

*The Southern Central (ahi-imperfect) Romani dialects
of Slovakia and northern Hungary*

Viktor Elšík

(together with Milena Hübschmannová and Hana Šebková)



Manuscript 1998, published as:

Elšík, Viktor, Milena Hübschmannová & Hana Šebková.

The Southern Central (*ahi-imperfect*) Romani dialects of Slovakia and northern Hungary.

In: Halwachs, Dieter & Florian Menz (Hrsg.) *Das österreichische Romani im europäischen Kontext*. Klagenfurt: Drava Verlag 1999.

1. Introduction

1.1. Romani dialects in Slovakia

Romani in Slovakia has been spoken for centuries and linguistically studied for decades. The linguists' attention, however, has not been paid in equal rate to different dialects. In this paper, we want to give a basic description of Romani dialects spoken in parts of southern Slovakia, whose study was neglected in the past.

Most Romani varieties spoken in Slovakia belong to two dialect groups: Central and Vlax. Speakers of the Central dialects have been settled for centuries, while the Vlax dialects are spoken by Roms who have arrived at Slovakia during the 19th and 20th centuries and who were sedentarized in the half of this century, mostly by force in 1959. Significant numbers of speakers of both groups also live in Czechia, where they have moved after the World War II. The Central dialects may be divided into two subgroups (as classified by Boretzky, this volume): the Northern Central (NC) and the Southern Central (SC); the latter may be also called *ahi*-imperfect Romani (see 3.13. and 4.2.). While all Central dialects in southern Poland, western Ukraine, and the pre-war Czechia belong or used to belong to the former subgroup, and all Central dialects in Slovenia, Austria, and Hungary to the latter, Slovakia is the country where dialects of both subgroups coexist and neighbour upon each other.

The main task of this paper, the basic description of the *ahi*-imperfect Romani in Slovakia, will be exceeded in two points. First, in order to delimit the SC dialects of Slovakia against the NC ones, a comparative perspective will be assumed. Second, there are reasons to include the SC Romani of northern Hungary (Pilis and Nógrád districts), too, into our description: it is geographically contiguous with the SC Romani of Slovakia, and there are a number of features which show their dialectal contiguity and linguistic unity (see 4.2.). Since the *ahi*-imperfect Romani of Slovakia and northern Hungary is the northernmost SC subgroup, one may speak of the Northern SC dialects (or NSC for convenience, see also 1.2.). On the other hand, the geographical and linguistic contiguity of NSC (as a whole) with the Vendic subgroup of the SC dialects, i.e. Roman, Vend, and Prekmurje, has been lost (for conformities between individual NCS varieties and Vendic see 4.2.). For the dialectological category "Romungro" in Boretzky's sense see 1.2.

The NC dialects of Slovakia may be divided into Western Slovakia Romani (WSR) in the southwest of the country (e.g. in Šaštín, Jablonica, Čachtice, and Trenčianske Teplice),

Central Slovakia Romani (CSR) in the midwest and in the central regions (e.g. in Prievidza, Kremnica, Žiar, and Banská Bystrica), and Eastern Slovakia Romani (ESR) in the east. The first serious description of any Romani dialect in Slovakia was devoted to a WSR variety (v. Sowa 1887), while contemporary Romani linguistics has concentrated on the language of the most numerous ESR speakers, who form the majority of Romani population in the post-war Czechia, too. Descriptions of CSR and of NC dialects in the northwest and the north of Slovakia are still missing.

It seems that there are gradual transitions between neighbouring varieties of CSR and/or ESR, as long as there is no natural boundary such as mountain ranges.¹ At the same time, only minor differences seem to exist between CSR and ESR; the variety of Prievidza in the midwest is still very similar to the Humenné variety in the extreme east of the country. On the other hand, although the similarity is great, there seems to occur a cluster of isoglosses between CSR and WSR (see also 4.1.), e.g. *tikno* ‘small’ (see 2.2.), *barra* ‘stones’ (see 2.7.), *kokóro* ‘alone’, or the indeclinable *odá* (see 3.11.) in Čachtice Romani, but *cikno*, *bara*, *korkóro*, and the declinable *odá* in Prievidza Romani. In accordance with their geographical location, the NC dialects of southeastern Poland and the pre-war Czechia are linguistically closest to ESR and WSR, respectively.

Nevertheless, the most perspicuous dialectal boundary within the Central Romani in Slovakia is the one between the NC and the NSC dialects, respectively. In some sectors of the boundary, e.g. in the extreme southwest of Slovakia (see 1.3.), there is a steep dialectal break, while in some other areas, transitional dialects have occurred. The ones spoken in the south of central Slovakia will be called Central Transitional (Ct), and the ones whose speakers live on the eastern border of the NSC area will be called Eastern Transitional (Et). The transitional dialects belong to the NC subgroup genetically, but they share a number of SC features (see 4.2.). In spite of the existence of the transitional dialects, there is a significant cluster of isoglosses between any adjacent NC and NSC variety, respectively.

1.2. Nomenclature

Speakers of all Romani varieties in Slovakia call themselves *Roma* and their own language *románi čhib*, *romaňi čhib* etc. Any further specification of the autonym is only secondary:

¹ Further research may discover administrative boundaries to be another source of dialectal diversity of Romani in Slovakia (at least as far as Slovak is concerned, the former boundaries of feudal regions are known to correlate with interdialectal boundaries). A demographic parallel: the high percentage of Roms in Spiš (8 % out of the whole population of the region according to the 1968 census, see 1.3.) strikingly contrasts with less than two per cent of Roms in the neighbouring Liptov.

questions about ethno-identity specification are usually answered by statements like “we are simply Roms but, if you insist [on an attribute], then ...”. Some people are not even willing to go that far, and they use descriptions such as *amen sam amáre Roma* ‘we are our Roms’, *amen sam čáče Roma* ‘we are the true Roms’, or *amen sam románe Roma* ‘we are Romani Roms’ etc. On the other hand, there is usually a specific name for Roms of other groups. Some of these appellations may be secondarily accepted by those to which they apply.

The *ahi-imperfect* Romani dialects of Slovakia have been called “Hungarian” in Czech(oslovak) linguistic literature (e.g. in Lída 1965, Hübschmannová et al. 1991, and still in Hübschmannová & Bubeník 1997). Boretzky (this volume) uses the Romani equivalent “Ungriko”. We have abandoned this quasi-ethnic term recently since it does not agree with the ethno-identity of many *ahi-imperfect* Romani speakers in Slovakia. As a secondary attribute, the term *ungriko* ‘Hungarian’ is usually accepted by the *ahi*-Romani-Hungarian bilinguals, but not by the *ahi*-Romani-Slovak bilinguals.

The term “NSC”, which will be used in this paper, is a purely linguistic (dialectological) term, and it should not be understood as implying an ethnic uniformity of the NSC Romani speakers. Although we are aware of the awkwardness of the term “NSC”, we think that it has an advantage over its equivalent “*ahi-imperfect* Romani in Slovakia and northern Hungary”: it renders a dialectological unit without being dependent on terms of state geography.

The term *Romungro* / *Rumungro* (compounded of *Rom* plus *Ungro* ‘Hungarian’, see below) is normally used by the Vlax Roms to refer to the sedentary Roms in Hungary and Slovakia, irrespective of their first second language and subethnic differences. This appellation has been accepted by the NSC Romani speakers in Hungary, and, exceptionally, by some settled Roms in Slovakia. Many of the latter, however, still find the appellation derogatory.² The term “Romungro” as a dialectological category may be applied to the SC dialects (the broadest sense), to the non-Vendic SC dialects (a broad sense), or to the non-Vendic SC dialects of Hungary (a narrow sense): the broad Romungro would then consist of the narrow Romungro plus Slovakia’s so-called Ungriko (cf. Boretzky, this volume). Having put the SC dialects of northern Hungary and Slovakia together on account of their geographical and dialectological contiguity (cf. 1.1.), we have tentatively excluded the Romungro dialects of western and southwestern Hungary (“Western Romungro”) from the NSC group. Further research is needed to decide what are the dialectological links between Western Romungro on the one hand, and NSC on the other hand. It cannot be excluded that

² In this context it can be remarked that intermarriages between sedentary Roms and Vlax Roms in Slovakia are exceptional.

there is a high degree of linguistic contiguity between individual dialects of both groups, despite their geographic discontinuity.

The ethnic term *Poláko* / *Pojáko* mostly applies to a group of local Roms of a lower social status. The Šóka and Farkašda speakers refer to the local Vlaxs by the appellation *Vlaho* if they want to be polite, but they use *Pojáko* when speaking among themselves. For Zohra speakers, *Pojáki* are the poorer Roms living to the north (in Plavecký Štvrtok etc.), who either speak WSR, or who have shifted to Slovak. According to a speaker of Čachtice WSR variety, *poláko* designates an evil or mischievous person, i.e. it is not an ethnic term. Generally, the meaning of the term varies considerably from place to place and it may be subject to subjective interpretations. The term was borrowed from Serbocroatian *Poljāk* ‘Pole, Polish’ (cf. also Slovak *Poliak*), but the motivation of the semantic shift remains obscure.

There is a set of appellations which may be translated as ‘highlanders, people of the hills’, e.g. *hedická Roma* (cf. Hungarian *hegy* ‘hill’) used by the WSR speakers in Záhorie to refer to their NSC neighbours (see 1.3.), *vrxára* (from Slovak *vrchár* ‘highlander’) used by the CSR speakers around Zvolen for the NSC speakers of Zvolenská kotlina, or *horňáki* (from Slovak *horniak* ‘inhabitant of the northern parts of Slovakia’, cf. *horný* ‘upper’) used in Čachtice (for whom?). The semantic motivation is likely to be merely local (e.g. the NSC speakers in Záhorská nížina live closer to the range of Bílé Karpaty) since, generally, there are more lowlands in the southern parts of Slovakia (where NSC is spoken) than anywhere else in the country. The most numerous eastern Slovakia Roms are often called *vixodňára* (from Slovak *východniar* ‘inhabitant of the eastern Slovakia’) by other sedentary Roms.

