see 13.3.8.

13.2.1 Non-factual complementiser

As in most other Romani dialects (cf. Matras 2002: 181–182; Matras 2004), in Eastern Uzh Romani, the non-factual complementiser is invariably represented by the inherited form *te*. The complementiser *te* introduces the same-subject infinitive complement of modal and phasal verbs, which are discussed in 12.5, as well as the same-subject infinitive complement of verbs of effort (e.g. ‘to try’ (11), ‘to dare’ (12)), of psych verbs (e.g. ‘to fear’ (13), ‘to feel ashamed’ (15)), of motion verbs in purpose clauses (16), of the verb ‘to give’ in its function of a causative verb (14), etc. (see also 3.4.3).

- (11) *probāl'in te aven sigeređer (UzhhR)^{LQCR}*
 come[IMP.2SG] NCOMP come.INF soon.COMPR
 ‘Try to come earlier.’

¹⁵¹ Formal differentiation of the non-factual and factual complementisers still occurs in the large majority of Romani dialects. Still, there are dialects in which such differentiation has already been abandoned and a single complementiser is used for both modal and epistemic complements, such as Welsh Romani, the Dolenjski dialect in Slovenia (including its related variety in Istria in Croatia) and certain Sinti varieties (cf. Matras 2002: 181; Matras 2004: 289).

- (12) *na tromahas pro fovros te džan* (Uzhhs)
 NEG dare.IPF/POT.1PL on town NCOMP go.INF
 ‘We didn’t dare to go to the town.’
- (13) *pre mil’icija daralas te džan* (Per)
 on police fear.IPF/POT.3SG NCOMP go.INF
 ‘He was afraid of going to the police.’
- (14) *añi na del pal peste te džanen* (Khu)
 not_even NEG give.PRS.3SG about REFL.LOC NCOMP know.INF
 ‘She even doesn’t let [us] know about herself.’
- (15) *tu tut ladžaha kadā te phenen* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 you you.ACC feel_shamed.FUT.2SG this.SPEC NCOMP say.INF
 ‘You will feel ashamed to say this.’
- (16) *gejle te zaroden vareso* (Ser)
 go.AOR.3PL NCOMP earn.INF something
 ‘They left in order to earn something.’

In addition to its occurrence with infinitives, the non-factual complementiser introduces finite verbs in negative optative constructions and in affirmative optative constructions with a second-person predicate (see 12.2.1). It also occurs in some contexts of purpose clause, which is discussed in 13.3.8 in detail.

13.2.2 Factual complementisers

In contrast to the non-factual complementiser, the factual complementisers display a certain diversity of forms in the Eastern Uzh dialect region. Altogether, three factual complementisers in various shapes occur: the inherited and rare *kāj* and two common complementisers borrowed from Hungarian and local Slavic.¹⁵²

The conservative factual complementiser is *kāj* (optionally with the short vowel as *kaj*), which was inherited from Proto-Romani (cf. Matras 2002: 179; Elšík and Matras 2006: 84). It has a shape identical to the spatial interrogative *kāj* ‘where’, from which it was grammaticalised, and to other related particles, such as a relativiser (13.4) and a negative utterance particle (9.6.3). However, *kāj* has been replaced by borrowed complementisers to a

¹⁵² In several LQCR sentences elicited in Perechyn, the thing interrogative *so* ‘what’ has also been encountered in the function of a factual complementiser. However, this form has not been observed in spontaneous speech, so its occurrence in translation elicitation may have been triggered by the interference of the Ukrainian complementiser *uŋo* (cf. also Russian *čmo*), which is identical to the interrogative ‘what’.

great extent, including in epistemic clauses that can only be introduced by borrowed forms in the entire dialect region. The only variety in which *kāj* still seems to function as a factual complementiser, in certain contexts at least, is that of Perechyn, where it is attested to introduce the assertion complements that function as sentential objects of the verb for ‘to say’ (17). In the other varieties, complementiser-derived *kāj* seems to only be maintained in clauses with causal or consequential and extent semantics, which allows for classifying it as a subordinator rather than a complementiser (see 13.3.6 and 13.3.7 for more details).

- (17) *phen, kāj man duj čhavōra hin* (Per)
 say[IMP.2SG] FCOMP I.ACC two child.DIM.PL COP.PRS.3
 ‘Tell [them] that I have two children.’

Currently, the most common factual complementiser is borrowed from the Hungarian *hogy* and occurs in three slightly different phonological shapes: *hod’*, *hoj* and *oj*. The most widespread variant is *hoj*, while *hod’* is common in Khudlovo and Sereďnie and among Hungarian L2 speakers in Uzhhorod. The rarest variant is *oj*, which is used by some speakers in Radvanka.¹⁵³ There is no functional differentiation between the three forms, which are all used in epistemic clauses as well as in other types of factual complements and are also part of complex subordinators in purpose and manipulation clauses (see 13.3.8).

- (18) *on dikhen hoj amen gil’avas* (UzhhR)
 they see.PRS.3PL FCOMP we sing.PRS.1PL
 ‘They see that we are singing.’
- (19) *vareko dikhl’a, oj tu gejl’al* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 somebody see.AOR.3SG FCOMP you go.AOR.2SG
 ‘Somebody saw that you left.’
- (20) *pal’ikerav tuke hoj av’al* (UzhhS)
 thank.PRS.1SG you.DAT FCOMP come.AOR.2SG
 ‘I thank you that you have come.’
- (21) *džanes hod’ hin ajse džung roma* (UzhhS)
 know.PRS.2SG FCOMP COP.PRS.3 such ugly Rom.PL
 ‘You know that there exist such ugly Roma.’

¹⁵³ The factual complementiser in the shape of *oj* also occurs in the related Western Uzh variety of Pavlovce nad Uhom.

- (22) *na dumind'am hoj avka sig avena* (Per)
 NEG think.AOR.1PL FCOMP thus soon come.FUT.2PL
 'We didn't think that you.PL would come so soon.'
- (23) *vakerlas, hod' igen but stradinnas are vojna* (Khu)
 speak.IPF/POT.3SG FCOMP very much suffer.IPF/POT.3PL in war
 'She was narrating that they had been suffering a lot in the war.'
- (24) *odā hirtelen pes polučind'a*
 DEM suddenly REFL result.AOR.3SG
hod' amen are špitā'la popejl'am aro fovros (Ser)
 FCOMP we in hospital get_to.AOR.1PL in town
 'It came so suddenly that we got into the hospital in Uzhhorod.'

A complementiser of Slavic origin exists only in Khudlovo in the form of *ož* (also *odž*), which is borrowed from the local dialectal Ukrainian (Rusyn) *ож* (cf. the Old East Slavic complementiser *оже*; Kopečný et al. 1980: 567–569). It is used in epistemic clauses as well as in other subtypes of factual complements and competes with the Hungarian-origin *hod'/hoj*. In purpose and manipulation clauses, a rarer variant *ež* occurs in the data of one speaker (see 13.3.8).

- (25) *pališ lakoro phral dodžangl'a,*
 then her brother come_to_know.AOR.3SG
mijra dakoro phralōr-' ož oj adaj dživel (Khu)
 my mother.GEN brother.DIM FCOMP she here live.PRS.3SG
 'Then her brother – the brother of my mother – found out that she was living here.'
- (26) *me mā na phend'om lenge,*
 I already NEG tell.AOR.1SG they.DAT
ož me džanav lengeri čhib (Khu)
 FCOMP I know.PRS.1SG their language
 'I didn't tell them that I knew their language.'
- (27) *amen dovakerd'am amen, ož džaha andre jekh* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 we agree_on.AOR.1PL we.ACC FCOMP go.FUT.1PL in one
 'We agreed that we would go together.'

Table 74 summarises the three factual complementisers and their shapes as they are attested in individual varieties. The brackets for the inherited *kāj* indicate that the

complementiser is functionally restricted to the non-epistemic factual clauses in the respective variety.

Table 72: Factual complementisers

ORIGIN	FORM	UzhhR	UzhhS	Per	Khu	Ser
inherited	<i>kāj (kaj)</i>	–	–	(+)	–	–
Hungarian <i>hogy</i>	<i>hod'</i>	+	+	–	+	+
	<i>hoj</i>	+	+	+	+	+
	<i>oj</i>	+	–	–	–	–
dialectal Ukrainian <i>ож</i>	<i>ož (odž, ež)</i>	–	–	–	+	–

13.2.3 Polar complementiser

Polar (yes/no) complement clauses are introduced by a borrowed particle *či* ‘whether’, which is common in the Slavic languages of the area (cf. Slovak *či*, Polish *czy*, Ukrainian *чи*). The identical form also serves the function of as a disjunctive coordinator in interrogative sentences (see 13.5.2). The following sentences illustrate the polar complements of imperative predicates (28), (29), a polar complement of immediate perception (30) and an epistemic polar complement (31).

- (28) *dža dik či avla o motoris* (UzhhS)
 go[IMP.2SG] see[IMP.2SG] whether come.AOR.3SG ART car
 ‘Go look whether the car has come.’

- (29) *phend'a, džala khejre, mind'a dikhela*
 say.AOR.3SG go.FUT.3SG home immediately see.FUT.3SG
či hin ke menša lovve (Per)
 whether COP.PRS.3 at/to Mensha money
 ‘He said that he would go home and immediately see whether Mensha has [some] money [at immediate disposal].’

- (30) *me na džanav či avka hin* (Per)
 I NEG know.PRS.1SG whether thus COP.PRS.3
 ‘I don’t know whether it is so (true).’

- (31) *dik palal či od'a savoro* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 see[IMP.2SG] in/to_the_back whether there all
 ‘Look back whether there is everything.’

13.2.4 Question-word complements

Embedded question-word clauses are formally interrogative clauses with plain interrogative pronouns (see 6.2). Optionally, they may be introduced by the Hungarian-origin factual complementiser *hod'/hoj*. Compare example (32), which contains the plain interrogative pronoun with no complementiser, with example (33) in which the factual complementiser *hod'* introduces the interrogative-like clause. In (34), both types are found within a single sentence in two coordinated clauses.

(32) *o dad džal te dikhen, kāj on sas* (Uzhhs)
ART father go.PRS.3SG NCOMP see.INF where they COP.PST.3
'The father is going to check where they were.'

(33) *na pametnav, hod' kāj dživen* (Uzhhs)
NEG remember.PRS.1SG FCOMP where live.PRS.3PL
'I don't remember where they live.'

(34) *añi na ronne ko phag'la,*
not_even NEG search.AOR.3PL who break.AOR.3SG
a džanenas hod' ko (Khu)
and/but know.IPF/POT.3PL FCOMP who
'They did not even search [for the perpetrator] who had broken it, and they knew [him] who [committed it].'

(35) *zvoñin hod' kana aveha* (Ser)
phone[IMP.2SG]FCOMP when come.FUT.2SG
'Give a call when you arrive.'

13.3 Adverbial subordination

In Eastern Uzh Romani, adverbial clauses are introduced by subordinators. The following discussion begins by discussing the subordinators and some other properties of conditional and concessive clauses and proceeds to describe the subordinators in temporal, spatial, manner, causal and consequential clauses. The final section on adverbial subordination is devoted to purpose and manipulation clauses.

13.3.1 Conditional clauses

The most common conditional subordinator in Eastern Uzh Romani is *te*, which was inherited from Proto-Romani and is known from other dialects (cf. Boretzky 1993; Elšík and Matras 2006: 84).

- (36) *te hin lovve, akor hin savoro,*
 if COP.PRS.3 money then COP.PRS.3 all
te nāne lovve akor nāne nič (UzhhS)
 if NEG.COP.PRS.3 money then NEG.COP.PRS.3 nothing
 ‘If there is money, then there is everything. If there is no money, then there is nothing.’
- (37) *te leperdahas mange, me spomñind’omas* (UzhhS)
 if remind.IRR.3PL I.DAT I recollect.IRR.1SG
 ‘If they had reminded me, I would have recollected.’
- (38) *te tumen san but džane,*
 if you.PL COP.PRS.2PL many person.PL
the amen sam roma but džane (Khu)
 also we COP.PRS.1PL Rom.PL many person.PL
 ‘If you are many people, we Roma, too, are many [in number].’
- (39) *te kames, dža khejre* (Ser)^{RDž}
 if want.PRS.2SG go[IMP.2SG] home
 ‘If you want to, go home.’
- (40) *sa šaj te doxuden, te manuš lāčho* (Ser)
 everything can NCOMP attain.INF if human good
 ‘Everything can be attained if a man is nice.’

In Perechyn, *te* is used by elder speakers, while young and middle-aged speakers commonly use *kid’*, a subordinator borrowed from the local Ukrainian (Rusyn) dialect (*кидѣ*).

- (41) *kid’ kames, od’a sa dovakeraha*
 if want.PRS.2SG there all agree_on.FUT.1PL
amenge raz dva (Per)
 we.DAT quickly
 ‘If you want to, we will arrange everything quickly there.’
- (42) *kid’ menk ade phireha,*
 if still here go_often.FUT.2SG
me šaj zalidžav tut od’a (Per)
 I can lead.PRS.1SG you.ACC there
 ‘If you keep coming here, I can take you there.’

- (43) *može the bikenena take,*
 maybe also sell.FUT.3PL you.DAT
a kid' na, prosto dikheha (Per)
 and/but if NEG simply see.FUT.2SG
 'Maybe they will sell [it] to you as well, and if they won't, you will simply take a look [at it].'

Predictive conditionals that are connected with some warnings may also be introduced by *sar*, a temporal subordinator derived from the manner interrogative 'how' (cf. 13.3.4).

- (44) *sar tu mange na pheneha,*
 how you I.DAT NEG say.FUT.2SG
me tut na mukava (Khu)^{LQCR}
 I you.ACC NEG leave.PRS.1SG
 'If you don't tell me, I won't release you.'