Intermarriages with non-Roms, especially Hungarians, are not rare in southern Slovakia. The term for a non-Rom common to all Central dialects of Slovakia is *gádžo*; it is now familiar in Czech and Slovak, too. Some NC dialects also use *goro* (e.g. around Prešov, or in Čachtice), which is unknown in NSC. The term *prósto* is frequently used in Šóka and Farkašda, and *prosto* is attested in “Nógrád” Romani. Both Romani *prósto* / *prosto* and Hungarian *paraszt* (cf. Benkő 1993: no. 1117) come from Serbocroatian *prost* ‘simple, common, gross’; they both underwent the semantic development to ‘farmer, peasant’, and the meaning has been further extended in Romani. The term *gádžo* in the NC dialects possesses a similar polysemy: ‘non-Rom; farmer’. In Farkašda and Šóka Romani, the duality of the in-group vs. the out-group terms has been extended to the pair *báťa* / *bátťa* (from Hungarian *bátya* ‘older brother’ / the possessive from *bátyja*) vs. *báči* (from *bácsi* ‘uncle’), which are used after the first name of an older respectable man, e.g. *Jánošbátťa* is a Rom, while *Jánošbáči* is not.

If nationality is to be specified, a Slovak is called *Slovákos* (female *Slovenka* or *Slovačka*, country *Slovensko*, adjective *slovačiko* or *slovensko*) in the NC dialects of Slovakia. In NSC, including the Slovak-bilingual varieties and the Ct dialect of Prenčöv, the term *Servo* (female *Servičkiňa* or *Serviňa*, country *Serviko*, adjective *serviko*) is used. Originally it must have been used for Serbs or other South Slavs, which means that the NSC speaking Roms must have still had at least a passive knowledge of Serbocroatian during their first contacts with Slovaks: they must have been able to recognize the similarity of both Slavic languages. Today, the term *Servo* is used exclusively for Slovaks.³ A Hungarian is called *Ungro* (female *Ungričkiňa* or *Ungriňa*, country *Ungriko*, adjective *ungriko*) in NSC.⁴

Both designations for non-Romani nationalities, *Servo* and *Ungro*, can be used eliptically for the appellations *serviko Rom* and *ungriko Rom*. Especially the term *Ungro* is often employed (e.g. by the Klinóca Romani speakers) to refer to Roms who speak prevalently or exclusively Hungarian. Similarly, the term *ungriki čhib* may mean both ‘Hungarian’ and ‘Romani spoken by the so-called Hungarian Roms’.⁵ We have also recorded the appellation *gadžikáne Roma* for Očova Romani speakers, which was explained to mean that their language contains a high number of non-Romani (Slovak!) words.

The group identity is based on the awareness of primordial kinship relation, profession and the social status of the community, language, cultural attributes, and geographical proximity. Different dialect may be a sign of otherness, but the same dialect does not automatically assert the sameness. Asserting a different dialect is mostly based on lexical differences, real or stereotypicized paralinguistic phenomena (such as intonation, speed rate of speech etc.), and more rarely on grammatical features. Evaluative statements about language are, of course, individual. Nevertheless, there are some stereotypes: the nicest language is usually the speaker’s own dialect, while the number of (recognized, i.e. Slovak and/or Hungarian) loanwords in it may be a target of severe selfcriticism. Often, Vlach Romani is considered to be the purest language. Thus, aesthetic and puristic criteria may (but need not) be contradictory.

³ The speakers of Čaba Romani use the Hungarian term *Rác* for Serbs. Two or three generations back some communities of eastern Slovakia Roms were specifying their own group identity by the attribute *servika*. Since there is no indication that *Servos* was used to refer to a Slovak in these varieties, the term *servika* might be brought from Serbia already as an attribute.

⁴ The terms for Germans and Czechs in some NSC varieties have been brought from Serbocroatian (cf. 3.6. and 4.1.).

⁵ The elipsis may be transferred to the majority languages. For example, a Farkašda Romani speaker said in Czech: *pindrango je slovensky a pernango je maďarsky* ‘“pindrango” is in Slovak, while “pernango” is in Hungarian’, having in mind Romani dialects, her own and the Slovak-bilingual ESR, respectively. For the lexicophonetic difference between *pindrango* vs. *pernango* see 4.1.

1.3. Geographical and demographical data

Roms live in more than a half of all localities in Slovakia (Seznam 1969); this ratio remains roughly equal in most regions. Speakers of the Central Romani dialects clearly dominate in number in any part of Slovakia. Only in a few localities, such as Komárno, Šamorín (southeast of Bratislava), or Hájske (west of Nitra), the Vlach Roms prevail. This state of affairs, in principle, enables the dialectologists to construct a relatively dense net of localities where the Central Romani is spoken, and to abstract geographically concrete isoglosses. So far, this has been accomplished to a very limited degree, and there is a rightful apprehension that the dialectologists will have been outstripped by language shifts from Romani to Slovak or Hungarian in many places.

Disregarding the language shift areas or localities, the NSC Romani in Slovakia is spoken⁶ in the southern part of Záhorská nížina (Záhorie): e.g. in +Zohor (Romani *Zohra*), Lozorno (Romani *Lozorna*), Vysoká pri Morave (Romani *Hošetna*), Borinka (Romani *Pajštún*), Stupava (with Roms mainly from Borinka), and Devínska Nová Ves (Romani *Falúva*); in Podunajská nížina and the lower Váh River area: e.g. in +Podunajské Biskupice (Romani *Biskupica*), Trstice, Neded, +Vlčany (Hungarian *Farkasd*, Romani *Farkašda*), Žihárec (Hungarian *Zsigárd*, Romani *Žigárda*), Diáky, +Trnovec (Hungarian *Tarnóc*, Romani *Tarnóca*), +Selice (Hungarian *Sókszelőce*, Romani *Šóka*), and perhaps as far north as in Madunice; in Pohronská pahorkatina: e.g. in +Čaradice (Romani *Čaradica*) and Rybník; in parts of Krupinská planina and Zvolenská kotlina: e.g. in +Litava (also in Romani), +Kráľová (Romani *Kráľova*), +Budča (also in Romani), Môt'ová, Breziny, +Lieskovec (Romani *Lieskovca*), Zvolenská Slatina (Romani *Slatina*), Vígľaš, +Očová (Romani *Očova*), Hrochoť (Romani *Hroxofa*), Poniky (Romani *Poňika*), Detva, Hriňová, and originally also in Lešť (cf. Lípa 1963); and, finally, in Juhoslovenská kotlina and the western parts of Slovenské rudohorie: e.g. in Lučenec (Hungarian *Losonc*, Romani *Lošonca*), +Hradište (Romani *Hradišťa*), +Kokava (also in Romani), +Klenovec (Hungarian *Klinóc*, Romani *Klinóca*), and Hnúšť'a (also in Romani). The easternmost speakers of NSC Romani cannot dwell a long distance to the east of Rimavská Sobota (Hungarian *Szombat*, Romani *Sombata*). In Hungary, the NSC dialects are spoken in +Csobánka (Romani *Čobánka*) and +Piliscsaba (Romani *Piliščaba* or *Čaba*) in the Pilis mountains north of Budapest, and in +Nógrád.

⁶ According to Lípa (1965: 6), speakers of the NSC dialects live south of the line of Bratislava, Trnava, Komjatice, Levice, Zvolen, Tisovec, Filakovo. Lípa's (1965: 58) NSC research localities were Trstice, Neded,

Speakers of the NC transitional dialects live in the eastern part of Štiavnické vrchy, the western part of Krupinská planina and parts of Zvolenská kotlina: e.g. in Banský Studenec, +Prenčov (Romani *Prenčova*), Krupina (Hungarian and Romani *Korpona*), Hontianske Tesáre, Sása (also in Romani), Zvolen (Romani *Zoľoma* or *Zvoleňa*), and Sliač; and in the valleys of the Muráň River, e.g. in +Revúca (also in Romani) and +Chyžné (Romani *Xižna*), and of the Štítňik River, e.g. in +Roštár, +Kunova Teplica (Teplica for short), and Plešivec.

According to the 1968 census of the “Gypsy inhabitants” in Czechoslovakia (cf. Seznam 1969), there were about 165 thousand Roms in Slovakia. In the 1991 census, only about 80 thousand people declared Romani nationality. The real number of Roms in Slovakia is much higher, the realistic estimates being 250 to 500 thousand people. The great advantage of the 1968 census is that it is the only one ever carried out which registrates data from individual localities. Inferring from the data of the 1968 census, more than 50 thousand Roms lived in the area where the NSC dialects are spoken, and about 5 to 10 thousand Roms in the area where the transitional dialects are spoken. It is likely that a number of Roms were not identified as such, due to their linguistic assimilation (especially in southern Gemer many Roms have shifted to Hungarian) and/or partial social assimilation.

We estimate the number of contemporary NSC speakers in Slovakia at 80 thousand, and the number of speakers of the transitional dialects at 15 thousand. Moreover, there may be about 5 to 20 thousand Roms speaking the NSC dialects in Czechia. Podunajské Biskupice, Selice, and Klenovec belong to the localities with the greatest numbers of Roms in Slovakia (with about 1.5 thousand, 1 thousand,⁷ and 600 Roms, respectively). In the other localities we have recordings from (see 1.5.), the absolute number of Roms is lower.

In this paper, we call the individual NSC Romani varieties according to the Romani name of the locality where they are spoken, e.g. “Šóka Romani” or simply “Šóka” designates the variety spoken in Selice. As far as the NC (including the transitional) varieties are concerned, the official names are employed, e.g. Prenčov Romani.

1.4. Multilingualism

The NSC and transitional varieties we analyze (1.5.) have different contemporary contact languages. Strong influence, including phonetic and structural, is to be expected from the everyday language of the majority population of the locality (the first second language for the

Vlčany, Rybník, Lešť, and Klenovec. Localities from where we actually have some recordings or other material are indicated by a plus sign in the following text.

⁷ A third of the inhabitants of Selice are Roms.

local Roms), i.e. the local Hungarian dialects in Biskupica, Farkašda, Šóka, Tarnóca, Čobánka, Čaba, and Teplica Romani, and the local Slovak dialects in the other varieties. The former varieties will be called “Hungarian-bilingual” varieties, the latter “Slovak-bilingual”. All speakers’ passive knowledge of the standard majority languages of the respective states, i.e. of standard Hungarian in Csobánka and Piliscsaba and of standard Slovak elsewhere, is beyond any doubts. Their active knowledge varies in correlation with parameters such as education of the speaker, and is in more or less individually determined. Nevertheless, particularly the lexical influence of the standard languages on Romani (as well as on the local Hungarian or Slovak dialects) is present.

In the Hungarian linguistic area in Slovakia, newspapers in standard Hungarian are published, and children, including Romani children, may choose between Hungarian and Slovak elementary schools. The Slovak varieties used by Roms in these areas include standard features (acquired through school education and massmedia), nivelized non-standard features (acquired through contact with Slovaks of diverse dialectal background), and, sometimes, features of the geographically closest Slovak dialect (e.g. *mesác* ‘month, moon’ in the Slovak variety used by a Šóka speaker, cf. the standard *mesiac*). The Slovak variety used by Roms living in the Hungarian linguistic area in Slovakia largely corresponds to the variety used by local Hungarians, and it also includes Hungarian interferential features (e.g. the labialized pronunciation of *á* in Selice; see also 2.9.). Moreover, speakers of Biskupica Romani are reported to have been fluent in German (due to a significant pre-war German minority in Podunajské Biskupice); our short recording, however, does not indicate any grammatical German influence.⁸

The situation in Slovakia is complicated by the fact that the former Czechoslovakian political unity, which had also found its reflection in the bilingual TV broadcasting, brought about collective passive bilingualism (semilingualism): not taking into account their structural similarity, both (standard) Czech and (standard) Slovak are well understood by any longer-staying inhabitant of Czechia and Slovakia.⁹ Even those Roms living in Slovakia who have never been to Czechia for some time, and many of them have, can understand Czech. In fact, if we do not communicate with them in Romani, then we simply use Czech and they answer back in Slovak, as is the common praxis in the Czech-Slovak communication.

⁸ There are some immediate lexical loans from German, e.g. *niglo* ‘hedgehog’ from *n'Igel* < *ein Igel*.

⁹ New state of affairs, young children having problems in understanding ‘the other’ language, is coming into being only after the political split of Czechoslovakia in 1991.

Thus, as far as the multilingualism of Romani speakers in the non-Romani languages is concerned, the situations in Slovakia and Hungary are clearly different. All speakers of the Slovak-bilingual varieties have an active knowledge of Slovak, and a passive knowledge of Czech, all speakers of the Hungarian-bilingual varieties in Slovakia an active knowledge of Hungarian and Slovak, and a passive knowledge of Czech, while most Roms of Csobánka and Piliscsaba, apart from Romani, speak only¹⁰ Hungarian. On the other hand, it is quite possible, that speakers of Čobánka and Čaba Romani have an active knowledge of a Hungarian Lovári variety, since Lovári speakers clearly prevail in Hungary.¹¹ We know about a reverse case in Selice and Vlčany, where small groups of the local Vlach Roms also speak Šóka and Farkašda Romani, respectively.

1.5. Material

The linguistic material analysed prevalently comes from our sound-recordings of authentic dialogues or narratives, most of which were made in the 90's.¹² The main corpus has been supplemented by a few elicited sentences in Šóka and Klinóca Romani; when cited, these will be indicated. Most recordings were taken in Slovakia, in the localities where the native Romani dialects of our informants are spoken. The Farkašda Romani speakers, however, now live in Prague, where Roms speaking ESR prevail in number, and the Kokava and Litava Romani speakers live in Handlová and Zvolen, respectively, and their language is influenced by the local NC varieties. In the last case, it is often difficult to decide whether a certain feature is just an idiolectal phenomenon due to the non-native dialectal environment, or whether the whole variety in question has been influenced by the adjacent NC dialects; occasionally, the designation Litava(–Zvolen) will be used in order to remind that a non-NSC feature is present in the example.

Our data on Roštár Romani are based on a few texts published in the Czech journal of Romani studies *Romano džaniben*, while the facts about Hradíšť'a Romani have been inferred

¹⁰ However, their ancestors probably knew Slovak since a significant Slovak minority lived in the Pilis district in the past. Our recording from Piliscsaba encompasses a song with lyrics in Slovak (which evidently was not understood by the singer).

¹¹ Our recording of a Čaba Romani speaker contains a song produced by him, which has both Lovári melody and lyrics.

¹² We would like to express our gratitude to our friends, who spoke Romani with us. Thanks belong to Mr. Lakatoš and his family, Mr. Krajčovič and his family (Šóka Romani), Mrs. Weissová, Mrs. Fabiánová, Mrs. Pášová (Farkašda), Mrs. Horváthová and her family, Mr. Humpi (Klinóca), Mrs. Suchá (Očova), Mr. Berky (Lieskovca), Mrs. Kryštofová (Zohra), Mrs. Šarkéziová (Čaraďica), Mrs. Hakeľová (Kráľova), Mrs. Balogh (Čobánka), Mr. Boris (Čaba), Mr. Abrahám (Budča), Mr. Kováč (Litava), Mr. Radič and his wife (Kokava); Mr. Vlačuha (Prenčov), Mr. Tomi (Chyžné), Mr. Cibulfa (Revúca), and many others. We are also grateful to Norbert Boretzky for providing us with written material we would not have had otherwise.

from Banga (1993a, 1993b). The author, a native speaker of Hradíšť'a Romani, has spent a considerable part of his life in the ESR environment, and his texts contain a number of ESR features: only the decidedly non-ESR features have been taken into account in our analysis of Hradíšť'a Romani.

The main secondary source used is Romano Rácz' (1994) dictionary and brief grammar of the "Carpathian" Romani in Hungary. The variety described is no less generally located by the author than to the Carpathian Basin. Taking into account some linguistic features of the variety – e.g., the 3rd plural preterite palatalization (see 3.14.), or the copula forms (see 3.17.) – and their distribution in the other NSC dialects (see 4.2.), it seems likely that Rácz' Romani is spoken in northern Hungary, perhaps in Nógrád (the tentative location of the variety to Nógrád will be symbolized by quotation marks, i.e. "Nógrád").

Comparative notes on the NC dialects are based especially on Lípa's (1963) and Hübschmannová et al.'s (1991) descriptions of ESR, v. Sowa's (1887) description of the WSR variety of Trenčianske Teplice ("v. Sowa's Romani"), Puchmajer's (1821) description of the pre-war Bohemian Romani ("Puchmajer's or Bohemian Romani"), and a number of our unpublished analyses and observations. Sporadic comparative remarks may be found in Lípa (1965).

2. Phonology and morphophonology

2.1. Transcription and orthography

The sum of the simple consonant inventories of the Central Romani dialects in Slovakia is given in [1], together with the graphemes used in this paper; the consonants which do not exist in all varieties are given in parentheses. The velar nasal [ŋ], a distributional allophone of the dental nasal before velar stops, is not reflected in the graphemic inventory, e.g. *angle* [aŋgle] 'in front of, before'. Geminated and long consonants are mostly rendered by doubling the graphemes of their simple counterparts; the graphemes of geminates of the digraph consonants double only the first graph, e.g. *laččo* 'good' (see 2.7.), not **lačhcho*. Vocalic length is rendered by an acute, e.g. *šukár* 'beautiful'.

[1]

p	t	c	k	<i>p</i>	<i>t</i>	{ <i>t'</i> }	¹³ <i>k</i>
b	d	j	g	<i>b</i>	<i>d</i>	{ <i>d'</i> }	<i>g</i>
p ^h	t ^h	c ^h	k ^h	<i>ph</i>	<i>th</i>	{ <i>t'h</i> }	<i>kh</i>
m	n	ɲ	[ŋ]	<i>m</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>ñ</i>	
	ts	tʃ			<i>c</i>	<i>č</i>	
	dz	dʒ			{ <i>dz</i> }	{ <i>dž</i> }	
	ts ^h	tʃ ^h			{ <i>ch</i> }	{ <i>čh</i> }	
f	s	s ^j	ʃ	<i>f</i>	{ <i>s</i> }	{ <i>š</i> }	<i>š</i> { <i>x</i> }
v	z	z ^j	ʒ	<i>v</i>	{ <i>z</i> }	{ <i>ž</i> }	<i>ž</i> <i>h</i>
	l		ʎ		<i>l</i>	{ <i>l'</i> }	
r				<i>r</i>			
		j				<i>j</i>	

The orthography used here¹⁴ widely agrees with the standard orthography of ESR, whose grapheme inventory is based on the Slovak (and Czech) one. We deviate in two points: First, in the distinctive symbolization of long vowels (see 2.10. for vocalic quantity), which agrees with the praxis of native speakers of most Romani varieties in Slovakia (except for many ESR speakers). Second, we employ the grapheme *x*, i.e. not *ch* of the standard orthography, for the uvular / velar fricative. The reason is merely technical: In varieties which contain the voiceless aspirated prealveolar fricative [ts^h] (see 2.6.), the principle that an aspirate grapheme is compounded of the grapheme of the respective non-aspirate plus an *h* produces a conflict with the spelling of the uvular / velar as *ch*. A native speaker of Roštár Romani used the grapheme *c* for both the non-aspirated and the aspirated consonant, e.g. *cáco* [tsa:tso] ‘true’ as well as *caj* [[ts^haj] ‘Romani girl’. In this paper, we spell the last word as *chaj* as against *xal* ‘to eat’ etc.

Consonant aspiration is phonetically neutralized at the end of a word in Romani; in the standard ESR orthography as well as here, the graphemic symbolization of aspiration is retained in inflectible words, e.g. *jakh* [jak] ‘eye’ in analogy to *jakha* ‘eyes’. The same

¹³ We would like to advocate the graphemic symbolization of the palatal consonants by diacritics (i.e. *t'*, *d'*, *ñ*, and *l'*) rather than by the *j*-digraphs (i.e. *tj*, *dj*, *nj*, and *lj*). The latter convention might suggest a consecutive pronunciation of the two elements, which is not the case, and it does not differentiate palatals from postvotated dentals, e.g. both *šutarel* ‘to dry’ (< *šukjarel) and *šutjarel* ‘to make sour’ (< *šutl'arel < *šutljarel) e.g. in Šóka Romani would be spelled as *šutjarel*.

principle is employed concerning the sonority neutralization, which takes place in most Slovak-bilingual Romani varieties, e.g. *dad* [dat] ‘father’ in analogy to *dada* ‘fathers’ (but cf. [dad] in the Hungarian-bilingual varieties). Individual Slovak dialects differ according to whether the phoneme *v* is subject to the sonority neutralization; in many dialects, the phoneme has a vocalic character at the end of a syllable after a vowel. Romani dialects copy the rules of local Slovak, e.g. *gav* ‘village’ may be pronounced as [gaf], [gav], or [gaw], and *avka* ‘so’ as [afka], [avka], or [awka]. The orthography does not reflect the phonetic variation.