The main clause (apodosis) of conditional sentences, which refers to the consequence of the realisation of the condition, is often introduced by a deictic correlative (English *then*), although the apodosis may lack any correlative element, as in sentences (37) to (44) above. The correlative is most commonly the temporal deictic adverb *akor* 'then, at that time' (see 7.3.2), from Hungarian *akkor*, which is also used as a correlative in Hungarian (see also (36) above). Outside of Uzhhorod, Slavic correlatives *ta(k)* and *to* 'so' also occur. In examples (45), (46) and (47), all three forms *akor*, *ta* and *to* occur in sentences uttered by a single speaker.

- (45) *te tu aveha, akor me tut dikhā* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 if you come.FUT.2SG then I you.ACC see.FUT.1SG
 'If you come, then I will see you.'
- (46) *te xav, ta thuv'uvav* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 if eat.PRS.1SG so thick.INCH.PRS.1SG
 'If I eat, then I grow fat.'
- (47) *te tu tut zabludzineha ar' odi skl'epa,*
 if you you.ACC stray.FUT.2SG in DEM shop
to stričinaha amen avri paž o vudar (Ser)^{LQCR}
 so meet.FUT.1PL we.ACC out beside ART door
 'If you get lost in the shop, then we will meet outside by the door.'

The Slavic-origin correlative that means ‘so’ may also be combined with *akor*, which is particularly common in the data from Khudlovo (48). If the apodosis precedes the subordinate clause (protasis), the correlative element is always missing (49).

- (48) *te me hrajnā avri mil'jonos,*
 if I win.FUT.1SG out million
t' akor dava kejčen savore romen (Khu)^{LQCR}
 so then give.FUT.1SG loan all Rom.ACC.PL
 ‘If I win a million, then I will give a loan to all Roma.’
- (49) *me bo tutar na phučl'omas, te džangl'omas* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 I COND you.ABL NEG ask.IRR.1SG if know.IRR.1SG
 ‘I wouldn’t have asked you if I had known [it].’

Counterfactual conditional clauses, which refer to imagined situations that either did not happen or can never happen (cf. Thompson, Longacre and Hwang 2007: 256), are composed of irrealis (remote perfective) verbs (cf. 3.1.3 and 3.2.2.3) in both protasis and apodosis clauses. In addition, they may contain a special conditional particle of Slavic origin *bi* (in Uzhhorod and rarely elsewhere) or *bo* (in Perechyn, Khudlovo and Serednie),¹⁵⁴ although most documented examples of counterfactual conditionals lack this particle. The particle may be present in either protasis (50) or apodosis (52) clauses, as well as in both parts of the construction (51).

- (50) *te me uvl'omas bi zdravo,*
 if I COP.IRR.1SG COND healthy
me kerd'omas buvči (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 I do.IRR.1SG work
 ‘If I had been healthy, I would have worked.’
- (51) *kid' bo tu avl'alas ijdž,*
 if COND you come.IRR.2SG yesterday
tu bo la dikhl'alas (Per)^{LQCR}
 you COND she.ACC see.IRR.2SG
 ‘If you had come yesterday, you would have seen her.’

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Ukrainian *ō/ōu*, Russian *ōbi* (see also Kopečný et al. 1980: 114).

- (52) *te tu av'alas ijdž,*
 if you come.IRR.2SG yesterday
ta bo tu la dikh'alas (Khu)^{LQCR}
 so COND you she.ACC see.IRR.2SG
 'If you had come yesterday, you would have seen her.'

13.3.2 Concessive conditional clauses

A distinct type of conditional clauses, which are semantically close to concessive clauses (see below), are concessive conditional clauses (English *even if*; cf. Thompson, Longacre and Hwang 2007: 261). In Eastern Uzh Romani, they are commonly expressed by the concessive subordinator ('although') accompanied by the focus particle *the* 'also, even' (9.6.1). The particle *the* may focus either the entire subordinate clause (53) and therefore precede the subordinator, or it may focus a single constituent of the subordinate clause and therefore follow the subordinator (54). The complex adversative expression *th' avka* 'nevertheless' (< *the avka* [also/even thus]) usually occurs in the apodosis, as in (53) and in the examples below.

- (53) *ov th' avka pre tute ruš'ahas,*
 he also thus on you.LOC be_angry.IRR.3SG
the hoč kerd'alas leske sa mišto (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 also although do.IRR.2SG he.DAT all well
 'He would nevertheless have been angry with you even if you had done everything right for him.'
- (54) *xoť the ejla ke tu,*
 although also COP.FUT.3SG at/to you
phen, hoj nāne (UzhhS)
 say[IMP.2SG] FCOMP NEG.COP.PRS.3
 'Even if you have [it], say that you don't have [it].'

In Perechyn, the concessive subordinator may also be followed by the conditional particle *bo*:

- (55) *xoťá bo me the nasval'i som,*
 although COND I also ill COP.PRS.1SG
no muš'inaŭ te džan pre buv'ti (Per)^{LQCR}
 but have_to.PRS.1SG NCOMP go.INF on work

‘Even if I am ill, I still have to go to work.’

Negative concessive conditionals are expressed through negative optative constructions that are introduced by the concessive subordinator. That *te* in the negative concessive conditionals is the non-factual complementiser in the optative function (see 12.2.1) rather than the conditional subordinator ‘if’ is evident from the subjunctive marking of the copula it introduces, as in example (56). Moreover, *te* in these constructions is used by Perechyn speakers who use the formally distinct conditional subordinator *kid’*; see (57), which contains the counterfactual optative. The adversative coordinator (‘but’), which is typical of concessive sentences, may also be present (see also (55) above).

(56) *xoč* *ov* *the* *te* *n’* *ejl* *babňikos,*
 although he also NCOMP NEG COP.PRS.SBJV.3SG womaniser
no *me* *th’* *avka* *lestar* *džā* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 but I also thus he.ABL go.FUT.1SG
 ‘Even if he isn’t a womaniser, I will leave him’

(57) *xot’* *ov* *te* *na* *ejl’alas* *babňik,*
 although he NCOMP NEG COP.IRR.2/3SG womaniser
abo *me* *lestar* *th’* *avka* *džav* *het* (Per)^{LQCR}
 but I he.ABL also thus go.FUT.1SG away
 ‘Even if he wasn’t a womaniser, I would leave him.’

A concessive subordinator may even be missing in constructions with negative optative phrases, which pertains to clauses with free-choice pronominal expressions. In sentence (58) from Radvanka, the free-choice pronoun *xočso* ‘whatever’ occurs as the direct object of the counterfactual negative optative phrase *te na kerd’omas*, literally ‘I wish I didn’t do’. In sentence (59) from Khudlovo, the local quality interrogative *soza* ‘of what kind’ (see 6.2.1.3) is present and the entire clause is similar to how the free-choice quality is expressed in Khudlovo (see 6.3.3.4).

(58) *xočso* *me* *leske* *te* *na* *kerd’omas,*
 whatever I he.DAT NCOMP NEG do.IRR.1SG
th’ *avka* *pre* *mande* *rušel* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 also thus on I.LOC be_angry.PRS.3SG
 ‘Even if I had done whatever for him, he is angry with me.’

- (59) *soz' ov te n' ejl kurvāšis,*
 which he NCOMP NEG COP.PRS.SBJV.3SG womaniser
me th' avka lestar džava (Khu)^{LQCR}
 I also thus he.ABL go.FUT.1SG
 ‘Even if he isn’t a womaniser, I will leave him.’ (Literally: ‘May he be not a womaniser of any kind, I will nevertheless leave him’)

13.3.3 Concessive clauses

In all varieties except in Khudlovo, concessive clauses (English *although*) are introduced by a devolutive subordinator of Slavic origin, which is related to Russian *хоть* and *хотя*, Ukrainian *хоч* and *хоча*, Slovak *hoci*, Polish *chociaż* and their dialectal variants (cf. Kopečný et al. 1980: 207–208). It is also etymologically related to a free-choice prefix (see 6.3.3.1), and like the free-choice prefix, it occurs in phonological variants *xoč* and *xoť*, rarely *hoč* and *hoť*. Sporadically, the concessive subordinator has a disyllabic form *xoťá*. The apodosis is optionally introduced by an adversative coordinator (‘but’) provided that the apodosis follows the protasis (63).

- (60) *xoč na kerďa o rom,*
 although NEG do.AOR.3SG ART Rom
o žandāra les māren murdaren (UzhhR)
 ART policeman.PL he.ACC beat.PRS.3PL kill.PRS.3PL
 ‘Although the Rom didn’t commit [it], the police give him a hard beating.’
- (61) *xoť tu na kameha la,*
 although you NEG love.FUT.2SG she.ACC
pališ odi čhaj tuke ejla andre govđi (UzhhS)
 then DEM girl you.DAT COP.FUT.3SG in mind
 ‘Then the girl will haunt you, even though you will not love her.’
- (62) *na bijrinav te vakeren, xoť kamav* (Per)
 NEG manage.PRS.1SG NCOMP speak.INF although want.PRS.1SG
 ‘I am not able to speak, though I want to.’
- (63) *xoťá me nasvalo,*
 although I ill
no mušinav te džan pre buvđi (Ser)^{LQCR}
 but have_to.PRS.1SG NCOMP go.INF on work
 ‘Although I am ill, I still have to go to work.’

- (68) *berš the jepaš mange sas,*
 year and half I.DAT COP.PST.3
kana man o papus zail'a la mamatar (Khu)
 when I.ACC ART grandfather take_away.AOR.3SG ART mother.ABL
 'I was one and half years old when my grandfather took me away from my mother.'
- (69) *bištajštāre beršengoro ejla, sar les mukena avri (Khu)*
 twenty_four year.GEN COP.FUT.3SG how he.ACC leave out
 'He will be twenty-four years old when they release him [from prison].'

The subordinator *sar*, more rarely *kana*, is also used in clauses that inherently express the posterior sequence meaning ('after').

- (70) *o daja o dada sar avle*
 ART mother.PL ART father.PL how come.AOR.3PL
prig e hrañica, t' ad' ačhile (UzhhR)
 across/through ART border so here stay.AOR.3PL
 'After our ancestors crossed the border, they stayed here.'
- (71) *kanāke jek čhon sar lovt'ilas (UzhhS)*
 now one month how give_birth.AOR. 3SG
 'It is now one month after she gave birth.'
- (72) *sar kočind'om e škola,*
 how finish.AOR.1SG ART school
gejl'om buvt'i te keren andro d'āros (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 go.AOR.1SG work NCOMP do.INF in factory
 'After I quit school, I went to work at a factory.'
- (73) *kana me končind'om e škola,*
 when I finish.AOR.1SG ART school
me xund'om te keren buvt'i andro zavodos (Per)^{LQCR}
 I start.AOR.1SG NCOMP do.INF work in factory
 'After I quit school, I started working at a factory.'

While the posterior meaning may only be inferred from the pragmatic context in such sentences, an introductory prepositional phrase [after DEM] may be used to overtly express the posterior semantics, which is modelled on the Slavic pattern (cf. Ukrainian *після того як*, Russian *после того как*, Polish *po tym jak* [after DEM how]), as in the Khudlovo example (74). In Serednie (75), the interrogative *so* 'what' is attested after this prepositional phrase

instead of *sar* or *kana*, which is structurally close to the way the posterior sequence is expressed in Slovak (cf. Slovak *po tom čo* [after DEM what]).

(74) *posl'' odā sar me končind'om e škola,*
 after DEM how I finish.AOR.1SG ART school
me xund'om pro zavodos buv'ī te keren (Khu)^{LQCR}
 I start.AOR.1SG on factory work NCOMP do.INF
 'After I quit school, I started working at a factory.'

(75) *posl'' odā so me končind'om e škola,*
 after DEM what I finish.AOR.1SG ART school
me ačhil'om te keren buv'ī pro zavodos (Ser)^{LQCR}
 I stay.AOR.1SG NCOMP do.INF work on factory
 'After I quit school, I ended up working at a factory.'

In posterior durative clauses ('since'), the temporal interrogatives (*ot*)*kanastar* and borrowed *otkedi* ('since when') (see 6.2.2) function as subordinators, sometimes with a correlative counterpart that means 'since then' in the main clause:

(76) *otkedi lesk' avka pomožind'am,*
 since_when he.DAT thus help.AOR.1PL
ottedi ov imar lāčho (Uzhhs)
 since_then he already good
 'Since we helped him this way, he has been nice [to us].'

(77) *kanastar lakoro rom gej'la het,*
 when.ABL her husband go.AOR.3SG away
oj na dikhl'a aňi pre jek āver murš (Per)^{LQCR}
 she NEG see.AOR.3SG not_even on one other male
 'Since her husband left, she hasn't taken a look at another single man.'

In certain types of temporal clauses, borrowed subordinators that are not related to temporal interrogatives occur. The most common is *medik* from Hungarian *meddig* 'how long, until when', which occurs in three types of temporal clauses. First, *medik* introduces durative clauses of anterior events ('until'). The subordinate clause of the anterior duration is negative and is usually correlated with *adik* from Hungarian *addig* 'until then' in the main clause.

- (78) *medik ov n' arakhela e k'leja,*
 until/while he NEG find.FUT.3SG ART key
adik leske naši te džan het (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 until_then he.DAT cannot NCOMP go.INF away
 'Until he finds the key, he isn't allowed to leave.'
- (79) *adik mārnas adik are e'etrika les,*
 until_then beat.IPF/POT.3PL until_then in electricity he.ACC
medik na il'a pre peste (Khu)
 until/while NEG take.AOR.3SG on REFL.LOC
 'They were beating him and keeping him under electricity so long that he accepted the blame.'
- (80) *medik tu mijre trin želañja na zhrabineha,*
 until/while you my three wishes NEG fulfil.FUT.2SG
adik me važ tu na džā romñake (Ser)^{RDž}
 until_then I for you NEG go.FUT.1SG wife.DAT
 'I will not get married to you until you fulfil my three wishes.'

Second, *medik* introduces clauses of simultaneous events ('while'):

- (81) *medik kerahas buv'ri pre mā'l'a, amen gil'avkerahas* (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 until/while do.IPF/POT.1PL work on field we sing.ITER.IPF/POT.1PL
 'While we were working in the field, we were singing.'
- (82) *medik sas lakoro rom opro čexi,*
 until/while COP.PST.3 her husband on (Czecho)slovakia
oj na dikhl'a ňi pre jek murš (Khu)^{LQCR}
 she NEG see.AOR.3SG not_even on one male
 'While her husband was in Slovakia, she didn't look at even a single man.'
- (83) *medik cikhōro čhavōro mišto* (Ser)
 until/while little.DIM boy.DIM well
 'While he is a little child, it's okay.'