Although most Romani varieties of Slovakia lack any standardized orthography, the grapheme inventory and the rules used in texts written by speakers of these varieties do not differ considerably from those presented above. In some cases, the great similarity can be attributed to the influence of the few Romani publications, which are mostly written in ESR, in its standard orthography. Often, however, the graphemic form of the text is created independently by individual speakers, as the result of a transfer of the graphemic inventory and the orthographic rules from those contact languages in which the speakers are literate. In the Slovak linguistic area it is, of course, Slovak (cf. 1.4.).

What is most important is the fact that even the speakers of Šóka and Farkašda Romani, whose first second language (and often the language of education as well) is Hungarian (cf. 1.4.), employ graphemes and rules transferred from Slovak, the state language. Hungarian graphemes are rarely used, and if they are, then only in loanwords, cf. *serelmo* ‘sexual love’ written as *szerelmo* (cf. Hungarian *szerelem*), or *sógálinel* ‘serve, attend’ (borrowed from Hungarian dialectal *szógal*) written as *szolgálínel*¹⁵ (cf. standard *szolgál*). Even the Hungarian loanwords, however, are graphemically adapted in most cases, e.g. *utóšono* ‘last’ (from Hungarian dialectal *utósó*, cf. standard *utolsó*), *tecinen* ‘to like’ (cf. *tetszik*), *šoha* ‘never’ (cf. *soha*), *hod* ‘that’ (cf. *hogy*) etc. by the same writer. Thus it seems that the Slovak-based orthography is acceptable even for speakers of the Hungarian-bilingual varieties of Romani in Slovakia.

2.2.-2.7. Consonants

2.2. Palatals and palatalizations

The Romani dialects of Slovakia as well as the Slovak dialects either possess or once possessed a series of palatals. The existence of a series of palatal, i.e. not palatalized,

¹⁴ For the sake of compatibility, all examples taken from other sources have been transcribed, e.g. Rácž’ *chhāvo* as *čhāvo* ‘boy’, *oddyā* as *od’d’a* ‘there’, or *tyhil* as *t’hil* ‘butter’.

¹⁵ The graphemic form of the stem is clearly taken as a whole from standard Hungarian.

consonants is an areal feature also shared by Czech and Hungarian. The fullest version of the palatal series in Romani comprises the non-aspirated stops *t'*, *d'*, *ñ*, the aspirate *th*, and the lateral *l'*. In this section, the development of palatals in the NSC and the NC dialects of Romani will be discussed, as well as the loss of the palatal lateral in some varieties of both subgroups. (For assibilation of the palatal dentals in some NC dialects see 2.6.).

Palatal consonants may arise through palatalization of dentals, or velars; by a following vocalic *i*, or a consonantal yod; within roots, or before grammatical formants. The yod-palatalizations mostly occur at the end of a stem (i.e. they are grammatical), while the *i*-palatalizations are both grammatical and root-internal. The palatals in the NC dialects have a wider distribution than in the SC dialects. In the former, the vowel *i* has had in many cases a palatalizing effect on a preceding dental consonant, i.e. **ti* > *t'i*, **di* > *d'i*, **ni* > *ñi*, and **li* > *l'i*, while this sort of palatalization is only exceptional in the SC dialects. It is important that all NC dialects, including Bohemian Romani, shared the development. The root-internal *i*-palatalization of dentals has been most consequently accomplished with *l* and *n*, less often with *t*, and exceptionally with *d*.

Nearly all sequences of **li*, which had been mostly initial, changed to *l'i* in NC: cf. *likerel* 'to hold', *livinel* 'to shoot', *pal'ikerel* 'to thank' in ESR, *li'thi* 'tree' in Bohemian Romani, and *kol'in* 'breast', *li'džal* 'to carry, bring, lead', *li'kh* 'nit', *li'l* 'leaf', and *li'm* 'phlegm' in both. The word **klidi(n)* 'key' changed to *kl'i'di* / *kl'i'din* and later to *kl'igin* 'padlock' in some ESR varieties. Puchmajer (1821: 44) also gives *mil'iklo* 'bead' < **miliklo*, which must have arisen through a distal assimilation from *miriklo*, as it is retained in ESR (cf. also NSC *mirikli* / *mirikla* 'pearl'). The only two exceptions to the palatalization we know of are: *dilino* 'fool, stupid' and *linaj* 'summer' in ESR; nevertheless, Puchmajer has *linaj*, and both Puchmajer and v. Sowa give *dil'ino*. Some Slovakia varieties have proceeded further in a few cases, losing the initial consonant: **liłjom* 'I took' > *liłom* (thus in Bohemian Romani and in some NC dialects of Slovakia) > *iłom*, **lindra* 'sleep' > *lindra* > *indra*, and **lizdral* 'shiver, flicker' > **l'izdral* > *izdral*.

The nasal became palatal, for example, in Bohemian *cukňida* 'nettle', *xaňig* 'well', and *perňica* 'bed-blanket', or in ESR *ňilaj* 'summer', *raňik* 'rod, twig', *burňik* 'palm' (but cf. *burnek* in Bohemian Romani). The dialectal variants of the noun meaning 'summer' (see above) show that the metathesis must have taken place before the palatalization of the primary **nilaj*. Only exceptionally, the original **ne* changed to *ňe* in the NC dialects, e.g. in *ňerno* 'sober'.

The original **ti* changed to *tʲi*, for instance, in *pativ* ‘honour’, or in Bohemian *postin* ‘fur, pelt’. In other cases, mainly at the beginning of a word, it was either retained (e.g. *tiro* ‘your’), or assibilated to *ci* (e.g. *cirax* ‘shoe’, or *keci* ‘how many’ in all NC dialects). In the case of assibilation, it is possible to assume a development through **tʲi*, e.g. **tirax* > **tʲirax* > *cirax*. There is an isogloss within the NC dialects between *tikno* ‘small’ in Czechia and WSR, and *cikno* in CSR and ESR.¹⁶ We have found only one root-internal instance of the change **di* > *dʲi* in NC, namely **dives* > *dʲives* ‘day’.¹⁷ Other cases remained non-palatalized, e.g. *dikhel* ‘to see’, *dikhlo* ‘kerchief’, *dilino* / *dʲilino* ‘fool, stupid’, *dino* ‘given’, and Bohemian *diz* ‘chateau, castle’.

Now if one looks at the NSC dialects, it is obvious that there was no such a wide palatalization of **li*, **di*, and **ti* in roots, cf. e.g. *dilino*, *dive* / *dʲi* (< **dives*), *kolin*, *lil*, *lim*, *lindra*, *livinel*, *pativ* (unlike *patʲal* ‘to believe’ < **patʲal*), and *tikno*. An exception may be the variant *pajikerel* in “Nógrád” (but Šóka *palikerel*) ‘to thank’, while the verb *ikrel* ‘to hold’ is likely to come from an old **ikerel* (thus in Arli, cf. Boretzky & Igla 1994: 122), which is only ultimately connected to **likerel*, the source of NC *lʲikerel*. The noun *tʲirhaj* ‘shoe, high boot’ (< **tirxaj*, cf. NC **tirax*) is another instance of a positive palatalization in NSC. Only apparently palatalized is the masculine *dʲikeri* ‘mirror’ in Farkašda and “Nógrád” Romani from Hungarian *tükör*: it is likely that the Romani form comes from dialectal **gyűkör*¹⁸, i.e. that it has been borrowed already with a palatal.

On the other hand, most instances of the root-internal **ni* have been palatalized in most NSC varieties (e.g. in Klinóca, “Nógrád”, and Šóka): cf. the feminines in *ik* or *ig*, namely *burňik* ‘palm’, *haňig*¹⁹ ‘well’ (< **xanig*), *raňik*, “Nógrád” *čuňik* ‘whip’ / Farkašda *čuňňik* / Klinóca *čubňik* (all ultimately from **čubnik*), and also *ňilaj* ‘summer’. The Serbocroatism *pernica* ‘pillow’ has kept the dental in the Hungarian-bilingual varieties, while there is a palatal, e.g., in Klinóca *perňica*. For the indefinite pronoun *ništ(a)* as well as the indefinite prefix *ni-* see 3.12., for *ni* ‘nor, not even’ see 3.24.

¹⁶ The form **tʲikno* is not attested.

¹⁷ The ESR root *dʲindʲ-* as given in Hübschmannová et al. (1991: 90) may be a hypercorrect representation of an underlying *dʲindʲž-* (for the assibilation *dʲ* > *dʲž* see 2.6.). Cf. the cognate *zinzo* ‘high, long’ (possibly from **dʲindʲžo* or **dʲindʲzo*) in the Romani dialects of Cosenza and Calabria (Soravia & Fochi 1995: 121).

¹⁸ This form is known to exist in the Hungarian dialects of Váhovce (northwest of Vlčany and Selice) and in some places in the Pest and the Heves districts (Imre 1971: 250). The feminine *dikhəri* ‘little mirror’ (Hübschmannová et al. 1991: 89) in some varieties of Slovakia Romani may be a contamination of the Hungarianism *dʲikeri* etc. and the original verb *dikhel* ‘to see’.

¹⁹ The non-palatalized *hanig* exists in Farkašda Romani. According to a Farkašda speaker, the palatalized form was used in the neighbouring villages of Žihárec and Neded.

The root-internal *i*-palatalizations of dentals affected the Greek and Serbocroatian words in NC, e.g. *cukňida* ‘nettle’ and *perňica* ‘feather bed-blanket’, respectively. The palatal in the ESR Hungarism *livinel* ‘to shoot’ (< **livinel*, probably from *lő*) may be a result of phonological adaptation (cf. above for the low number of words with the root-internal sequence *li*) rather than historical palatalization. It is likely that Slovak is the source of the palatalization **li* > *lʲi* in NC as well as of a few instances of **ni* > *ɲi* in both the NC and the Slovak-bilingual NSC dialects, while the palatalizations **ti* > *tʲi*, **di* > *dʲi*, and most instances of **ni* > *ɲi* are obviously older.