Third, *medik* introduces anterior sequential clauses ('before').

- (84) *medik dovakerd'am, the šut'ard'om avri* (Uzhhs)
 until/while finish_speaking.AOR.1PL also dry.AOR.1SG out
 'Before we finished talking, I even dried it up.'

- (85) *on adik na aven are tāborňa,*
 they until_then NEG come.PRS.3PL in settlement
medik ke leste na džan (Ser)
 until/while at/to he.LOC NEG go.PRS.3PL
 ‘They do not enter the Romani settlement before they go to see him.’

In Perechyn, rarely elsewhere, a durative subordinator *pokamis* of East Slavic origin (cf. colloquial Russian *покамест*) is used for the same functions as *medik*, i.e. in the anterior (86) and simultaneous (87) duration, as well as in the anterior sequence (88).

- (86) *amen na bijrinas te visal'on,*
 we NEG manage.PRS.1PL NCOMP return.INF
pokamis oj na zdravisal'ola (Per)^{LQCR}
 until/while she NEG healthy.INCH.FUT.3SG
 ‘We cannot return until she gets well.’

- (87) *pokamis amen užarahas,*
 until/while we wait.IPF/POT.1PL
xund'a te peren jiv (Per)^{LQCR}
 start.AOR.3SG NCOMP fall.INF snow
 ‘While we were waiting, it started to snow.’

- (88) *pokamis amen gejl'am khejre,*
 until/while we go.AOR.1PL home
oj mā gejl'a het (Per)^{LQCR}
 she already go.AOR.1PL away
 ‘Before we went home, she had already left.’

Finally, the restrictive focus particle *ča(k)* ‘only’ occurs as a second part of complex subordinators that introduce a simultaneous-like posterior sequential clause ‘as soon as, just as’. The first part is either the phasal particle *menk* ‘still’ (89), resulting in *menk čak* (usually pronounced as [meŋtʃa(k)]), or the thing interrogative *so* ‘what’ (90).

- (89) *menk čak ov phend'a odā,*
 still only he say.AOR.3SG DEM
oj takoj muvl'a (Per)
 she immediately die.AOR.3SG
 ‘As soon as he said it, she died right then.’

- (90) *šovārdeš dolāra denas*
 sixty dollar.PL give.IPF/POT.3PL
so ča len dikhenas (Ser)
 what only they.ACC see.IPF/POT.3PL
 ‘They were giving [them] sixty dollars as soon as they met them.’

13.3.5 Spatial and manner clauses

Spatial and manner adverbial clauses are introduced by the respective interrogative pronouns *kāj* ‘where’ (91) and *sar* ‘how’ (92), (93). The main clause may contain the corresponding deictic, such as the spatial *od’a* (91) and the manner deictic *avka* (93), which is obligatory if the adverbial clause precedes the main clause.

- (91) *añi na dživel od’a, kāj lakeri baba dživel* (Khu)
 not_even NEG live.PRS.3SG there where her grandmother live.PRS.3SG
 ‘She even doesn’t live where her grandmother lives.’

- (92) *igen pre dzeka lenge,*
 very on mood/liking they.DAT
sar amen keras o pārušāga (UzhR)
 how we do.PRS.1PL ART funeral.PL
 ‘They like the way we do funerals a lot.’

- (93) *sar nič na džanes,*
 how nothing NEG know.PRS.2SG
avka tuke nič te n’ ejl (Per)
 thus you.DAT nothing NCOMP NEG COP.PRS.SBJV.3SG
 ‘As you know nothing, so may nothing afflict you.’ (A magic formula used in curing little children.)

13.3.6 Causal clauses

Two types of causal clauses occur in Eastern Uzh Romani, which are differentiated by the type of the subordinator.

First, there are causal clauses introduced by *kāj* (or *kaj*). The causal subordinator *kāj* was grammaticalised from the Proto-Romani factual complementiser **kaj*, which has been replaced by borrowed forms in the Eastern Uzh Romani factual complementation to a large extent (see 13.2.2 for more details).

The subordinator *kāj* is generally used when the consequential relation [cause (trigger) > consequence] or [consequence < cause (trigger)] must be highlighted. It may introduce a

causal clause that may either follow the main clause, as in (94) to (96), or precede it, as in (97) and (98). If it precedes the main clause, the main clause may optionally be introduced by a correlative *ta* ‘so’ to indicate a consequence (97). With respect to the function of *kaj/kāj* as a subordinator not only in causal but also in consequential/extent clauses, it is glossed as ‘inasmuch as’.

- (94) *mijro čha zarovña, kāj leskere barāta*
 my son weep_once.AOR.3SG inasmuch_as his friend.PL
les asane avri (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 he.ACC laugh.AOR.3PL out
 ‘My son wept as his friends laughed at him.’
- (95) *amen igen rade sam,*
 we very glad.PL COP.PRS.1PL
kaj tumen aven k’ amende (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 inasmuch_as you.PL come.PRS.2PL at/to we.LOC
 ‘We are very glad that you (PL) come to us.’
- (96) *od’a on’ imā ladžan pes,*
 there they already feel_ashamed.PRS.3PL REFL
kaj one o roma (Per)
 inasmuch_as they ART Rom.PL
 ‘There they already feel ashamed that they are Gypsies.’
- (97) *kāj na suv’as, ta lovle lesk’ o jākha* (UzhhS)
 inasmuch_as NEG sleep.AOR.3SG so red.PL he.DAT ART eye.PL
 ‘As he didn’t sleep, (so) he has red eyes.’
- (98) *kaj ajsi bāri barval’ sas,*
 inasmuch_as such big wind COP.PST.3
mange l’ovl’ile o kāna (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 I.DAT red.INCH.AOR.3PL ART ear.PL
 ‘As there was such strong wind, my ears got red.’

Quite often, in causal clauses, *kāj* is preceded by the consecutive adverb *vašodā* ‘therefore’. This combination shows that it developed as a calque of the complex causal prepositions ‘because’ in North Slavic languages, which consist of a consecutive expression plus the complementiser, such as Slovak *pretože* (< *preto že*), Ukrainian *тому що* and Russian *потому что*. However, *kāj* may also occur by itself, independent of any consecutive expression. Compare the following pair of elicited sentences:

- (99) *vašodā kāj leskeri romñ' izmiñind'a leske,*
 therefore inasmuch_as his wife cheat.AOR.3SG he.DAT
ov otčhind'a lake korotkān o bala (Ser)^{LQCR}
 he cut_off.AOR.3SG she.DAT short.ADV ART hair.PL
 'As his wife cheated on him, he cut her hair short.'
- (100) *kāj leskeri romñi leske izmiñind'a,*
 inasmuch_as his wife he.DAT cheat.AOR.3SG
ov nožničkaha opčhind'a lake o bala (Per)^{LQCR}
 he scissors.INST cut_around.AOR.3SG she.DAT ART hair.PL
 'As his wife cheated on him, he cut her hair around using the scissors.'

The causal prepositional phrase *važ kadā* 'for that' may also precede the causal subordinator *kāj*:

- (101) *a tumenge po'inen važ kadā*
 and you.PL.DAT pay.PRS.3PL for this.SPEC
kāj tumen avka phiren ? (Khu)
 inasmuch_as you.PL thus go_often.PRS.2PL
 'And do they pay you for this that (> because) you are travelling in such a way?'

The other type of causal clauses involves borrowed subordinators among which the most frequent is *bo* from local Slavic dialects (cf. Kopečný et al. 1980: 92–93). The subordinator *bo* is mainly used in explanation clauses:

- (102) *amen nāne odā vozmožnost',*
 we.ACC NEG.COP.PRS.3 DEM opportunity
bo amen na prelen o gādže (Uzhhr)
 because we.ACC NEG accept.PRS.3PL ART nonRom.PL
 'We don't have such opportunity because the non-Roma don't accept us.'
- (103) *andro kamaš'li lenge mindik xejva sas*
 in shoe.PL they.DAT always hole.PL COP.PST.3
bo but khelenas (Uzhhs)
 because much dance.IPF/POT.3PL
 'There were always holes in their shoes because they were dancing a lot.'

- (104) *but roma pregejle ungvārate te dživen,*
 many Rom.PLmove.AOR.3PL Uzhhorod.LOC NCOMP live.INF
bo ade esas phāreder te dživen (Per)
 because here COP.PST.3 hard.COMPR NCOMP live.INF
 ‘Many Roma moved to Uzhhorod because it was harder to live here.’

Along with the Slavic *bo*, the causal subordinator of Hungarian origin *mer* (< Hungarian *mert* ‘because’) is attested in the same function in all varieties except in Perechyn:

- (105) *mange kapkica phāro ukrajinciko,*
 I.DAT a_bit hard Ukrainian
mer amen rusiko učinahas (UzhhS)
 because we.ACC Russian teach.IPF/POT.1PL
 ‘For me, Ukrainian is somewhat difficult because we were learning Russian [at school].’
- (106) *me bešava od’ader, mer ade fes kerades* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 I sit.FUT.1SG there.COMPR because here very hot.ADV
 ‘I will sit farther away because it is very hot here.’
- (107) *sa šaj te doxuden, te manuš lācho,*
 everything can NCOMP attain.INF if human good
mer andro lācho ilo o dejl dživel (Ser)
 because in good heart ART God live.PRS.3SG
 ‘Everything can be attained if a man is nice because the God dwells in a good heart.’

The borrowed subordinator may also be preceded by a consecutive adverb, such as *vašodā* or Khudlovo-specific *azijr*:

- (108) *me gejlom khejre vašodā*
 I go.AOR.1SG home therefore
bo me man mučind’om avri (Ser)^{LQCR}
 because I I.ACC suffer.AOR.1SG out
 ‘I went home (therefore) because I got tired.’
- (109) *feder sas o dživipe (...)*
 better COP.PST.3 ART life
azijr bo sa tuño sas (Khu)
 therefore because all cheap COP.PST.3
 ‘Life was better.’ (*Another’s question ‘Why.’*) ‘Because everything was cheap.’

13.3.7 Consequential and extent clauses

Consequential and extent adverbial clauses express a consequence of the proposition of the main clause or an extent to which an action of the main clause takes place. In Eastern Uzh Romani, they are introduced by subordinators that draw from factual complementisers (cf. 13.2.2). The main clause contains a comparative deictic element, such as *avka* ‘thus’, *ajci* ‘so much’ or *ajso* ‘such’ (see 7.4).

In Radvanka and Perechyn, the causal subordinator *kaj/kāj*, from the old factual complementiser, occurs in consequential and extent clauses.¹⁵⁵

- (110) *oj avka začāl'ila, kaj čhankerelas* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 she thus eat_fill.AOR.3SG inasmuch_as vomit.ITER.IPF/POT.3SG

‘She had eaten fill in such a way (to such an extent) that she was vomiting.’

- (111) *ajso esa māto, kaj na džanelas*
 such COP.PST.3 drunk inasmuch_as NEG know.IPF/POT.3SG
peskero kher te arakhen (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 REFL.GEN home NCOMP find.INF

‘He was so drunk that he wasn’t able to find his own house.’

- (112) *ov ajci vakerelas,*
 he so_much speak.IPF/POT.3SG
kāj me zabisterd'om so kaml'om (Per)^{LQCR}
 inasmuch_as I forget.AOR.1SG what want.AOR.1SG

‘She had been speaking so much (to such an extent) that I forgot what I had wanted.’

- (113) *oj avka predaran'la,*
 she thus get_frightened.AOR.3SG
kāj pej'la teje andro vómorok (Per)^{LQCR}
 inasmuch_as fall.AOR.3SG down in unconsciousness

‘She got frightened in such a way (to such an extent) that she lost her consciousness.’

In the other varieties, only the borrowed factual complementisers are attested as consequential and extent subordinators. They are also used in Radvanka (114) and Perechyn (117) in addition to *kaj/kāj*.

¹⁵⁵ Note that Perechyn is the only variety where *kāj* is still documented to be used in certain subtypes of factual complementation, though marginally (see 13.2.2 for more details).

- (114) *oj ajci preligind'a o draba,*
 she so_much swallow.AOR.3SG ART pill.PL
hoj majnem odā na predživd'ila (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 FCOMP almost DEM NEG survive.AOR.3SG
 'She swallowed so many pills that she almost didn't survive.'
- (115) *khelenas rataha ajci, hoj lengero dad*
 dance.IPF/POT.3PL night.INST so_much FCOMP their father
džalas te previrinen lengere kamaš'li (UzhhS)
 go.IPF/POT.3PL NCOMP check.INF their shoe.PL
 'They were dancing through the night so much (to such an extent) that their father went to check their shoes.'
- (116) *oj ajci but vakerlas,*
 she so_much much speak.IPF/POT.3SG
ož bisterd'om so kam'om (Khu)^{LQCR}
 FCOMP forget.AOR.1SG what want.AOR.1SG
 'She had been speaking so much (to such an extent) that I forgot what I had wanted.'
- (117) *avka les mārde, občovrne les,*
 thus he.ACC beat.AOR.3PL rob.AOR.3PL he.ACC
hoj les ligende andre špitā'la (Per)
 FCOMP he.ACC carry.AOR.3PL in hospital
 'They beat him [and] robbed him in such a way (to such an extent) that they took him to the hospital.'
- (118) *oj avka darand'ila, hod' zamuv'las* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 she thus fear.AOR.3SG FCOMP faint.AOR.3SG
 'She got frightened in such a way (to such an extent) that she fainted.'