Palatalization of velars by a vocalic *i* takes place only within roots and is lexically determined (restricted to some Asian words). The change **ki* > *tʲi* occurred in *finel* ‘to buy’, *tʲiral* ‘curd’, and *potʲinel* ‘to pay’ in most NSC varieties, but not in *kirvo* ‘godfather’, *kitʲi* ‘how many’ etc. Biskupica Romani, quite specifically, has *kinel*, *kiral*, but also *kirhaj* ‘shoe, high boot’ (< *tʲirhaj* < **tʲirxaj*, cf. above); the last word shows that the initial velar could be an innovation in Biskupica (i.e. *kinel* < *tʲinel* < **kinel*), rather than a simple retention.²⁰ The NC dialects further assibilated the ‘develar’ palatal in most cases, e.g. *cinel*, *ciral*, and Bohemian *pocinel* (vs. ESR *potʲinel*). The change **gi* > *dʲi* occurred in *dʲiv* ‘rye, corn’ (see also 2.6.) and *vodʲi* ‘soul’ in both the NC and the NSC dialects, while **gili* ‘song’ and its derivatives have been palatalized to *dʲili* (etc.) only in NSC. Any root-internal **khi* changed to *tʲhi* in Bohemian Romani, e.g. *litʲhi* ‘tree’, *matʲhin* ‘fly’, *tʲhil* ‘butter’, and *tʲhilava* ‘plum, fruit’. The palatal of this origin also exists in NSC, e.g. *matʲhi* (or *matʲha*), *tʲhil*, and *tʲhino* ‘tired’, while in most ESR dialects, either the original velar is retained, e.g. *khil*, *khilav*, and *khino*, or it has changed to a postalveolar affricate rather than a palatal, e.g. *mačhi*, *čhil*, and *čhilav*. In “Nógrád” Romani, but not anywhere else in NSC, there was a later depalatalization in *thino* (< **tʲhino* < **khino*).

Palatalization of dentals triggered by an immediately following grammatical *i* is extremely rare in NSC: it occurs in the nominative singular of the original masculine *páňi* ‘water’ (and, due to a morphophonological analogy, also in its diminutive *páňóri*), in the feminine vocative singular, e.g. *romňije* (of *romni* ‘wife’), and sometimes also in the singular of those athematic²¹ *i*-masculines which end in *n* in the source language (see 3.3.), e.g. Šóka *Tarzaňi*

²⁰ However, it is more likely that the initial velar in Biskupica *kinel* (etc.) is old, and that *tʲirhaj* changed to *kirhaj* because there was no other palatal-initial word in the variety. An interdialectal analogy could have played an important role, too: an initial palatal in the other NSC dialects (perhaps even in the immediately neighbouring ones) corresponds to the initial velar in Biskupica, i.e. Biskupica *kirhaj* ~ other NSC *tʲirhaj* in analogy to Biskupica *kinel* ~ other NSC *tʲinel*.

²¹ Athematic suffixes, formants, subclasses, types of inflection or derivation (etc.) in Romani are marked as to their non-originality. See also the individual sections (especially 3.2.-3.3., 3.6.-3.8., 3.14., and 3.18.).

‘Tarzan’, or *vásoňi* ‘canvas’ (beside *vásoni*, from Hungarian *váson*), but only the non-palatalized “Nógrád” *fácáni* ‘pheasant’ (from Hungarian *fácán*). The other inflectional or derivational formants which begin in *i* do not palatalize the preceding consonants.

In the NC dialects, on the other hand, dentals are palatalized by a majority of the immediately following formants which begin in *i*. The palatalization occurs: in the nominative singular of the few thematic *i*-masculines such as *páň-i* ‘water’ (as well as in its diminutive *páňóri*); in the singular of all athematic *i*-masculines (see 3.3.), e.g. *sapuň-is* ‘soap’, or *bacil-is* ‘bacillus’ (from Slovak *bacil*), including the vocative, e.g. *baroň-ina* (of *baroňis* ‘baron’); in the nominative singular of the *i*-feminines and the feminine *o*-adjectives (see 3.2. and 3.7., respectively), e.g. *romň-i* ‘wife’, *kal-i* ‘black [feminine]’; in the vocative of the *i*-feminines, e.g. *romň-ije* ‘wife!’; before the formants *-ipen* or *-iben* (see 3.6.), e.g. *sastipen* ‘health’ – only exceptionally, deverbal formations are not palatalized, e.g. *khandipen* ‘pong, stink, smell’ (of *khandel* ‘to stink’); before the formant *-ica* (see 3.6.), e.g. *lavuřica* ‘little violin’, or Bohemian *lurdřica* ‘female soldier’; before the suffix *-in* deriving names of fruit trees (see 3.6.), e.g. *ambrolin* ‘pear-tree’; before the formants *-iko* and *-ikáno* (see 3.8.), e.g. *džuvřikáno* ‘female, woman’s’; before the formant *-indos*, e.g. *pařřindos* ‘lying’; etc. The NSC dialects have the non-palatalized *romni*, *kali* (for *Klinóca* and *Čaraďica* see below), *sastipe*, *lavutica*, *džuvřiko* etc.

The adaptational verbal suffix *-in-* (see 3.18.) and its participle counterpart NC *-imen* / NSC *-ime* (see 3.14.) do not palatalize the preceding consonant neither in NSC, nor in NC, e.g. “Nógrád” *marakodinel* ‘to fight, brawl’, Farkašda *molinel* ‘to pray’, Litava *obetime* ‘sacrificed’, or *Klinóca kedime* ‘taken’, as well as ESR *tetinel* ‘to tattoo’ and *tetimen* ‘tattooed’. There is no palatalization in the NC formations derived by the formant *-iřřagos* (see 3.6.) from athematic verbs, e.g. *tetiřřagos* (from *tetinel* ‘to tattoo’), or *parančoliřřagos* (from *parančolinel* ‘to order, command’), while the derivations from thematic verbs get palatalized in the NC dialects, e.g. ESR *xinřiřřagos* ‘diarrhoea’ (from *xinel* ‘to shit’), or *uxaňřiřřagos* (from *uxanel* ‘to comb’).

The absence of palatalization before the nominative plural *-i* (of some athematic nouns, irrespective of gender, see 3.3.) is common to both dialect groups, cf. Farkašda *keresti* ‘crosses’, *kabáti* ‘coats’, *fali* ‘walls’, ESR *barati* ‘friends’, *čudi* ‘miracles’, or Bohemian *popeli* ‘ashes’ (*o*-masculines), and Farkašda *kotti* ‘music notes’, *iřřkoli* ‘schools’, ESR *kopani* ‘baths, tubs’, *labdi* ‘balls’, or Bohemian *buneti* ‘caps’ (feminines). If there is a palatal consonant before the nominative plural *-i*, then the palatal also exists in the base form, e.g. NSC *hedři* (of *hedřo* ‘hill’), or ESR *amoňi* (of *amoňis* ‘anvil’).

The yod palatalizes both preceding dentals and velars, in both NSC and NC: **tj* and **kj* > *tʲ*, **dj* and **gj* > *dʲ*, **nj* > *ɲ*, and **lj* > *lʲ*. When there was a yod after other consonants, it has been lost in the NC dialects, but usually retained after labials and the liquid *r* in NSC. In some NSC varieties, the yod has expanded through various morphological developments, so its reflexes may be found even after palatals or sibilants. The yotation and yod-palatalization may occur, for example, in the non-base forms of the thematic feminines (see 3.2.), in the nominative plural of the athematic masculines (see 3.3.), in the *al*-adjectives (see 3.8.), in the so-called synthetic passives (SPs), and in the factitives (see 3.19. and below). The original yod in the preterite forms is always reflected as palatalization, since the preterite stem always ends in a dental (cf. the participial markers *-d-*, *-t-*, *-l-*, *-n-*, *-il-* etc.; see 3.14.).

As has been mentioned, a yod existed in the SPs, e.g. **ternjovav* ‘I grow young’ and **ternjiljom* ‘I grew young’. In both the NC and the NSC dialects, the preceding dentals or velars were palatalized, e.g. *terňovav* and *terňilom* (for the raising *ov* > *uv* see 3.13., for *lʲ* > *j* see below). The preterite forms of the SPs which are derived from stems in a lateral contained two palatal laterals after the palatalization, e.g. *čalilom* (< **čaljiljom*) ‘I ate my fill, became satiated’ (from *čalo* ‘replete’). Both consonants have been kept in the NC dialects and in Klinóca Romani, while in Biskupica, Farkašda, Šóka, Čaba, Čobánka, and “Nógrád”, the first consonant has been dissimilated from the second one into the dental lateral. It is not clear whether the dissimilation took place after the delateralization (see below), or before it, i.e. whether the interlink between *čalilom* and *čalijom* was **čájjjom*, or **čáliilom*, respectively. The dental in the 3rd plural preterite is due to analogy with the other preterite forms, e.g. *čálile* ‘they ate their fill’, not **čájile* (< **čálile* < **čáljile*). Thus in the dialects with the positive dissimilation, there is an alternation between the palatal in the present, and the dental in the preterite (and the base word), e.g. *čájovav* ‘I eat my fill’ vs. *čalijom* ‘I ate my fill’ (and *čalo* ‘replete’).

The transitional dialects share the NC palatalizations, e.g. Prenčov *dʲive* ‘day’, *kijaráti* ‘evening’, *romňi* ‘wife’, Teplica *búči* ‘work’, *káji* ‘black [feminine]’, *puraňi* ‘old [feminine]’, Chyžné *búti* ‘work’, *terňi* ‘young [feminine]’. In the peripheral NSC Čaraďica Romani as well as in Klinóca, palatalizations of the NC type may occur in the nominative feminine, e.g. Čaraďica *me somaʼi tikňi* ‘I was small’, *asi običajni búti* ‘such an ordinary work’, or Klinóca *oja manušňi* ‘that woman’. Although the contact with the NC dialects must have been decisive, an important factor in creating the nominative feminine palatalization seems to be the resulting morphophonological uniformity of the inflectional stem (cf. above): cf. the non-palatalized Čaraďica *rátik* ‘at night’ (an adverb with no inflectional paradigm). In Klinóca

Romani, the nominative feminine palatalization may affect only the original nasal dental (in accord with the forms of the type *pheň* ‘sister’; see 3.2.), e.g. *romňi* (beside *romni*) ‘wife’, but only *nasvali* ‘ill [feminine]’, *budžándi* ‘clever [feminine]’ etc.