13.3.8 Purpose and manipulation clauses

As discussed by Matras (2004: 292–293), purpose clauses are generally treated as non-factual complement clauses in Romani. Factual complementisers may also be used to introduce a purpose clause in addition to the non-factual complementiser, which may result in complex purpose subordinators. However, in Eastern Uzh Romani, the purpose subordination differs from the non-factual complementation in two respects. First, in contrast to non-factual complementation, most types of purpose clauses are finite, with the exception of clauses that complement motion verbs (see below). Second, the optative particle *mi*, as well as the optative copula *mije* (see 12.2), are employed in many contexts of purpose clauses instead of the non-factual complementiser. In fact, most types of purpose clauses are similar to optative

constructions and may be described as optative-like purpose clauses or even as embedded optatives. These optative-based purpose clauses may be introduced by a factual complementiser that may be split from *te* or *mi* by another word, commonly by the subject and/or the object, as in the following:

- (119) *dejvla, mije tjri voľa,*
 God.VOC OPT.COP your will
hoj man o derektořis mi lel andre škola (Uzhhs)
 FCOMP I.ACC ART director OPT take.PRS.3SG in school
 ‘Lord, let there be your will so that the director admits me into the school.’

Several types of purpose clauses may be distinguished based on their formal representations. The first type is that of a non-factual infinitive complement (13.2.1), which occurs if a motion predicate of the matrix clause is involved.

- (120) *gejľa te roden* (Uzhhr)
 go.AOR.3SG NCOMP look_for.INF
 ‘He has gone to search [for it].’
- (121) *čirla amen phirahas te mangavkeren* (Per)
 long_ago we go_often.IPF/POT.1PL NCOMP beg.INF
 ‘In the past, we used to go begging.’
- (122) *but roma gejle adārik het dur te dživen* (Khu)
 many Rom.PL go.AOR.3PL from_here away far NCOMP live.INF
 ‘Many Roma left to live far from here.’

Second, there are finite purpose clauses that are dependent on the imperative predicate of the matrix clause. These purpose clauses are embedded optatives with no factual complementiser. As in other optative constructions, the complementiser-based particle *te* is obligatory in negative clauses, while the optative particle *mi* normally occurs in affirmative clauses with the first- or third-person predicate (see 12.2.1):

- (123) *muk mi spočivinel odā televizoris* (Uzhhr)
 leave[IMP.2SG] OPT rest.PRS.3SG DEM TV_set
 ‘Leave the TV set turned off.’ (Literally: ‘Leave [the TV set] so that the TV set has a rest.’)

- (124) *de cixeder, te na ušel opre* (Uzhhs)
 give.IMP.2SG quiet.COMPR NCOMP NEG get_up.PRS.3SG up
 ‘Turn [it] down so that he doesn’t wake up.’
- (125) *čit phan tejle, mi vakerav tuke,*
 hush close[IMP.2SG] down OPT speak.PRS.1SG you.DAT
mi dav tut govdi (Per)
 OPT give.PRS.1SG you.ACC mind/advice
 ‘Quiet! Turn it off so that I [can] speak to you so that I [can] give you advice.’
- (126) *dža phen lake, mi avel andre* (Khu)
 go[IMP.2SG] tell[IMP.2SG] she.DAT OPT come.PRS.3SG in
 ‘Go tell her to come in.’
- (127) *vidāzin, te na peres tejle*
 be_careful[IMP.2SG] NCOMP NEG fall.PRS.2SG down
are kodi xovr xār (Ser)^{LQCR}
 in that.SPEC.F deep pit
 ‘Be careful in order not to fall into the deep pit.’

Purpose clauses introduced by a factual complementiser are rare with the imperative main clauses, but some examples do occur, as in:

- (128) *jek duj tut kide,*
 one two you.ACC gather/clothe.IMP.2SG
hod’ amen te na pozņinas (Ser)^{LQCR}
 FCOMP we NCOMP NEG be_late.PRS.1PL
 ‘Get dressed as soon as possible so that we aren’t late.’

See also the following pair of elicited sentences: one with a factual complementiser (129) and one without it (130):

t

- (129) *previsar odā mas hoj te na zlabol* (UzhhsR)^{LQCR}
 turn_over[IMP.2SG] DEM meat FCOMP NCOMP NEG get_burnt.PRS.3SG
 ‘Turn that meat over so that it doesn’t get burnt.’
- (130) *previsar odā mas te na prelabol* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 turn_over[IMP.2SG] DEM meat NCOMP NEG get_burnt.PRS.3SG
 ‘Turn that meat over so that it doesn’t get burnt.’

Purpose clauses of the non-imperative matrix are usually introduced by a borrowed factual complementiser, such as *hod'* and *hoj* (from Hungarian *hogy*) or *ož* and *ež* in Khudlovo (see 13.2.2). The old complementiser *kaj* (*kāj*) never occurs in purpose clauses.

- (131) *o phuredera imā sikaven le ternen*
 ART old.COMPR.PL already teach.PRS.3PL ART young.ACC.PL
hoj mi džanen (Uzhhs)
 FCOMP OPT know.PRS.3PL

‘The elder people already teach the young so that they know [it].’

- (132) *me man garuvav, ež oj man te na dikhel* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 I I.ACC hide.PRS.1SG FCOMP she I.ACC NCOMP NEG see.PRS.3SG

‘I am hiding myself so that she doesn’t see me.’

Importantly, verbs in purpose clauses of non-imperative matrices are frequently introduced by the non-factual complementiser *te* even in contexts where *mi* normally occurs in optative constructions, viz. in the first- and third-person affirmative clauses. See the following examples (and compare (134) with (131)):

- (133) *i menk diña odi rukavica mange pro vas,*
 and still give.AOR.3SG DEM glove I.DAT on hand
hod' te hordinav (Ser)
 FCOMP NCOMP carry.PRS.1SG

‘And moreover, he gave me the glove on my hand to wear [it].’

- (134) *le manuŝenge pisinav, hoj te džanen*
 ART human.DAT.PL write.PRS.1SG FCOMP NCOMP know.PRS.3PL
pal o roma (Per)
 about ART Rom.PL

‘I write for the people so that they know about the Roma.’

- (135) *ade na xuden ole manuŝes jekhes*
 here NEG catch.PRS.3PL DEM human.ACC one.ACC
ko kerd'a odā bida, ož te māren les (Khu)
 who do.AOR.3SG DEM trouble FCOMP NCOMP beat.PRS.3PL he.ACC

‘Here, they don’t arrest that particular person who committed a crime in order to punish him.’

The following pair shows that both *te* and *mi* compete in purpose clauses even within a single variety:

- (136) *zakhasaňom, hod' ov man mi zadikhel (UzhhR)^{LQCR}*
 give_a_cough.AOR.1SG FCOMP he I.ACC OPT catch_sight_of.PRS.3SG

as against:

- (137) *zakhasaňom, oj man te dikhel (UzhhR)^{LQCR}*
 give_a_cough.AOR.1SG FCOMP I.ACC NCOMP catch_sight_of.PRS.3SG
 'I gave a cough so that he would see me.'

As in optative constructions, the copula in purpose clauses has the subjunctive form (see 3.3.2):

- (138) *ov amenge prediňa,*
 he we.DAT send_a_message.AOR.3SG
hod' amen mi avas menk dži dijlos ode (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 FCOMP we OPT COP.PRS.SBJV.1PL still TERM noon there
 'He sent a message to us so that we are there until noon.'

- (139) *amen pod'ikeras le manušes,*
 we support.PRS.1PL ART human.ACC
hoj te n' ejl leha bida (UzhhS)
 FCOMP NCOMP NEG COP.PRS.SBJV.3SG he.INST trouble
 'We support a man so that he is not in trouble.'

In third-person affirmative clauses, the optative copula *mije* serves to express the predicate of the purpose clause (see 12.2.2).

- (140) *me phend'om mijre čhaske,*
 I say.AOR.1SG my son.DAT
hoj mije muzikantos (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 FCOMP OPT.COP musician
 'I told my son to be a musician.'

- (141) *rakin are šparejta kašta,*
 load[IMP.2SG] in stove wood.PL
hod' mije tātes (Ser)^{LQCR}
 FCOMP OPT.COP warm.ADV
 'Load firewood into the stove so that it is warm.'

development is ascribed to convergence with colloquial Greek (see Matras 2002: 176; Elšík and Matras 2006: 305). There are no formal differences between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses.

- (146) *tu arakh'lal odi tāška, kāj rodehas?* (Uzhhr)^{LQCR}
 you find.AOR.2SG DEM bag REL(=where) search.IPF/POT.2SG
 ‘You found the bag you were looking for?’
- (147) *kale čhaskeri pheñ dživel le jañiha,*
 this.SPEC boy.GEN sister live.PRS.3SG ART Yani
kāj manca buvti kerel (Uzhhs)
 REL(=where) I.INST work do.PRS.3SG
 ‘A sister of this boy is living with Yani, who works with me.’
- (148) *čak mijro phral ode, kāj rendešno* (Uzhhs)
 only my brother there REL(=where) respectable
 ‘Only my brother is there who is respectable.’ (That is: ‘My brother is the only respectable person there.’)
- (149) *kadi čhajōri, kāj ade dživel perečinate* (Per)
 this.SPEC.F girl.DIM REL(=where) here live.PRS.3SG Perechyn.LOC
 ‘This little girl who lives here in Perechyn.’
- (150) *me len pametnav odalen,*
 I they.ACC remember.PRS.1SG DEM.ACC.PL
kāj merkerde (Per)
 REL(=where) die.ITER.3PL
 ‘I remember them – the ones who died.’
- (151) *āk’ o al’ik, kāj dživel kanāke od’a* (Khu)
 right_here ART Alik REL(=where) live.PRS.3SG now there
 (Showing a photograph:) ‘This is Alik, who is now living there.’
- (152) *ov kāj le krāl’iskero vlāsno čha phenel* (Ser)^{RDZ}
 he REL(=where) ART king.GEN own son say.PRS.3SG
 ‘He, who is the king’s own son, says.’

In Khudlovo and Serednie, and sporadically in Uzhhorod and Perechyn, relativisers are mostly based on the selection interrogative *savo* ‘which one’ and the thing interrogative *so* ‘what’. The occurrence of *savo* and *so* in introducing relative clauses replicates the pattern of Slavic languages in which relativisers are often recruited either from the interrogative adjective ‘which one’ (e.g. Slovak *ktorý*, Ukrainian *котрий*, Russian *который*) or from the

thing interrogative ‘what’ (Slovak *čo*, Ukrainian *що*, Russian *что*). Like *kāj*, both *savo* and *so* may occur with animate and inanimate referents (for *savo*, see also sentences (167) to (169) below).

(153) *tu arakh'l'al odi tāška, savi tu rodehas?* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 you find.AOR.2SG DEM bag REL(=which) you search.IPF/POT.2SG
 ‘You found the bag you were looking for?’

(154) *tu arakh'l'al odi tāška, so rodehas?* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 you find.AOR.2SG DEM bag REL(=what) search.IPF/POT.2SG
 ‘You found the bag you were looking for?’

(155) *jek o rusi, so začenas*
 one ART Russian.PL REL(=what) advocate.IPF/POT.3PL
važ o roma (Khu)
 for ART Rom.PL
 ‘[There were] only Russians who stood up for the Roma.’

In Khudlovo, two additional relativisers are attested, viz. the person interrogative *ko* ‘who’ used for human referents (156) and the local peculiar quality interrogative *soza* ‘what kind of’ (see 6.2.1.3), as in (157).

(156) *ade na xuden ole manušes jekhes*
 here NEG catch.PRS.3PL DEM human.ACC one.ACC
ko kerd'a odā bida, ož te māren les (Khu)
 REL(=who) do.AOR.3SG DEM trouble FCOMP NCOMP beat.PRS.3PL he.ACC
 ‘Here, they don’t arrest that particular person who committed the crime in order to punish him.’

(157) *me čovrňom o trasta, soza ov kind'a* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 I steal.AOR.1SG ART iron.PL REL(=what_kind) he gather.AOR.3SG
 ‘I stole the iron that he collected.’

Compare the elicited translation of the latter sentence in Perechyn:

(158) *me čovrňom odala trasta, kāj ov kind'a* (Per)^{LQCR}
 I steal.AOR.1SG DEM.PL iron.PL REL(=where) he gather.AOR.3SG
 ‘I stole the iron that he collected.’

The nominal phrase of a relative clause is expressed either by a plain relativiser or by a relativiser accompanied by a resumptive pronoun. Resumptive pronouns are personal pronouns in a relative clause that refer to the relativised entity of the main clause and encode the grammatical roles of the nominal phrase in the relative clause. The relativiser itself is only rarely marked for case; if it is case-marked, a resumptive pronoun is lacking.

The relativisers *kāj* and *so* are uninflected and therefore cannot be marked for case.¹⁵⁶ In the following Perechyn examples, the relativised nominal phrases are in bold. The sentences show that the relativiser *kāj* with no resumptive pronoun may express the nominal phrase in the subject role (159) and even in the direct object role (160), while it is accompanied by a resumptive pronoun in the sociative (161) and possessive (162) roles as well as in the dative expression of age of a non-human referent (163).

- (159) *tu lemad'al odales čhavōres,*
 you hit.AOR.2SG DEM.ACC boy.DIMIN.ACC
kāj *kod'a rovel?* (Per)^{LQCR}
 REL(=where) there.SPEC weep.PRS.3SG
 'Have you hit that boy who is crying over there?'
- (160) *odā manuš **kāj** me ijdž dikh'om*
 DEM human REL(=where) I yesterday see.AOR.1SG
ade hino pāle (Per)^{LQCR}
 here COP.PRS.3SG.M again
 'The man whom I saw yesterday is here again.'
- (161) *adi romñi **kāj** amen laha vakerahas*
 this woman REL(=where) we she.INST speak.IPF/POT.1PL
tože dživel andr' odā kher (Per)^{LQCR}
 also live.PRS.3SG in DEM house
 'This woman who we spoke to lives in that house, too.'
- (162) *odā odala manuša **kāj** lengoro kher izlabil'a* (Per)^{LQCR}
 DEM DEM.PL human.PL REL(=where) their house get_burnt.AOR.3SG
 'These are the people whose house burned down.'
- (163) *hin tābora, kāj hin lenge*
 COP.PRS.3 settlement.PL REL(=where) COP.PRS.3 they.DAT
po duj šel berš (Per)
 DISTR two hundred year

¹⁵⁶ In this respect, *so* as a relativiser differs from *so* as a thing interrogative, which inflects for case (see 6.2.1.1).