There is no yotation or palatalization in the feminine diminutives in NSC, e.g. Čaba *čiriklóri* (from *čirikli* ‘bird’), *melóri* (from *mel* ‘dirt’), *čerhenóri* (from *čerhen* ‘star’), Čobánka *phenóri* (from *phen* ‘sister’), or Farkašda and Klinóca *tiknóri* (from *tikni* ‘small, little [feminine]’). At least in Farkašda, the oblique forms are not palatalized either, e.g. the accusative singular feminine *tiknóra* (vs. the non-diminutive *tikňa*). In the NC dialects, the feminine diminutives are palatalized as if they were inflectional forms of the base noun or adjective, e.g. *raklóri* (from *rakli* ‘non-Romani girl’), *pheňóri* (from *phen* ‘sister’), or *terňóri* (from *terňi* ‘young [feminine]’); this type of palatalization is due to a morphophonological analogy, i.e. there was no historical yod (e.g. no **phenjori*).²²

In some Romani varieties, both NC and NSC, the palatal lateral has undergone further developments: either it has been depalatalized into a dental (i.e. **l' > l*), or it was delateralized into the palatal approximant (i.e. **l' > j*). In both cases the new sounds merged with existing phonemes. The depalatalization took place in the NC dialects of the extreme west of Slovakia, e.g. in Šaštín, but not in Čachtice, or Trenčianske Teplice, while the delateralization occurred in the NSC varieties of Zohra, Biskupica, Farkašda, Šóka, Čaradica, and “Nógrád”, in the Et dialects of Teplica and Roštár, and in some southern varieties of ESR, e.g. in Košice. The NSC dialects of Litava, Budča, Lieskovca, Očova, Kokava, Klinóca, the transitional dialects of Prenčov and Revúca, and the majority of the NC dialects have retained the palatal lateral. In the Et dialect of Chyžné, the delateralization is just in process, e.g. clear *gélom* and clear *géjom* ‘I went’ are used alternatively, and in Čobánka and Čaba the lateral can now be heard only exceptionally and in careful pronunciation.

In many cases it is possible to find a positive synchronic correlation between the state in Romani and in the local Slovak or Hungarian dialects. Three types of correlation must be distinguished: First, both languages in contact retain the palatal lateral, e.g. Litava, Lieskovca, Očova, Kokava, and Klinóca Romani, the transitional dialects of Prenčov and Revúca, and many CSR and ESR varieties on the one hand, and the local Slovak on the other hand. Second, both languages lack the palatal lateral sharing the outcome of its change, e.g. in

²² The inconsistent palatalization in Puchmajer, e.g. *pheňóri*, *kanglóri* (from *kangli* ‘comb, crest’), but non-palatalized *džuklóri* (from *džukli* ‘bitch’) etc., may be a technical error. Unlike ESR, diminutives of all *in*-nouns (see 3.2.) were probably (judging from the consistent data) non-palatalized in Bohemian Romani, e.g. *arminóri* (from *armin* ‘cabbage’), *mathinóri* (from *mathin* ‘fly’), or *papinóri* (from *papin* ‘goose’). It is possible that the morphophonological analogy was just in the process of development in the 19th century.

Šaštín, where both Romani and Slovak $*l' > l$, and in Biskupice, Vlčany, and Selice, where both Romani and Hungarian $*l' > j$. Third, both languages in contact lack the palatal lateral without sharing the outcome of its change, e.g. in Zohor, Čaradice, Teplica, and Roštár, where Romani $*l' > j$, but Slovak $*l' > l$. There are a few types of negative correlation, too: First, Romani retains the palatal lateral, but the contact dialects have lost it, e.g. in Czechia, Čachtice, Trenčianske Teplice, Budča, where Czech (a long time ago) and Slovak $*l' > l$, and Pilis, where Hungarian $*l' > j$. Second, the palatal lateral has been lost in Romani, but kept in the contact dialect, e.g. in “Nógrád” or in the surroundings of Košice.

Some of the correlations are quite interesting: The second type of positive correlation leaves open the possibility that the changes in both languages took place simultaneously.²³ The first type of negative correlation could be interpreted as follows: the speakers of Romani have not used the l' -less Slovak or Hungarian dialect long enough for the sound to be lost in Romani. This interpretation, however, should not be applied without caution: for example, it is likely that Čachtice Romani has kept the palatal lateral for at least 400 years²⁴ in the l' -less Slovak environment. And finally, the negative correlation of the second type either assumes a recent movement of the l' -less Romani speakers into their contemporary domiciles (not very likely), or it requires an internal rather than contact explanation. Another contingency is a recent influence of standard Hungarian in “Nógrád”, and of the l' -less Hungarian dialects in the surroundings of Košice.

2.3. Loss of the uvular fricative

In the NC dialects, the uvular x is phonologically distinct from the laryngeal h . NSC has lost this distinction by changing the original uvular into the laryngeal in most cases, e.g. $*xal > hal$ ‘to eat’, $*xaljoval > ha'ol / hajol$ ‘to understand’, $*xandžol > handžol$ ‘to itch’, $*xanig > hañig / hanig$ ‘well’, $*xarno > harno$ ‘low, short’, $*xev > hév$ ‘hole, jail’, $*xoli > hóli$ ‘anger’, $*xolov > \text{“Nógrád” } holón \text{ or } *xolev > \text{Farkašda } holév$ ‘trousers’, $*xudel > \text{“Nógrád” } hudel$ ‘to get’, $*xuxur > huhur$ ‘mushroom’, $*xulaj > hulaj$ ‘housekeeper, farmer’, $*xumer > humer$ ‘dough’, $*xurdo > hurdo$ ‘minute, small’, $*soljxarel$ (cf. NC *solaxarel*) $> sol'harel / sojharel$ ‘to swear, get married’, $*tirxaj$ (cf. NC *tirax*) $> t'irhaj$ ‘shoe, high boot’ etc. The verb

²³ The depalatalization in Western Slovak occurred in the 14th or 15th century. If the change $*l' > l$ in Šaštín Romani is that old, the palatalizations of dentals in the NC dialects must be even older. The delateralization in some Hungarian-bilingual NSC varieties, on the other hand, is surely a recent development, i.e. not simultaneous to Hungarian.

²⁴ From the 16th century on, there is a continuity of (quite specific) surnames of Čachtice Roms in historical sources.

**xoxavel* ‘to tell lies’ changed to *hohavel* (retained e.g. in Klinóca), and was later dissimilated to *hovavel* in “Nógrád” and Farkašda.

The change of the uvular into the laryngeal also occurred in the Vedic dialects, and it must have been a common innovation of all SC dialects, since they share the exceptions in the outcome of this change: **x* followed by the dental *t* ultimately resulted in an *s*, e.g. the general **baxt* > *bast* ‘luck’ and its derivatives, and the less common **moxto* > *mosto* ‘chest, coffin’ and **poxtan(o)* > *postan(o)* ‘linen, cloth’.²⁵ Since the original laryngeal also changed to the sibilant before *t*, e.g. Farkašda *pisti* (< **pihti*) ‘jelly, liver-wurst’, or *plasta*²⁶ (< **plahta*) ‘bed-sheet’, it is sure that the uvular first changed to the laryngeal, e.g. **baxt* > **baht*, which was only later assimilated to the following dental, e.g. **baht* > *bast*. The original **oxto* ‘eight’ resulted in *ofto* in most SC dialects, probably by analogy with *efta* ‘seven’ (Halwachs 1996: 44); this change may be independent of the change **x* > *h* | –*t*, cf. *ofto* in Arli (Boretzky & Igla 1994: 200) and *ohto* in some Romungro dialects in Hungary (Vekerdi 1983: 119).

In the cases mentioned above the NC dialects retain the uvular, cf. *xal*, (*a*)*xal’ol*, *xandžel* / *xandžol*, *xañig*, *xarno*, *xev*, *xól’i*, *xólov*, *xudel*, *xuxur* (in some varieties), *xulaj*, *xumer*, *xurdo*, *solaxarel*, *cirax* (< **tirax*), *xoxavel*; *baxt*, *moxto*, *poxtan*, and *oxto*. All NC dialects, moreover, possess a few words with a uvular which has arisen from the laryngeal, e.g. *buxlo* ‘wide’ (< **buhlo*). ESR, in addition, has *kaxñi* ‘hen’ (vs. Bohemian *kahñi*, both from **kahni*), *xar’as* ‘smith’ (vs. Bohemian Romani, WSR, and CSR *har’as*), and *xasna* ‘use, profit’ (vs. Puchmajer’s *hasno* ‘apt, useful’). In these cases, NSC naturally retains the laryngeal, cf. *bulho* (metathesized from **buhlo*), “Nógrád” *kanhi* or Farkašda and Šóka *kañhi*²⁷, *har’a*, and *hasna*, respectively. The *h* in “Nógrád” *hušnel* ‘to knead’ is prothetic, cf. *ušnel* in Farkašda (and in Arli; Boretzky & Igla 1994: 294), and ESR *ušanel*.

The impetus for the loss of the phoneme *x* in NSC could be the absence of the uvular or velar voiceless fricative in Serbocroatian and Hungarian. The fact that the changes are common to all SC dialects speaks rather for the earlier, Serbocroatian influence.²⁸ It is very likely that the SC speakers stayed a longer time in the South Slavic linguistic area than the

²⁵ Both nouns are attested in Roman (Halwachs et al. 1996: 77, 80). Neither of them is given by Vekerdi (1983) or Rácz (1994), or attested in NSC. Both words are extinct in Farkašda Romani. Cf. also v. Sowa (1887: 26).

²⁶ The noun *plaxta* ‘canvas’ in Budča Romani is borrowed from Slovak. Kráľova Romani uses both *plasta* (< **plahta*) and *plaxta*.

²⁷ Both the noun *kanhi* and its adjective *kañhalo* in “Nógrád” Romani arose through metathesis, cf. the older **kahni* and **kahñalo* (< **kahnjalo*). At the same time it is clear that the metathesis took place after the palatalization. In Farkašda and Šóka, the noun has been probably palatalized by an analogy with the adjective.

NC speakers (see also 4.1.): the NC dialects have not been influenced as much as the SC dialects on the phonological level. On the other hand, the relatively long stay – judging from the high number of lexical Hungarisms – of the NC dialects and especially of ESR in Hungarian linguistic area has not been reflected in the loss of *x*.

On the contrary, there seem to have occurred the reverse change **h > x* in ESR. Two hypotheses are possible concerning the uvular, for example, in the word *ñuxos* ‘smell’ (from Serbocroatian *njuh*). First, the change **h > x* occurred before the word was borrowed, so there was no laryngeal in the phonological system of the predecessor of ESR, and the loanword was phonologically adapted. Second, the loanword was directly affected by the change. In any case, all (or almost all²⁹) Hungarisms and all Slovakisms retain their *h* in ESR, e.g. *harangos* ‘bell’, or the regional *hetvin* ‘Monday’ (from Hungarian *harang* and *hétfő*, respectively), and *holubos* ‘pidgeon’ (from Slovak *holub*). Sometimes, an *h* is prothetized³⁰, e.g. *had’os* (beside *vad’os*) ‘bed’, or *husinel* ‘to swim’ from Hungarian *ágy* and *úszik* (stem *úsz-*), respectively.

The laryngalization **x > h* and the assimilation **h > s | -t* in the NSC dialects affected the Asian, Greek (cf. *hóli* ‘anger’, or *pisti*³¹ ‘jelly’), and South Slavic loanwords (cf. older *holov* / *holév* ‘trousers’, or *plasta* > **plahta* ‘bed-sheet’ from Serbocroatian *plahta* ‘canvas, bed-sheet, cloth’), but not the Hungarian and Slovak ones. New *x* (this time velar), including the cluster *xt*, is freely borrowed within Slovakisms, and it is not phonologically adapted even in the Hungarian-bilingual varieties of Slovakia. The transitional dialects of Prenčöv, Chyžné, and Teplica retain the distinction between the uvular and the laryngeal (cf. 4.2.).

2.4. Final *s*-lessness and final *n*-lessness

There is a number of grammatical forms which lack a word-final *s* in the SC dialects if compared to their equivalents in many other dialects, including the NC: a) the nominative

²⁸ There is no connection between the change in NSC and a similar one (cf. **mucha > muha* ‘fly’) in the Slovak dialects of Abov and Spiš, which form a strip connecting the areas without the distinction of the velar vs. the laryngeal fricative (Polish and Hungarian).

²⁹ The ESR noun *xasna* ‘use, profit, benefit’ is likely to be borrowed from Serbocroatian *hasna*, but Hungarian *haszon* (non-base stem *haszn-*) cannot be excluded as a source. The noun also exists as *hasna* in NSC.

³⁰ The *h*-prothesis may originate in local Slovak dialects. In any case, some Slovakisms contain it, e.g. *huzlos* ‘knot’ from Slovak *uzol* (stem *uzl-*), or, more likely, from dialectal *huzel* or *huzol*. The laryngeal in the original verb *hazdel* ‘to lift’ in most ESR varieties is likely to be of prothetic origin, too, i.e. *hazdel* < **azdel* < *vazdel* (in some ESR varieties as well as in NSC) < **vast del* ‘to give a hand’.

³¹ The cognate forms *pehtija* or *pextija* ‘jellied meat’ exist in Serbian Kalderaš (Boretzky & Igla 1994: 212), *pexteä* ‘brawn in jelly’ < **pextija* (Gjerdman & Ljungberg 1963: 310) in Swedish Kalderaš, *pehće* ‘jellied meat’ in Bosnian Gurbet, and *pexti* ‘jelly’ in some varieties of ESR. The Kalderaš forms must be borrowed from Serbian *pihtije* ‘a kind of jellied meat’ which in turn comes from Turkish *pıhtı* ‘clot, coagulum’ (cf. Boretzky & Igla 1994: 212), a loanword from Greek or Persian. The ESR *pexti* (< **pehti*) and NSC *pisti* (< **pihti*) are likely to be direct Graecisms (cf. Modern Greek *pixti* ‘jelly’, derived from *pixtos* ‘thick’, which can be traced back to the Old Greek *piktos* ‘fixed, joined’).

singular of the athematic masculine nouns, e.g. *fôro* ‘town’, *lavutári* ‘musician’, *papu* ‘grandfather’, or *hart’a* ‘smith’; b) the accusative singular of all masculine nouns, e.g. *dade* (of *dad* ‘father’), *rakle* (of *raklo* ‘non-Romani guy’), *lavutári*, *papu*, and of the 3rd person masculine pronoun: *le* ‘him’; c) the accusative of the reflexive singular pronoun: *pe*; d) deadjectival adverbs, e.g. *románe* ‘in Romani’; and e) the 3rd person singular preterite form, e.g. *kerd’a* ‘s/he did, made’.

In some cases, however, a word-final *s* has been retained: a) in the base form of some lexemes, e.g. *mas* ‘meat, flesh’, or *balevas* ‘bacon’; b) in the 2nd singular and the 1st plural present forms of most verbs (see 3.13.; for the copula suffixes see 3.17.), e.g. *keres* ‘you do, make’ and *keras* ‘we do, make’; and c) in the accusative form of *ko* ‘who’ and its derivatives: *kas*, *valakas* etc. (see 3.12.).

Because the final *s*-lessness is not automatic (i.e. fully predictable on phonological grounds), even if one restricts the scope to grammatical formants, it must be considered a phenomenon of morphology in the SC dialects (unlike Arli). Historically, however, such a wide range of final *s*-lessness could not have appeared but through a general phonetic change: *s* | -# > **h* > ∅ (as in Arli).

The outcomes of the phonetic change have been removed by a morphological change in the base form of *mas*, *balevas* etc. to yield intraparadigmatic uniformity of the stem. In a few lexemes, however, such a morphological analogy did not appear: *dive* ‘day’ (< **dives*), *va* ‘hand’ (< **vas*), and *gra* ‘horse’ (< **gras*). The non-base stems of the nouns were and still are *dives-* (see 3.2.), *vast-*, and *grast-*, respectively. Was it the existing stem non-uniformity of the last two nouns (i.e. **gras-* ~ *grast-* and **vas-* ~ *vast-*) that attracted new irregularity, or is the explanation to be sought in a cultural importance of these terms?³² What is clear is that the change *st* | -# > **s* (through which *vast* became **vas* etc.) must have occurred before the loss of the uvular (cf. 2.3.), and before the metathesis of *sastr-* ‘iron’ to *trast* in NSC (see 4.1.).

It is necessary to make a note on the final *s*-lessness of the athematic masculines: Both dialect groups, the SC and the NC, agree in that all subclasses of these nouns possess the same general type of the nominative singular formant, i.e. either *-V* in all subclasses (*-o*, *-i*, *-a*, *-u*), or *-Vs* (*-os*, *-is*, *-as*, *-us*), respectively. This is in no way necessary³³ and it is impossible to say whether there was a general *-Vs* pattern in the SC dialects before the phonetic loss of the final *s*.

³² Cf. Gurbet *va* ‘hand’ and *gra* ‘horse’.

[2]

	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
many NC (incl. Spiš and Šariš ESR)	+	+	+	+	+
many ESR	+	+	+	+(±)	±
Ct Prenčov	–	+	±	±	–
Et Teplica	–	+	–	–	–
Et Roštár	–	±	–	–	–
Et Chyžné and Revúca	–	–	–	–	–
NSC	–	–	–	–	–

No NSC variety deviates from the consistent final *s*-lessness in the forms in question (the minus sign in [2] means the *s*-lessness, the plus sign the presence of a sibilant). On the other hand, there is a number of NC dialects in Slovakia which have some *s*-less forms. Most WSR and CSR varieties as well as the Spiš and Šariš ESR are consistent in having the sibilant in the formants in question; perhaps they form a continuous area. The most common *s*-lessness is in the 3rd person singular preterite form [e]: it is present in all transitional dialects, and facultatively in many ESR varieties. Less commonly, a lexically determined *s*-lessness occurs in the deadjectival adverbs [d] in some ESR varieties (e.g. *mište* ‘well’).

The most important delimiting feature of the NC transitional dialects is the final *s*-lessness in the nominative singular of the athematic masculines [a]; in Prenčov and Revúca, also the thematic *dīve* (< **dīves*) ‘day’ is attested. The dialects of Chyžné and Revúca are almost totally *s*-less (with the NSC exception of *kas* ‘whom’ etc.); however, Chyžné retains the sibilant in *dīves*. The Teplica dialect keeps the sibilant in the accusative singular of masculine nouns and of the 3rd person masculine pronoun [b], e.g. Teplica *jekh ole rakjórendar igen kamelaš mire phraleš* ‘one of those guys liked my brother very much’, *u šar leš i daj dikhja* ‘and as mother saw him’, but not in the reflexive pronoun [c], e.g. *i vojna pe tiš škoncindža* ‘the war also finished’ (cf. the Slovak reflexive *skončit’ sa* ‘to finish’). The *s*-lessness of the accusative singular of masculines is only variant in the neighbouring Roštár dialect, e.g. Roštár *o chavé amen šte but, maj na šakoneš dešupánc* ‘we had a lot of children, nearly fifteen each’ (vs. *mang vaš amenge tire phrale, le gadžengere Devle* ‘implore your brother,

³³ As is evident from the fact that the formant *-os* is much less dialectally restricted than the (unstressed) *-is*: Bugurdži, Drindari, Erli and some other Romani dialects (cf. Boretzky & Igla 1991: 25-32) possess the former in the absence of the latter.

the God of non-Roms, on behalf of us'). In Prenčov Romani, the *s*-lessness of the reflexive is variant, e.g. *sar pe vičinel jov?* 'what is his name?' vs. *palek pes talind'a le Romenge andal o fóro jekh bálo* 'afterwards a ball offered itself to the Roms from the town', while the *s*-lessness of the adverbs seems to be lexically determined, e.g. *báres* 'very' vs. *láche* 'well'.

The final *s*-lessness in the transitional NC dialects is due to their contact with the NSC dialects. The *s*-less accusative singular of masculine nouns and the 3rd person pronoun [b] implies the *s*-less accusative singular of the reflexive [c], but not vice versa (cf. also Kalderaš): the inflectional forms of the reflexive pronoun (cf. 3.10.) are more easily borrowed than the forms of other nominals. The sibilant in the accusative singular (except for the reflexive) [b] is the last to be given up in the contact situation, while the sibilant in the nominative singular of the athematic masculines [a] and in the 3rd singular preterite [e] loses most easily. The *s*-less 3rd singular preterite in some NC dialects is likely to have developed independently of NSC, and it is possible that in the Et dialects, it was present already before the contact with the NSC dialects.