‘There are [such] Romani settlements that are two hundred years old.’

Note that the resumption in (161) to (163) encodes roles that are lower on the ‘accessibility hierarchy’ than the subject and object roles with no resumptive pronoun (cf. Keenan and Comrie 1977). The occurrence of pronominal resumption also seems to be sensitive to animacy because an animate referent of a nominal phrase is more likely to be signalled by a resumptive pronoun than an inanimate referent. In (164), the sociative role of the inanimate nominal phrase in the relative clause can be inferred from the sentence context only because a resumptive pronoun is missing:

- (164) *kāj odi čhuvri,*
 where DEM knife
kāj tu phuterd'al avri odā lil? (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 REL(=where) you open.AOR.2SG out DEM letter
 ‘Where is the knife you opened up the letter with?’

In contrast, there are numerous instances of pronominal resumption in animate nominal phrases that assume the object or even subject roles. It seems that the resumption in roles higher on the hierarchy is possible if the grammatical roles of the relativised nominal are different. See sentence (165) in which the nominal in the main clause is ascribed the direct object role, while the resumptive phrase is the subject of the relative clause. Sentence (166) shows that this resumption is only optional.

- (165) *me džanās jekha čha*
 I know.IPF/POT.1SG one girl.ACC
kāj oj khelelas važ o lovve (UzhhsR)^{LQCR}
 REL(=where) she dance.IPF/POT.3SG for ART money
 ‘I knew a girl who danced for money.’

as against

- (166) *me džanās jekha čha terña*
 I know.IPF/POT.1SG one girl.ACC young.ACC
kāj khelelas važ o lovve (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 REL(=where) dance.IPF/POT.3SG for ART money
 ‘I knew a young girl who danced for money.’

The pronoun *savo* inflects as an adjective (see 6.2.1.2), and as such it is marked for gender and number. However, it usually occurs in the nominative form in relative clauses, and the case roles are expressed by a resumptive pronoun, which results in double marking of gender and number on both the relativiser and the resumptive pronoun. See the following sentences from Serednie:

(167) *kadā odā murš*
 this.SPEC DEM male
savo me leske diňom o lovve (Ser)^{LQCR}
 REL(=which).NOM.SG.M I he.DAT give.AOR.1SG ART money
 ‘This is the man whom I gave the money.’

(168) *kala ola manuša*
 this.SPEC.PL DEM.PL human.PL
save lengere khera izlabile (Ser)^{LQCR}
 REL(=which).NOM.PL their house.PL get_burnt.AOR.3PL
 ‘These are the people whose houses burned down.’

(169) *me džanās jekha terňa čha*
 I know.IPF/POT.1SG one young girl.ACC
savi oj khellas
 REL(=which).NOM.SG.F she.NOM dance.IPF/POT.3SG
važ o lovve (Ser)^{LQCR}
 for ART money
 ‘I knew a young girl who danced for money.’

On the contrary, the personal relativiser *ko* in Khudlovo is obligatorily marked for case and never occurs with a resumptive pronoun:

(170) *odā murš kas me ijdž dikh'om*
 DEM male REL(=who).ACC I yesterday see.AOR.1SG
pāle ade (Khu)^{LQCR}
 again here
 ‘The man whom I saw yesterday is here again.’

13.5 Coordination

Coordination, i.e. a combination of two or more syntactic units (phrases, clauses, sentences) of the same type (coordinands), is achieved through dedicated prepositive connectors, or

coordinators, in Eastern Uzh Romani. In addition to the three main types of coordination, conjunction (‘and’), disjunction (‘or’) and adversation (‘but’), consecutive (‘therefore’) and negative emphatic (‘neither...nor’) coordination is described in this subchapter. The terminological framework of Haspelmath (2007) is followed in the discussion.

13.5.1 Conjunctive coordination

Conjunctive coordination is achieved through connectors whose employment is subject to the type of combining units (phrases versus clauses and sentences) on the one hand and to subtler semantic differentiations within the conjunction on the other hand. There are five conjunctive coordinators in Eastern Uzh Romani: common *the*, *a* and *i* and rarer *ta* and *iš*. The only inherited conjunctive coordinator is *the*, which mainly links phrases, while the two most common loan coordinators *i* and *a*, which are of Slavic origin, are used in combining clauses and sentences. In addition, two rarer coordinators occur in specific varieties: Slavic *ta* in Khudlovo and Sereďnie and *iš* from Hungarian in Uzhhorod.

The basic phrasal coordinator is *the*, which is descended from Proto-Romani **thaj*¹⁵⁷ (< OIA *tathāpi* ‘even so, nevertheless’; cf. CDIAL 5647), and its cognates are common in other Romani dialects (cf. Matras 2002: 201). See 9.6.1.1 and 9.6.1.2 regarding the function of *the* as the additive and scalar focus particles ‘also’ and ‘even’.

(171) *duj d'ives, sombat the kurko* (UzhhR)

two day Saturday and Sunday

‘Two days: Saturday and Sunday.’

(172) *mijro rom the me kerahas buvt'i* (UzhhS)

my husband and I do.IPF/POT.1PL work

‘My husband and I were working.’

(173) *o čhave denašenas andre dvovra*

ART child.PL run.IPF/POT.3PL in courtyard

nange the pindgrangle

naked and barefoot

(Per)^{LQCR}

‘Children were running in the courtyard naked and barefoot.’

¹⁵⁷ Note that the conservative diphthongal form of the coordinator *thaj* is still maintained in the additive connector of the numeral *biš* ‘twenty’ with units, as in *biš-thaj-jekh* ‘21’, *biš-thaj-duj* ‘22’, etc. (see 8.1.1 for more details).

- (174) *oj imā sājinlas peskere romes*
 she already feel_sorry.IPF/POT.3SG REFL.GEN husband.ACC
the peskere čhaven (Khu)
 and REFL.GEN child.ACC.PL
 ‘She already felt sorry for her husband and for her children.’
- (175) *kāj mijri koza the o ručnikos ?* (Ser)^{RDž}
 where my goat and ART towel
 ‘Where is my goat and the towel?’

In Khudlovo and Serednie, another connector is *ta*, which is borrowed from local Slavic (cf. Ukrainian *ma* ‘and’) and is identical to the sentence particle *ta* ‘so’. The two forms *the* and *ta* may also be combined into a single complex coordinator *ta the*.

- (176) *le ruveskere danda igen oštra ta igen zorāle* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 ART wolf.GEN tooth.PL very sharp and very strong
 ‘Wolf’s teeth are very sharp and very strong.’
- (177) *pro šejro lenge thode d’iplejvi*
 on head they.PL put.AOR.3PL rein.PL
ta th’ o kantāra (Khu)^{LQCR}
 and and ART bridle.PL
 ‘They tied reins and bridles onto their heads.’

In constructions with multiple coordinands, only the last one usually has the overt coordinator:

- (178) *romanes, rusika, ungrika the slovāt’ika* (Per)
 Romani.ADV East_Slavic.ADV Hungarian.ADV and Slovak.ADV
 ‘In Romani, in East Slavic, in Hungarian and in Slovak.’

Bisyndetic coordination, in which *the* is placed before each coordinand, has a special emphatic force ‘both X and Y’, as in:

- (179) *mijro fajtos the pre slovensko the pro čexi* (Uzhhr)
 my family and on Slovakia and on Czechia
 ‘My family is in both Slovakia and Czechia.’

(180) *ov džanela the t' egenen*
 he know.FUT.3SG and NCOMP read.INF
the te pisinen (UzhhR)
 and NCOMP write.INF

‘He will know both how to read and to write.’

(181) *diña leske od'ej*
 give.AOR.3SG he.DAT there
the o ručnikos the la koza (Ser)^{RDž}
 and ART towel and ART goat.ACC

‘She handed both the towel and the goat to him.’

The connectors *the* and *ta* may also be used at the clause level:

(182) *tumen axal'on amen, so vakeras,*
 you.PL understand.PRS.2PL we.ACC what speak.PRS.1PL
the amen tumen axal'uvas (UzhhR)
 and we you.PL.ACC understand.PRS.1PL

‘You understand us—what we say—and we understand you.’

(183) *oj šāžniñd'a, the e daj zdravisal'ila* (UzhhS)
 she vanish.AOR.3SG and ART mother healthy.INCH.AOR.3SG

‘She got lost, and the mother recovered.’

(184) *bikind'a o zemli sa, the gejla het* (Khu)
 sell.AOR.3SG ART land.PL all and go.AOR.3SG away

‘He sold [all] pieces of [his] land—everything—and left.’

(185) *ijdž me il'om mijre grajes, ta gej'om*
 yesterday I take.AOR.1SG my horse.ACC and go.AOR.1SG
man te vožinen verxóm (Ser)^{LQCR}
 I.ACC NCOMP transport.INF on_horseback

‘Yesterday, I took my horse and went for a ride.’

Otherwise, verbs, clauses and sentences are more commonly connected by the Slavic coordinator *i*.

- (186) *bešes tuke pre maršutka,*
 sit.PRS.2SG you.DAT on marshrutka
i džas spokojno (UzhhS)
 and sit.PRS.2SG peaceful
 ‘You will board the marshrutka and go peacefully.’
- (187) *beš soňo i šun so me vakerā* (Per)
 sit[IMP.2SG] Sonia.VOC and hear[IMP.2SG] what I speak.FUT.1SG
 ‘Sit down, Sonia, and listen to what I am going to say.’
- (188) *me la avri bārard’om, i mijro unuk*
 I she.ACC out big.FACT.AOR.1SG and my grandson
la il’a romňake (Khu)
 she.ACC take.AOR.3SG wife.DAT
 ‘I brought her up, and my grandson married her.’
- (189) *me dikhl’om o tunelis, sar me džās*
 I see.AOR.1SG ART tunnel how I go.IPF/POT.1SG
ko dejl, i od’a šund’om holos (Ser)
 at/to God and there hear.AOR.1SG voice
 ‘I saw a tunnel when I was approaching the God, and there I heard a voice.’

Another conjunctive coordinator of Slavic origin is *a*, which is used in rather specific types of conjunctive coordination. First, it often introduces a new sentence.

- (190) *so sas ke lende, o lovve, sa sa sa*
 what COP.PST.3 at/to they.LOC ART money all all all
ile, a sa po pački sas
 take.AOR.3PL and/but all DISTR PACKET.PL COP.PST.3
ke lende (UzhhR)
 at/to they.LOC
 ‘They took [from them] absolutely everything they had with them, including money. And they had everything in packets.’
- (191) *a tijri daj kāj?* (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 and/but your mother where
 ‘And where is your mother?’

Second, *a* indicates repeated actions expressed by two identical verbs (192) and a succession of events, as in (193) to (196):

- (192) *ov ciknevarbastar talam čak sik'olas*
 he since_childhood perhaps only learn.IPF/POT.3SG
a sik'olas (UzhR)
 and/but learn.IPF/POT.3SG
 'Since childhood, he has probably been only learning and learning.'
- (193) *demade les pal o šejro, a ov zavisal'ila* (UzhR)
 hit.AOR.3PL he over ART head and/but he faint.AOR.3SG
 'They had hit him on the head, and he fainted.'
- (194) *ov muvl'a, a but lavutāra*
 he die.AOR.3SG and/but many musician.PL
pregejle te dživen od'a (Per)
 move.AOR.3PL NCOMP live.INF there
 'He had died, and many musicians moved to live there.'
- (195) *the me cikñake darās, a pališ*
 also I little.DAT.SG.F fear.IPF/POT.1SG and then
mā na darās (Per)
 already NEG fear.IPF/POT.1SG
 'I, too, was afraid as a little girl, and then I no longer was afraid.'
- (196) *bešes opre, a sig tosāra mā od'a sal* (Khu)
 sit.PRS.2SG above and/but early morning already there COP.PRS.2SG
 'You get on, and early in the morning [of a following day], you are already there.'

Furthermore, *a* is used to link clauses that convey somewhat contrasting or slightly conflicting pieces of information. Here, *a* shows a function transitional to the adversative coordination, more specifically to that of the substitutive coordinator after negation (see 13.5.3 for more details). Note in (200) that it may even add a slightly concessive meaning to the clause it connects.

- (197) *vareko kapka dikhel,*
 someone.NOM a_bit see.PRS.3SG
a vareko vobec na dikhel (UzhR)
 and/but someone.NOM not_at_all NEG see.PRS.3SG
 'Someone sees a little, while someone doesn't see at all.'

- (198) *hin varekas motoris, a varekas nāne* (UzhR)
 COP.PRS.3 someone.ACC car and/but someone.ACC NEG.COP.PRS.3
 ‘Someone has a car, while someone does not.’
- (199) *roma but ade, a khera frima* (Per)
 Rom.PL many here and/but house.PL few
 ‘The Roma are many here, while the houses are few.’
- (200) *añi na ronne ko phag’la,*
 not_even NEG search.AOR.3PL who break.AOR.3SG
a džanenas hod’ ko (Khu)
 and/but know.IPF/POT.3PL FCOMP who
 ‘They did not even search [for the perpetrator] who had broken it, and (although) they knew [him] who [did it].’
- (201) *mijre trin čhave zdrava, a onuki mange nasvale* (Ser)
 my three child.PL healthy.PL and/but grandchild.PL I.DAT ill.PL
 ‘My three children are healthy, while my grandchildren are ill.’

Finally, the conjunctive coordinator *iš* (from Hungarian *és*) is attested in clause linking in data from some Hungarian L2 speakers in Uzhhorod. It has a shape identical to the rare additive focus particle *iš* ‘too’ from Hungarian *is* (9.6.1.1).

- (202) *les pārunde, iš ande xār leske thode*
 he.ACC bury.AOR.3PL and in pit he.DAT put.AOR.3PL
e lavuta (UzhS)^{LQCR}
 ART violin
 ‘They buried him and put a violin into his grave.’

13.5.2 Disjunctive coordination

Five disjunctive coordinators are documented in Eastern Uzh Romani: common *vaj*, *abo* and *vad’*, rare *ili* and then *či*, which is restricted to interrogative disjunction.

The coordinator *vaj* is the most conservative option, possibly of Indo-Aryan origin (cf. OIA *vā* ‘or’) unless it represents an older loanword of Hungarian *vagy* (cf. below). It most commonly occurs in Uzhhorod. Note that *vaj* is also used as an approximative quantifier (see 8.2.4).

- (203) *o xulaj vaj o rom* (UzhhR)
 ART landlord or ART Rom
 ‘The landlord or the Rom.’
- (204) *tuke savi mindik kamaš'la kampe,*
 you.DAT which.F.always shoe.F be_needed.PRS
bāri vaj cikñi? (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 big or small
 ‘Which kind of shoe do you always need: a big one or a small one?’
- (205) *hin tut dzeka vaj nāne?* (UzhhS)
 COP.PRS.3 you.ACC mood/liking or NEG.COP.PRS.3
 ‘Do you have a mood or not?’

The other common coordinator is *abo*, which is of local Slavic origin (cf. dialectal East Slovak *abo*, Ukrainian *або*, e.g. Kopečný et al. 1980: 30–31). Its form is identical to one of the adversative coordinators (cf. 13.5.3), although it has a different etymology. It occurs in all Eastern Uzh varieties.

- (206) *me kamav so jekfeder o buločki*
 I want.PRS.1SG what good.SUPL ART bread_roll.PL
le čhileha abo le balevaseha (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 ART butter.INST or ART salo.INST
 ‘Most of all, I love the bread rolls with butter or with salo (pork food).’
- (207) *hoj mange te bičhaven holmi abo lovve* (Per)
 FCOMP I.DAT NCOMP send.PRS.3PL cloth.PL or money
 ‘In order to send me clothing or money.’
- (208) *adād'ive dikhel' o televizoris,*
 today see.FUT.3SG ART TV_set
abo džala peske andro bar (Khu)^{LQCR}
 or go.FUT.3SG REFL.DAT in bar
 ‘Today, he will watch TV, or he will go to a bar.’

Another borrowed coordinator is *vad'*, which is of Hungarian origin (cf. Hungarian *vagy* ‘or’). Its occurrence in Eastern Uzh Romani may also be due to contact with local Slavic dialects as the identical Hungarian loanword occurs in Ukrainian (Rusyn) dialects in Transcarpathia (cf. Kopečný et al. 1980: 717). The coordinator *vad'* is common in Khudlovo and Serednie and among Hungarian L2 speakers in Uzhhorod.

(209) *me vad' o phuvro pro motoris len lidžas* (Uzhhs)
 I or ART old on car they.ACC carry.PRS.1PL

‘I or the elder man [will] take them by car.’

(210) *e čhajōri pejl'a avri pal o balkonos*
 ART girl.DIM fall.AOR.3SG out from ART balcony

vad' pal e blaka (Ser)^{LQCR}

or from ART balcony

‘The girl fell down from a balcony or from a window.’

The rarest disjunctive coordinator *ili* is borrowed from Russian (cf. Russian *или* ‘or’).

(211) *džaha ola mašinaha savi džal sigereeder,*
 go.FUT.1PL DEM train.INST which go.PRS.3SG early.COMPR

ili so džal pozneder? (Khu)^{LQCR}

or what go.PRS.3SG late.COMPR

‘Will we go by the earlier train or by the later one?’

All four coordinators *vaj*, *abo*, *vad'* and *ili* are attested in bisyndetic constructions in the function of the emphatic disjunctive coordination (‘either X or Y’). Both correlative coordinators in these constructions are usually identical to each other (but cf. below).

(212) *povši abo frima abo but* (UzhhR)
 sand or little or much

‘Sand is either little or a lot.’

(213) *jevende vaj o jiv del,*
 winter.ADV or ART snow give.PRS.3SG

vaj e barval' phurdel (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}

or ART wind blow.PRS.3SG

‘In the winter, it is either snowy or windy.’

(214) *me adād'ive abo varekaha dikhā televizoris,*
 I today or someone.INST see.FUT.1SG TV_set

abo džā mange andro bar (Per)^{LQCR}

or go.FUT.1SG I.DAT in bar

‘Today, I will either watch TV with someone or go to the bar.’

- (215) *vad' pondzelkone vad' vovtorkone*
 or on_Monday or on_Tuesday
me džā aro čexi (Khu)^{LQCR}
 I go.FUT.1SG in Slovakia
 'Either on Monday or on Tuesday, I will go to Slovakia.'
- (216) *ili budžand' ili xitro* (Khu)
 or cunning or sly
 'Either cunning or sly.' (A metalinguistic note about two synonymous words.)
- (217) *po ľubomu vaj avka vaj avka meres* (Ser)^{RDZ}
 anyhow or thus or thus die.PRS.2SG
 'In any way, you [will] die, either in one way or in another way.'

The final disjunctive coordinator draws upon the Slavic polar particle *či* 'whether' (cf. 13.2.3). In the function of a coordinator, *či* occurs in polar complements (218) and in interrogative disjunction, as in sentences (219) and (220).

- (218) *ade sas len či zname*
 here COP.PST.3 they.ACC whether acquaintance.PL
či rodzina či sar odā
 whether family whether how DEM
me odā na džanav (Uzhhr)
 I DEM NEG know.PRS.1SG
 'Here they had either acquaintances or a family, or what else, I don't know.'
- (219) *xas či naa?* (Uzhhr)
 eat.PRS.2SG whether no
 'Are you going to eat or not?'
- (220) *so tumen feder kamen te pijen,*
 what you.PL better want.PRS.2PL NCOMP drink.INF
kerko kavejos či gulo čajos? (Ser)^{LQCR}
 bitter coffee whether sweet tea
 'What would you rather have to drink: bitter coffee or sweet tea?'

The form *či* also occurs with numerals in what appears to be a bisyndetic emphatic coordination with two unidentical coordinators, of which the first is *vaj*, i.e. *vaj* NUMERAL *či* NUMERAL 'either NUMERAL or NUMERAL'. Note that *vaj* is also an approximative quantifier

(8.2.4), and its occurrence in this type of numeral constructions perfectly matches both the approximative and the coordinating functions.

(221) *odaleske vaj oxtō či ejña berš* (UzhR)
 DEM.DAT or/about eight whether nine year
 ‘(Around) eight or nine years ago.’

(222) *zabešle opre vaj tranda*
 sit_on.AOR.3PL above or/about thirty
či saranda muxi (Ser)^{RDŽ}
 whether forty fly.PL
 ‘(Around) thirty or forty flies have sat on [there].’

However, *či* does not appear to be the only option in any function. Other coordinators, such as *abo*, are also attested in polar clauses (223), in interrogative (224) and numeral (225) coordinations.

(223) *me na džanav, či adā kher kerdo*
 I NEG know.PRS.1SG whether this house made
le labarde cehendar, abo na le labardendar (UzhS)^{LQCR}
 ART burnt brick.ABL.PL or NEG ART burnt.ABL.PL
 ‘I don’t know whether this house is made out of the burnt bricks or out of the unburnt ones.’

(224) *so tumen kamen te pijen,*
 what you.PL want.PRS.2PL NCOMP drink.INF
kerko kavejos abo gul’i teja? (UzhS)^{LQCR}
 bitter coffee or sweet tea
 ‘What do you want to drink: bitter coffee or sweet tea?’

(225) *od’a vaj ezeros abo duj ezera roma dživen*
 there or/about thousand or two thousand Rom.PL live.PRS.3PL
andre jek tāboris (Per)
 in one settlement
 ‘Either one thousand or two thousand Roma are living there in a single settlement.’

13.5.3 Adversative coordination

Like disjunctive coordinators, adversative coordinators are also relatively diverse. The most common adversative coordinators are *abo* and *no*, which occur in all Eastern Uzh varieties, along with *ale* (or *al’e*) in Uzhhorod and Perechyn and *de* in Uzhhorod. After negation, *a* and

the very rare *hanem* (the latter only in Uzhhorod) serve as substitutive adversative coordinators.

The adversative coordinator *abo* is identical to one of the disjunctive coordinators (see 13.5.2 above), but its etymology is different: it originates from the local dialectal Slavic adversative *aũbo* ‘but’, which is typical of Transcarpathian Ukrainian (e.g. Kopečný et al. 1980: 43–44). It is used as a phrasal coordinator as well as a clausal coordinator.

- (226) *ijdž somas nasval'i,*
 yesterday COP.PST.1SG ill
abo tajsa avā zdravo (Uzhhs)^{LQCR}
 but tomorrow COP.FUT.1SG healthy
 ‘Yesterday I was ill, but tomorrow I will be healthy.’
- (227) *te dinahas kher sar kampe, akor hā,*
 if give.IRR.3PL house how be_needed.PRS then yes
abo na den kher avka sar kampe (Uzhhs)
 but NEG give.PRS.3PL house thus how be_needed.PRS
 ‘If they had given a house properly, then yes, but they don’t give a house properly.’
- (228) *me ušav opre eŧta ovrendar,*
 I get_up.PRS.1SG up seven hour.ABL.PL
abo adād'ive me ušil'om opre šovvendar (Per)^{LQCR}
 but today I get_up.AOR.1SG up six.ABL
 ‘I get up at seven o’clock, but today I got up at six.’
- (229) *mijri šovgorkiña igen šukār ta lāčhi, abo rešto* (Khu)^{LQCR}
 my sister_in_law very beautiful and good but lazy
 ‘My sister-in-law is beautiful and nice but lazy.’
- (230) *hoť den buter love,*
 although give.PRS.3PL much.COMPR money
abo dživipe nāne (Khu)
 but life NEG.COP.PRS.3
 ‘Though they give more money, (but) it is not life.’
- (231) *mijro than d'ind'ārdo abo usko,* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 my bed long but narrow
tijro xārno abo buxlo
 your short but wide
 ‘My bed is long but narrow; yours is short but wide.’

The other coordinator *no* reflects a more widespread Slavic adversative coordinator, which is common especially in Russian (*HO* ‘but’) but also in Slovak. It may be used as a phrasal, clausal and sentential coordinator.

- (232) *jek phuvro ade xustostar,* (UzhhR)
 one old here Khust.ABL
no mā ov but berš ade dživel
 but already he many year here live.PRS.3SG
 ‘There is an elder man from Khust here, but he has already been living here for many years.’

- (233) *dža pānčto šovto kher, ode ker so kames,*
 go[IMP.2SG] fifth sixth house there do[IMP.2SG] what want.PRS.2SG
no paž tijro kher ničda na ker nič (UzhhS)
 but beside your house never NEG do[IMP.2SG] nothing
 ‘Go [to] the fifth or sixth house; there you do what you like, but by your own house, don’t do anything.’

- (234) *o phuvre mudre, no slabe* (UzhhS)
 ART old.PL wise.PL but weak.PL
 ‘Elder people are wise but weak.’

- (235) *od’a vaj ezeros abo duj ezera roma dživen*
 there or/about thousand or two thousand Rom.PL live.PRS.3PL
andre jek tāboris, no od’a na vakeren romanes (Per)
 in one settlement but there NEG speak.PRS.3PL Romani.ADV
 ‘Either one thousand or two thousand Roma are living there in a single settlement, but they do not speak Romani there.’

- (236) *ijdž amen samas nasvale,*
 yesterday we COP.PST.1PL ill.PL
no tajsa avaha zdrava (Ser)^{LQCR}
 but tomorrow COP.FUT.1PL healthy.PL
 ‘Yesterday we were ill, but tomorrow we will be healthy.’

In Uzhhorod and Perechyn, the adversative coordinator of Slavic origin *ale* or *a’le* (cf. West Slavic *ale*, Ukrainian *але* ‘but’) is also common. The form *a’le* with the palatalised lateral occurs in Radvanka.

- (237) *kode palal kerde lenge jek bitovka,*
 there in_the_back make.AOR.3PL they.DAT one apartment_house
al'e tel o epta bers' igen zničinde odā (UzhhR)
 but under ART eight year very destroy.AOR.3PL DEM
 'They made an apartment house for them there in the back, but within eight years, they have destroyed it to a great extent.'
- (238) *tijro ciknōro ale buxlo* (UzhhS)^{LQCR}
 your little.DIM but wide
 'Yours is tiny but wide.'
- (239) *me len axal'uvav,*
 I they.ACC understand.PRS.1SG
ale on amen na axal'on (Per)
 but they we.ACCNEG understand.PRS.1SG
 'I understand them, but they don't understand us.'

In Uzhhorod, Hungarian L2 speakers also make use of the Hungarian *de*:

- (240) *ov pes garud'ahas, de na sas kāj* (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 he REFL hide.IRR.3SG but NEG COP.PST.3 where
 'He would have hidden himself, but there wasn't a place to hide (literally: where).'
- (241) *kerās savoro, de o dejl man izmiñind'a* (UzhhR)
 do.IPF/POT.1SG all but ART God I.ACC change.AOR.3SG
 'I was committing everything, but the God has changed me.'

After negation, different adversative coordinators are used in Eastern Uzh Romani, like in some other languages (cf. German *sondern*, Czech archaic *nýbrž*, Hungarian *hanem*, Russian *a*, etc.). Haspelmath (2007: 28) calls this semantic subtype of adversative coordination in which a positive expression substitutes for a negative expression 'substitutive adversative coordination'. In all Eastern Uzh varieties, the most common substitutive coordinator is *a*, which is identical to the conjunction *a* 'and' (see 13.5.1), and reflects the substitutive function of *a* in East Slavic languages.

(242) *na tijro pontretos majines te thoven,*
 NEG your photo have_to.PRS.2SG NCOMP put.INF
a oles kas tu meržines (UzhhS)
 and/but DEM.ACC who.ACC you hate.PRS.2SG
 ‘You have to put [there] not your own photo but rather that of whom you hate.’

(243) *na pre adi sejra dživnas,*
 NEG on this side live.IPF/POT.3PL
a od'a kāj cehli keren (Per)
 and/but there where brick.PL make.PRS.3PL
 ‘They did not live on this side but rather there where they make bricks.’

(244) *duje džanenge ... na dujenge a trinenge*
 two person.DAT.PL NEG two.DAT.PL and/but three.DAT.PL
labard' opr' o khera (Khu)
 burn.TR.AOR.3PL up ART house.PL
 ‘They burned the houses of two people...not of two [people] but rather of three [people].’

(245) *izarakhaha amen na tajsa, a paltajsaskoro* (Ser)^{LQCR}
 meet.FUT.1PL we.ACCNEG tomorrow and/but day_after_tomorrow
 ‘We will not meet tomorrow but rather the day after tomorrow.’

Some Hungarian L2 speakers in Uzhhorod also use the Hungarian *hanem*:

(246) *na čak jek, hanem duj papina* (UzhhS)
 NEG only one but_rather two goose.PL
 ‘Not just one but rather two geese.’

13.5.4 Consecutive coordination

Consequence is expressed by *vašodā* ‘therefore, that’s why’, which has developed through the fusion of the prepositional phrase **vaš odā* ‘for that’; cf. the current causal preposition *važ* (see 11.2.2.1) and the endophoric demonstrative *odā* (7.2.1.3). The form *vašodā* commonly functions as a consecutive coordinator.

(247) *ov korisal'ila,*
 he blind.INCH.AOR.3SG
vašodā ov ačhila koro (UzhhR)^{LQCR}
 therefore he become.AOR.3SG blind
 ‘He went blind; therefore, he became blind.’

- (248) *džungāles vakerel, pherasa kerel,*
 obscene.ADV speak.PRS.3SG joke.PL do.PRS.3SG
les vašodā kamen pro mulatšāgos (UzhhS)
 he.ACC therefore want.PRS.3PL on party
 ‘He speaks obscenely [and] he makes jokes; therefore, they love (or: want) him at the party.’
- (249) *mijri daj th’ o dad keren buvti pre čexiko,*
 my mother and ART father do.PRS.3PL work on Slovakia
vašodā me bāruvav paž e baba (Ser)^{LQCR}
 therefore I big.INCH.PRS.1SG beside ART grandmother
 ‘My parents work in Slovakia; therefore, I grow up with my grandmother.’

The form *vašodā* may also be preceded by *ta* ‘so’, a particle borrowed from Slavic, which then leads to a complex coordinator *ta vašodā*, as in:

- (250) *oj pes ladžalas,*
 she REFL feel_ashamed.IPF/POT.3SG
ta vašodā terd’olas pre sejra (Ser)^{LQCR}
 so therefore stand.IPF/POT.3SG on side
 ‘She was ashamed; that is why she was standing aside.’

In Khudlovo, *azijr* [azi:r] borrowed from the Hungarian *azért* ‘therefore’ is used in addition to *vašodā*. It may also be preceded by *ta*:

- (251) *ov korisal’i’a, azijr ačhil’a koro (Khu)^{LQCR}*
 he blind.INCH.AOR.3SG therefore become.AOR.3SG blind
 ‘He went blind; therefore, he became blind.’
- (252) *ehin brišind, t’ azijr na av’la (Khu)*
 EMP.COP.PRS.3 rain so therefore NEG come.AOR.3SG
 ‘There is rain; that’s why he hasn’t come.’

13.5.5 Emphatic negative coordinaton

A final note should be made of negative coordinators that are used in special emphatic contexts, which are equivalent to English *neither...nor* (cf. Haspelmath 2007: 17–19). Like Slavic languages, the negative scalar focus particle *añi* or *ñi* ‘not even’ (see 9.6.1.2) is used as a prepositive correlative coordinator in Eastern Uzh Romani.

- (253) *ode aňi čexika na vakernas pro taboris,*
 there not_even Slovak.ADV NEG speak.IPF/POT.3PL on settlement
aňi ungrika, aňi ňisar na vakernas,
 not_even Hungarian.ADV not_even nohow NEG speak.IPF/POT.3PL
ča jek vakernas romanes (UzhhS)
 only one speak.IPF/POT.3PL Romani.ADV

‘They spoke neither Slovak in the settlement nor Hungarian nor any other language. They only spoke in Romani.’

- (254) *ňi perečinate ňi ade,*
 not_even Perechyn.LOC not_even here
ňikhaj na muk ňi holmos
 nowhere NEG leave[IMP.2SG] not_even clothing
ňi pontretos, nič (UzhhS)
 not_even photograph nothing

‘Neither in Perechyn nor here, don’t leave anything at any place: neither [your] clothing nor [your] photograph.’

- (255) *e lisc'a na xal aňi le packānen,*
 ART fox NEG eat.PRS.3SG not_even ART rat.ACC.PL
aňi le žamben (Khu)^{LQCR}
 not_even ART frog.ACC.PL

‘The fox eats neither rats nor frogs.’

- (256) *e lisc'a na xal ňi mišen*
 ART fox NEG eat.PRS.3SG not_even mouse.ACC.PL
ňi žamben (Ser)^{LQCR}
 not_even frog.ACC.PL

‘The fox eats neither mice nor frogs.’

References

- Adam, A. and Je. Navroč'ka. 2002. *Ukrajins'ko-roms'kyj rozmovnyk*. Užhorod: VAT.
- Adam, A., Ju. Zejkan and Je. Navroč'ka. 2006. *Bilyj kamin' z čornoji kativni. Parno bar aj kalo kinno*. Užhorod: Vydavnyctvo Oleksandry Harkuši.
- Agócs, A. 2003 Sociálna identifikácia Bajášov na Slovensku. *Etnologické rozpravy* 2: 41–53.
- Anonymous. 1934. In a Gypsy School. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* III, 8, 2: 117–119.
- AUM = 1988. *Atlas ukrajins'koji movy v tr'och tomach . Tom II.: Volyn', Naddnistrjansčyna, Zakarpattja i sumižni zemli*. Kyjiv: Naukova dumka.
- Babka, L., H. Opleštilová and A. Mušinka. 2015. *Rudolf Hůlka: fotografie Rómov z Podkarpatskej Rusi zo začiatku 20. storočia*. Praha - Prešov: Národní knihovna České republiky - Slovanská knihovna and Krajské centrum pre rómske otázky.
- Bakker, P. 1997 Athematic morphology in Romani. In: Matras, Bakker and Kyuchukov (eds.), 1–22.
- 2001 Typology of Romani numerals. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 54, 2: 91–107.
- Barannikov, A. P. 1934. *The Ukrainian and South Russian Gypsy dialects*. Leningrad: Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
- Beníšek, M. 2009. Middle Indo-Aryan Ablative and Locative Markers in Romani. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52, 4: 335–362.
- 2010. The quest for a Proto-Romani infinitive. *Romani Studies* 5, 20, 1: 47–86.
- 2012. On the origin of the consonantal feminine stems in Romani. Paper presented at the *10th International Conference on Romani Linguistics*. Barcelona, 5-7 September 2012.
- 2013a. Central Romani lidža-/ ledž-: a vestige of an Indo-Aryan compound verb and its cross-dialectal variability. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 66, 4: 471–486.
- 2013b. Sereďnye Romani: a North Central Romani dialect of Transcarpathian Ukraine. In: Schrammel-Leber and Tiefenbacher (eds.), 42–60.
- 2013c. Predicative possession in Western Transcarpathian Romani. Paper presented at the *7th International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE)*. Trondheim, 26-28 June 2013.
- 2014a. Čtyři pohádky „slovenských Romů“ ze Zakarpatské Ukrajiny. *Romano džaniben* 1/2014: 113–141.

- 2014b. Rediscovered Central Romani in Ukrainian Galicia. Paper presented at the *11th International Conference on Romani Linguistics*. Oslo, 15-17 September 2014.
- 2014c. Romani dialects on the Slovak – Ukrainian border. Paper presented at the *FINKA Symposium ‘On the border of language and dialect’*. Joensuu, 4-6 June 2014.
- 2014d. The sociolinguistic situation of two Romani communities in Uzhhorod. Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the Gypsy Lore Society and Conference on Gypsy Studies*. Bratislava, 11-13 September 2014.
- 2016. Long vowels in Eastern Uzh Romani, with special reference to /ā/. Paper presented at the *12th International Conference on Romani Linguistics*. Stockholm, 14-16 September 2016.
- 2017. Miklosich’s vocabulary of Galician Romani and its affinities with today’s North Central of Halychyna. In: Kozhanov, K., M. Osłon and D. W. Halwachs. (eds.) *Das amen godi pala Lev Čerenkov. Romani historija, čhib taj kultura*. Graz: Grazer Linguistische Monographien, 98–110.
- Bloch, J. 1932. Survivance de skr. *āsīt* en indien moderne. *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique* 33, 1: 55–65.
- 1965. *Indo-Aryan from the Vedas to Modern Times*. Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Bodnárová, Z. 2013. Overview of Vend Romani in Hungary. In: Schrammel-Leber and Tiefenbacher (eds.), 29–41.
- Bodnárová, Z. and J. Wiedner. 2015. Analogical extension of vowel length in Vend Romani. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 65, 2: 157–170.
- Boretzky, N. 1993. Conditional sentences in Romani. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 46: 83–99.
- 1995a. Armenisches im Zigeunerischen (Romani und Lomavren). *Indogermanische Forschungen* 100: 137–155.
- 1995b. Die Entwicklung der Kopula im Romani. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 43, 1–50.
- 1996a. The new infinitive in Romani. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 5, 6, 1: 1–51.
- 1996b. Zu den Modalia in den Romani-Dialekten. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 32, 1: 1–27.
- 1997. Suppletive forms of the Romani copula: ‘ovel/avel’. In: Matras, Bakker and Kyuchukov (eds.), 107–37.
- 1998. Areal and insular dialects and the case of Romani. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 50, 1–27.

- 1999. Die Gliederung der Zentralen Dialekte und die Beziehungen zwischen Südlichen Zentralen Dialekten (Romungro) und Südbalkanischen Romani-Dialekten. In: Halwachs and Menz (eds.), 210–276.
- 2000. The definite article in Romani dialects. In: Elšík and Matras (eds.), 31–63.
- 2003. *Die Vlach-Dialekte des Romani: Strukturen, Sprachgeschichte, Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse, Dialektkarten*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 2007. The differentiation of the Romani dialects. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 60, 4: 314–336.
- 2012a. *Die lexikalischen Gräzismen des Romani. Ein Beitrag zur Wortgeschichte*. Grazer Linguistische Monographien. Graz: Karl Franzens Universität Graz.
- 2012b. *Studien zum Wortschatz des Romani*. Veliko Tarnovo: Faber.
- 2013. Gender adaptation in loan layers of Romani. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 66, 4: 404–424.
- Boretzky, N. and B. Iglá. 1993. *Lautwandel und Natürlichkeit. Kontaktbedingter und endogener Wandel im Romani*. Essen: Universität GH Essen.
- 1994. *Wörterbuch Romani-Deutsch-English für den südosteuropäischen Raum*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- 2004. *Kommentierter Dialektatlas des Romani. Teil 1. Vergleich der Dialekte*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Braun, L., I. Csernicsekó and J. Molnár. 2010. *Magyar anyanyelvű cigányok / romák Kárpátalján*. Ungvár: PoliPrint Kft.
- Bubeník, V. 1995. On typological changes and structural borrowing in the history of European Romani. In: Matras (ed.), 1–23.
- Bubeník, V. and M. Hübschmannová. 1998. Deriving inchoatives and mediopassives in Slovak and Hungarian Romani. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 5: 29–44.
- Buffa, F. 1967. K charakteristike východoslovenských nárečí. *Nové obzory. Spoločenskovedný zborník východného Slovenska* 9: 263–277.
- Burton-Page, J. 1957. Compound and Conjunct Verbs in Hindi. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 19, 3: 469–478.
- CDIAL = Turner, R. L., Sir. 1962–1966. *A comparative dictionary of Indo-Aryan languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Chelliah, Sh. L. 2001. The role of text collection and elicitation in linguistic fieldwork. In: Newman and Ratliff (eds.), 152–165.

- Cherenkov L. 2005. The Plaščuny and their dialect. Preliminary notes. In: Schrammel, Halwachs and Ambrosch (eds.), 43–47.
- Comrie, B. and M. Polinsky (eds.). 1993. *Causatives and Transitivity*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Čerenkov, L. 2008. Cyganskaja dialektologija v Ukraine. Istorija i sovremennoe sostojanie. *Naukovi zapysky. Zbirnyk prac' molodych včenyh ta aspirantiv* 15: 489–503.
- Čeripková, M. 1995. Nárečie sotáckej oblasti pri Sobranciach z hľadiska slovenskougrajinských jazykových vzťahov. In: *Varia IV*. Bratislava — Banská Bystrica: Slovenská jazykovedná spoločnosť pri SAV a Pedagogická fakulta Univerzity Mateja Bela, pp. 30–34.
- Červenka, J. 2006. *Dialektní specifika severocentrální romštiny ve středoslovenských oblastech Kysuce, Turiec a Liptov*. Praha: Signeta.
- Danylenko, A. and S. Vakulenko. 1995. *Ukrainian*. München/Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Diessel, H. 1999a. *Demonstratives. Form, function and grammaticalization*. (Typological Studies in Language 42). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Diessel, H. 1999b. The morphosyntax of demonstratives in synchrony and diachrony. *Linguistic Typology* 3: 1–49.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 2007. Field linguistics: a minor manual. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 60, 1: 12–31.
- Dixon, R. M. W. and A. Y. Aikhenvald (eds.) 2000. *Changing valency. Case studies in transitivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dzdznelivs'kyj, J. O. 1958-60. *Linhvistyčnyj atlas ukrajins'kyh narodnych hovoriv Zakarpats'koji oblasti URSS*. Užhorod: Užhorods'kyj deržavnyj universytet.
- Elšík, V. 2000a. Romani nominal paradigms: Their structure, development and diversity. In: Elšík and Matras (eds.), 9–30.
- 2000b. Dialect variation in Romani personal pronouns. In: Elšík and Matras (eds.), 5–94.
- 2002. The synchrony and diachrony of vowel length in Šóka Romani. Paper presented at the 6th International Conference on Romani Linguistics. Graz, 12-14 September 2002.
- 2008–. *Linguistic Database for the Documentation of Central European Romani*. Prague: Charles University.
- 2008–2012. *Linguistic Questionnaire for the Documentation of Central European Romani* (= LQCR). Prague: Charles University.

- 2014. Multal and paucal quantifiers in Central Romani. Paper presented at the *11th International Conference on Romani Linguistics*, Oslo, 15-17 September 2014.
- 2016 Vokalická délka v selické romštině: synchronie a diachronie. Handout. *Lingvistická kolokvia* 19. 4. 2016. Praha: Ústav obecné lingvistiky FF UK.
- Elšík, V., M. Hübschmannová and H. Šebková. 1999. The Southern Central (ahi-imperfect) Romani dialects of Slovakia and northern Hungary. In: Halwachs and Menz (eds.), 277–390.
- Elšík, V. and Y. Matras (eds.). 2000. *Grammatical Relations in Romani. The Noun Phrase*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 2001. *Romani Dialectological Questionnaire*. Manchester: University of Manchester, Department of Linguistics.
- 2006. *Markedness and Language Change. The Romani Sample*. Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- 2009. Modality in Romani. In: Hansen and Haan (eds.), 267–324.
- ERRC = 2006. European Roma Rights Centre. *Proceedings Discontinued: The Inertia of Roma Rights Change in Ukraine*. Country Report Series, No. 16. Budapest: European Roma Rights Centre.
- Ferguson, C. A. and J. J. Gumperz. 1960. Introduction. In: Ferguson, C. A. and J. J. Gumperz (eds.). *Linguistic Diversity in South Asia: Studies in Regional, Social and Functional Variation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1–26.
- Filip, L. I. 1996. *Stara Radvanka. Istoryčnyj narys*. Užhorod: Hosprozrachunkovyj redakcijno-vydavnyčyj viddil Zakarpats'koho komitetu u spravach presy ta informaciji.
- Friedman, V. 1991. Case in Romani: old grammar in new affixes. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 5, 1: 85–102.
- Gerovskij G. 1934. Jazyk Podkarpatské Rusi I. Lidová řeč Podkarpatské Rusi (s mapou nářečí Podkarpatské Rusi). In: *Československá vlastivěda III. Jazyk*. Praha: Sfinx, 480–517.
- Givón, T. 1990. *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction. II*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hancock, I. 1995. *A Handbook of Vlax Romani*. Columbus: Slavica.
- Halwachs, D. 2002. Anmerkungen zur Romani-Variante der Prekmurje. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 58: 43–53.

- Halwachs, D. W. and F. Menz (eds.) 1999. *Die Sprache der Roma. Perspektiven der Romani-Forschung in Österreich im interdisziplinären und internationalen Kontext*. Klagenfurt: Drava.
- Halwachs, D. W. and M. Wogg. 2002. *Burgenland-Romani (Roman)*. München/Newcastle: Lincom.
- Hansen, B. and F. de Haan (eds.) 2009. *Modals in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hanulíková, A. and S. Hamann, 2010. Slovak. Illustrations of the IPA. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 40, 3: 373–378.
- Hanyč, J., Ju. Kul and Ju. Šejko. 1999. *Perečyn*. Perečyn: (n.p.).
- Haspelmath, M. 1993. More on the typology of inchoative/causative verb alternations. In: Comrie and Polinsky (eds.), 87–120.
- 1997. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 2007. Coordination. In: Shopen (ed.), 1–51.
- Haspelmath, M. and O. Buchholz. 1998. Equative and similative constructions in the languages of Europe. In: van der Auwera, J. (ed.). *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 277–334.
- Helbig, A. N. 2005. *'Play for me, Old Gypsy.'* *Music as Political Resource in the Roma Rights Movement in Ukraine*. PhD thesis. Columbia University.
- Heuvel, W. Van Den and E. Urech. 2014. Romani Dialect Variation in Transylvania: Migration and Diffusion. *Romani Studies* 5, 24, 1: 43–70.
- Hübschmannová, M. and V. Bubeník. 1997. Causatives in Slovak and Hungarian Romani. In: Matras, Bakker and Kyuchukov (eds.), 133–145.
- Hübschmannová, M., H. Šebková and A. Žigová, A. 1991. *Romsko-český a česko-romský kapesní slovník*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Hyman, L. M. 2001. Fieldwork as state of mind. In: Newman and Ratliff (eds.), 15–33.
- Ihnátko, G. 1877. *Czigány Nyelvtan*. Losonc: S. Róth.
- Jemec', H. S. and Djačenko, B. I. 1993. *Cyhans'ke naseleňnja Zakarpattja*. Užhorod: Karpaty.
- Joseph, B. D. 2009. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keenan, E. and B. Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 1: 63–99.
- Kenesei, I. et al. 1998. *Hungarian*. London/New York: Routledge.

- Kopečný, F. et al. 1973. *Etymologický slovník slovanských jazyků. Slova gramatická a zájmena. Svazek 1: předložky, koncové partikule*. Praha: Academia.
- 1980. *Etymologický slovník slovanských jazyků. Slova gramatická a zájmena. Svazek 2: spojky, částice, zájmena a zájmená adverbia*. Praha: Academia.
- Kopernicki, I. 1930. *Textes tsiganes. Contes et poésies avec traduction française*. (= Prace Komisji orientalistycznej, 7.) Cracow: Polska akademja umiejętności.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. 2000. Romani genitives in cross-linguistic perspective. In: Elšík and Matras (eds.), 123–149.
- Kovalcsik, K. 2000. Teasing as a Sung Speech Genre of Vlach Gypsy Couples in the Sub-Carpathian Region. *Narodna umjetnost. Croatian Journal of Ethnology and Folklore Research* 37, 1: 67–95.
- Körtvély, E. 2009. Modals in Hungarian. In: Hansen and Haan (eds.), 403–430.
- Krajčovič, R. 1988. *Vývin slovenského jazyka a dialektológia*, Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.
- Ladefoged, P. and I. Maddieson. 1996. *The sounds of the world's languages*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lizanyec, P. N. and K. I. Horváth. 1981. A kárpátontúli magyar nyelvjárások főbb sajátosságairól. *Magyar Nyelvjárások XXIV*: 3–18.
- Lípa, J. 1963. *Příručka cikánštiny*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- LQCR = Elšík 2008-2012.
- Magocsi, P. R. 1979. *Let's speak Rusyn. Transcarpathian edition*. Fairview/New Jersey: Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center.
- Masica, C. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Y. 1995. *Romani in contact: the history and sociology of a language*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- 1997. The typology of case relations and case layer distribution in Romani. In: Matras, Bakker and Kyuchukov (eds.), 61–93.
- 1999a. s/h alternation in Romani: an historical and functional interpretation. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 51: 99–129.
- 1999b. The speech of the Polska Roma. Some highlighted features and their implications for Romani dialectology. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 5, 9, 1: 1–28.
- 2000. The structural and functional composition of Romani demonstratives. In Elšík and Matras (eds.), 95–122.

- 2001. Tense, aspect and modality categories in Romani. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 54, 2: 162–180.
- 2002. *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2004. Typology, dialectology and the structure of complementation in Romani. In: Kortmann, B. (ed.). *Dialectology Meets Typology. Dialect Grammar from a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 277–304.
- Matras, Y., P. Bakker and H. Kyuchukov (eds.) 1997. *The Typology and Dialectology in Romani*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Matras, Y. and J. Sakel (eds.) 2007. *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matras, Y., Ch. White and V. Elšík. 2009. The Romani Morpho-Syntax (RMS) Database. In: Everaert, M., S. Musgrave and A. Dimitriadis (eds.). *The Use of Databases in Cross-Linguistic Studies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 329–362.
- Mády, K. 2012. Shortening of long high vowels in Hungarian: a perceptual loss? In: Calamai, S., C. Celata and L. Ciucci. *Sociophonetics, at the crossroads of speech perception, processing and communication*. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 41–44.
- Miklosich, F. 1872. *Über die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europa's II. Beiträge zur Grammatik und zum Lexicon der Zigeunermundarten*. Wien: Karl Gerold's Sohn.
- Navroc'ka, Je. 2013. Robota pravozachysnych centriv po zachystu prav romiv v Ukrajinii. In: *Romolohija*, 134–140.
- Nedjalkov, V. P. (ed.) 2007. *Reciprocal Constructions*. Typological Studies in Language, 71. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Newman, P. and M. Ratliff (eds.) 2001. *Linguistic Fieldwork*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Népszámlálása = A Magyar Szent Korona országainak 1910. évi népszámlálása*. 1912. Budapest: A Magyar Kir. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal.
- Noonan, M. 2007. Complementation. In: Shopen (ed.), 52–150.
- Nováková, M. 1949. *Cikáni v Užhorodě. Anthropologický a ethnologický nástin prováděný v roce 1938*. Praha: (n.p.).
- Oslon, M. 2012. O nekim osobinama romskog naglasnog systema. In: *IWoBA VIII. Referati VIII međunarodnog skupa o baltoslovenskoj akcentologij*, 295–317.

- Pan'kevč, I. A. 1938. *Ukrajins'ki hovory Pidkarpats'koji Rusi i sumižnych oblastej*. Praha: Sbor pro výzkum Slovenska a Podkarpatské Rusi/Orbis.
- Payne, T. E. 1997. *Describing Morphosyntax. A Guide for Field Linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Plank, F. (ed.) 1995. *Double case: Agreement by Suffixaufnahme*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Puchmayer, A. J. 1821. *Románi Čib, das ist: Grammatik und Wörterbuch der Zigeuner Sprache, nebst einigen Fabeln in derselben. Dazu als Anhang die Hantýrka oder die Čechische Diebessprache*. Prague: Fürst-erzbischöflichen Buchdruckerey.
- Pugh, S. M. 2009. *The Rusyn Language*. München: Lincom.
- Pugh, S. M. and I. Press. 1999. *Ukrainian. A Comprehensive Grammar*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Romolohija = 2013. *Romolohija: istorija i sučasnist'*. *Materialy Mižnarodnych naukovych čytan', Ukrajina, m. Užhorod 24-26 žovtnja 2013 roku*. Užhorod: Lira.
- Rozwadowski, J. 1936. *Wörterbuch des Zigeunerdialekts von Zakopane*. Crakow: Polska Akademja Umiejęności.
- Sabol, J. 1964. O výslovnosti spoluhlásky v. *Slovenská reč* 29, 6: 342–348.
- Sakel, J. 2007. Types of loan: Matter and pattern. In: Matras and Sakel (eds.), 15–29.
- Samarin, W. 1967. *Field Linguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Sampson, J. 1926. *The dialect of the Gypsies of Wales, being the older form of British Romani preserved in the speech of the clan of Abram Wood*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Schmid, W. P. 1963. Das zigeunerische Abstraktsuffix *-ben/-pen*. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 68: 276–83.
- 1968. Zur Bildung der Abstrakta in den Zigeunerdialekten Europas. In: Brekle, H. E. and L. Lipka (eds.). *Wortbildung. Syntax und Morphologie*. The Hague: Mouton, 210–16.
- Schrammel, B., D. Halwachs and G. Ambrosch (eds.) 2005. *General and applied Romani linguistics. Proceedings from the 6th International conference on Romani linguistics*. München: Lincom.
- Schrammel-Leber, B. and B. Tiefenbacher (eds.) *Romani V. Papers from the Annual Meeting of the Gypsy Lore Society, Graz 2011*. Grazer Romani Publikationen 2. Grazer Linguistische Monographien: Graz.
- Shibatani, M. 1976. *Causativization*. New York: Academic Press.
- Shopen, T. (ed.) 2007. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol. II Complex Constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- SLOPR = 1928. *Statistický lexikon obcí v Podkarpatské Rusi*. Praha: Státní úřad statistický.
- SLOZP = 1937. *Statistický lexikon obcí v zemi Podkarpatoruské*. Praha: Orbis.
- Sova, P. 1937. *Prošloje Užgoroda*. Užgorod: RNG.
- Sowa, R. von. 1887. *Die Mundart der slovakischen Zigeuner*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprechts Verlag.
- 1893. Die Mährische Mundart der Romsprache. In: *Xenia Austriaca: Festschrift der österreichischen Mittelschulen zur 42. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Wien*, 50–51.
- Steiner, F. B. 1939. Gypsies in Trans-Carpathian Russia. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* III, 18, 2–3: 57–60.
- Tenser, A. 2005. *Lithuanian Romani*. München: Lincom.
- 2008. *Northeastern group of Romani dialects*. PhD thesis. Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Thompson, S. A., R. E. Longacre and S. J. J. Hwang. 2007. Adverbial Clauses. In: Shopen (ed.), 237–300.
- Timár, G. and S. Biszak. 2010. Digitizing and georeferencing of the historical cadastral maps (1856-60) of Hungary. In: Livieratos, E. and G. Gartner (eds.). *Proceedings of the 5th International Workshop on Digital Approaches in Cartographic Heritage*. Vienna: Vienna University of Technology, 559–564.
- Tóbič, Š. 1965. Východoslovenské nárečia. (Úvod do ich ďalšieho výskumu a štúdia). *Nové Obzory* 7: 235–268.
- Turner, R. L. 1926. The Position of Romani in Indo-Aryan. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* III, 5: 145–89.
- TZO = 2012. *Tuberkul'oz v Zakarpatskij oblasti*. Užhorod: Ftyziatria.
- van der Auwera, J. and V. Plungian. 1998. Modality's Semantic Map. *Linguistic Typology* 2. 79-124.
- Wagner, P. 2012. *A Grammar of North West Lovari*. PhD thesis. Prague: Charles University in Prague.
- Wentzel, T. W. 1980. *Die Zigeunersprache. (Nordrussischer Dialekt)*. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Zan, M. 2013. Problemy etnokul'turnoho rozvytku romiv Zakarpattja (1989 – 2001 rr.). In *Romolohija*, 10–23.
- Zilyns'kyj, I. 1979. *A Phonetic Description of the Ukrainian Language*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.

Zograf, G. A. 1976. *Morfologičeskij stroj novyx indoarijskix jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.