The final *n*-lessness in the NSC dialects is much more restricted than the final *s*-lessness: it occurs in the athematic participle suffix *-ime* (vs. NC *-imen*; see 3.14.) and in the abstract noun suffixes *-ipe* etc. (vs. NC *-ipen* etc.; see 3.6.). The nasal does not usually get lost elsewhere (e.g. in the accusative of the 3rd person plural pronoun *len* 'them'; neither in the nominative, nor in the accusative of *amen* 'we' and *tumen* 'you[-Pl]'; etc.). Only rarely, perhaps as a fast-speech variant, the plural *le* 'them' occurs in Farkašda Romani. The Hungarian particle *igen* 'yes, very' can be *n*-less in Šóka, e.g. *tecinel mang'adí čhib IGE, važdár mer IGE šúži hi* 'I like this language very much because it is very pure'. The vocative plural suffix shows a reverse relation between the dialect groups, the *n*-less form being present in the NC dialects (see 3.1.). The transitional dialects exhibit the NC state, e.g. Prenčov *raňimen áčhi'om* 'I stayed wounded', Revúca *manušiben* 'humanity', or Chyžné *máriben* 'war'.

2.5. So-called aspiration (**s* < *h*)

According to the phonological responses of the original *s*, Romani dialects have been classified into the so-called *s*-dialects and *h*-dialects. Central Romani belongs to the latter group. Any original intervocalic *s* in a grammatical formant was aspirated to a laryngeal: in the instrumental singular forms, e.g. *pheňaha* (< **phenjasa*) of *phen* 'sister', or *romeha* (< **romesa* < **romessa*) of *rom* 'husband'; in the 2nd singular and the 1st plural future and imperfect forms, e.g. *džaha* 'you/we will go' (< **džasa*), or NC *džahas* and SC **džahahi*

‘you/we went’ (< **džasas* and **džasasi*, respectively); and, finally, in the SC imperfect suffix itself, i.e. *-ahi* < **-asi* (see 3.13.). The aspiration produced the morphophonological alternation *s* ~ *h* in some cases, and the complex morphophonological relations in the masculine instrumental singular forms: cf., for example, the different underlying forms of the surface formant *-aha* in the masculine *bandistaha* (of *bandistas* / *bandista* ‘a member of a music band’) and in the feminine *cipaha* (of *cipa* ‘skin, complexion’), namely {a}{s}{sa} and {a}{sa}, respectively. (For the change **s* > *c* | *n*–, e.g. **mansa* > *manca* ‘with me’, see 2.6.).

The state of affairs produced by the aspiration has remained intact in the NC dialects and in the Vedic dialects. In NSC, however, the imperfect forms contain the sibilant, e.g. *džasahi* ‘you/we went’, not *džahahi* as in the Vedic dialects. At first sight, it looks as if NSC has passed just half of the way between the original state with the two *s*’s and the Vedic state with the two *h*’s. The only plausible explanation, however, is that NSC went further: only after both intervocalic sibilants changed to the laryngeals, the first of them has been dissimilated from the second one. The resultant consonant of the dissimilation was *s* again, due to an analogy with the present forms of the same person and number, e.g. with *džas* ‘you/we go’.

At the time of linguistic uniformity of the NSC dialects, the future forms contained the laryngeal, e.g. *džaha* ‘you/we will go’. Only as a recent development in Šóka and Farkašda Romani, the future forms of the type *džasa* can be used along with *džaha*, e.g. Šóka *te laha levinesa, furt trafinesa* ‘if you will shoot with it [a gun], you will always hit the mark’ vs. *vakereha téle, kana ánde rukkolind’al lukestoske* ‘you will tell [the story about] when you enlisted as a soldier’. The influence of local Vlax, which is an *s*-dialect, cannot be excluded, although the variants of the type *džasa* can be conveniently viewed as another step towards an elimination of the *s* ~ *h* alternation, i.e. towards uniformity of the personal suffixes in question.

Moreover, there is one verb whose 2nd singular / 1st plural future form contains the sibilant obligatorily, and not only in Šóka and Farkašda, but supposedly in all NSC dialects (attested also from Klinóca) as well as in Vedic: only *hasa* ‘you/we will eat’ exists, not **haha*. This individual case supports the dissimilative hypothesis presented above. Again, it is the laryngeal of the person-and-number suffix which dissimilates: it dissimilates into an *s* due to the analogy with the present forms³⁴, and it dissimilates from the stem laryngeal. This means that the dissimilation could not take place before the laryngealization **x* > *h*.

³⁴ It is the potential of this morphological analogy which makes the dissimilation possible: two laryngeals in a lexical stem do not dissimilate, e.g. *huhur* ‘mushroom’.

A few *s*-initial function words have undergone the aspiration in Czechia Romani as well as in most WSR varieties, e.g. *har* ‘how’ (< **sar*), or *havo* ‘what, which’ (< **savo*), but the non-aspirated *savóro* ‘all, every’. Unlike the inflectional forms of the *s*-initial impersonal pronoun *so* ‘what’ (see 3.9.), the original dative form, which was lexicalized as a function word in a number of Romani dialects, has been aspirated in Czechia Romani (cf. Puchmajer 1821: 25, 40) and WSR: *hoske* ‘why’ (vs. the inflectional dative *soske*); the Čachtice Romani equivalent is *vahoske* ‘why’ (< **vasoske* < **vaš soske* ‘for what’). The aspirated 3rd person past copula form *has* (< *sas*) and/or *ehas* (< **esas*) has a much wider geographical distribution than the other aspirated function words: it is also used in CSR and variantly in some northern ESR varieties. No *s*-initial function words have been aspirated in NSC.

2.6. Sibilants and assibilation of palatals

The inventory of sibilants [3] of most NC dialects in Slovakia contains prealveolar fricatives [a], postalveolar fricatives [c], prealveolar affricates [d], and postalveolar affricates [e]. In the extreme east of Slovakia, e.g. in Humenné, palatalized sibilants [b] have been borrowed into Romani from the local Slovak dialects: they mostly exist in loanwords, e.g. *šenos* ‘hay’ from dialectal *šeno*, but they also result from a series of phonetic developments in inherited words. First, any prealveolar or postalveolar fricative sibilant changes to a palatalized one before a palatal *ʎ* or *ň*, e.g. *bešʎa* (< **bešʎa*) ‘s/he sat’ vs. *bešle* ‘they sat’. Second, **šʎ* > **šč* > **šč* > *š*, e.g. **ušʎav* > *ušav* ‘I get up’ (Lípa 1965: 14). The cluster **šʎ* has also changed to *šč* in some WSR varieties (v. Sowa 1887: 27), in accord with the absence of *šʎ* in local Slovak dialects, but the change does not produce a new phoneme there.

[3]

	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
most NSC	<i>s z</i>		<i>š ž c</i>		<i>č dž čh</i>
Zohra	<i>s z</i>		<i>š ž c</i>		<i>č čh</i>
most NC	<i>s z</i>		<i>š ž c dz</i>		<i>č dž čh</i>
Humenné etc.	<i>s z</i>	<i>ś (ž)</i>	<i>š ž c dz</i>		<i>č dž čh</i>
Puchmajer ³⁵	<i>s z</i>		<i>š ž c dz</i>		<i>č dž</i>
Štítnik			<i>š ž c dz ch</i>		<i>č dž</i>

The aspirated postalveolar affricate *čh* has changed to non-aspirated *č* in Bohemian Romani and, according to v. Sowa (1887: 27), in the WSR variety of Trenčianske Teplice. However, we know positively that the aspirate does exist in many varieties of western Slovakia, including nearby Čachtice.³⁶ It seems that no Central Romani dialect in Slovakia has lost the aspiration of this phoneme. For the change **čh > ch* see below.

The voiced prealveolar affricate *dz* exists as a rare phoneme in the NC dialects. It occurs initially in three old etyma: *dzar* ‘hair of body’ and its derivatives (also in Bohemian Romani), *dzeveli* ‘scrambled eggs’, and in the archaic *dzet* (beside *džet*) ‘oil’. Further it may occur only in borrowings from Slovak, e.g. *sadza* ‘soot’, and especially from Eastern Slovak dialects, where the older palatal *dʲ* has been assimilated to *dz*, e.g. ESR *dzivo* ‘wild’ from *dzivý* (standard Slovak *divý*). The old etyma contain the prealveolar fricative in most Romani dialects, i.e. *zar*, *zeveli*, *zet*, and the postalveolar affricate in some others, i.e. *džar*, *džet*. The prealveolar affricate in these words in the NC dialects must be old, and it cannot be explained by a regular change of initial *z* to *dz* (cf. *zumavel* ‘to try, experience’, or Bohemian *zeň* ‘saddle’), nor by an old regular change of initial *dž* to *dz* (cf. *džal* ‘to go’ and many others). In NSC, only the noun *zár* ‘hair of body, coat’ (< **dzar*) is attested. The consonant *dz* may be present only in borrowings from Slovak in the Slovak-bilingual varieties. The absence or presence of the phoneme *dz* is the only difference between the original inventory of sibilants in the SC and the NC dialects, respectively.

³⁵ Puchmajer (1821: 9) differentiates the sign /*c*/ from the sign /*ç*/, which is used only in the ‘post-nasal’ instrumental suffix *-ça*, e.g. *maŋça* ‘with me’. The pronunciation of the latter sign is obscure (cf. discussion in v. Sowa 1893: 10); it is possible that the sound symbolized by /*ç*/ was a distributional allophone of the phoneme *s* in the 19th century Czechia Romani, i.e. that it had not merged with the affricate *c* yet. The merger has appeared in all Central dialects of Slovakia and Czechia until now.

³⁶ V. Sowa’s statement on Trenčianske Teplice Romani can be neither confirmed nor disproved since today there are no Roms in the town who have not moved there from other places.

The greatest changes in the subsystem of sibilants have been accomplished in the Et dialects of Teplica and Roštár (but not in the Et dialects of Chyžné and Revúca). It is likely that the changes have affected all varieties in the Štítnik River valley, whence the label Štítnik Romani used here. Two stages are apparent in the development of affricates in Štítnik Romani. First, postalveolar affricates changed into their prealveolar counterparts, i.e. **č > c* (e.g. *čak > cak* ‘only’, *phučel > phucel* ‘to ask’), **dž > dz* (e.g. *džanel > dzanel* ‘to know’, *gádžo > gádzo* ‘non-Rom’), and **čh > ch* (e.g. *čhibálo > chibálo* ‘boss, head of a community’, *áčhel > áchel* ‘to stay’). The non-aspirated prealveolar affricates resulting from this change merged with the old ones (cf. *celo* ‘whole’), which considerably increased the distribution of *dz* (see above). The aspirated prealveolar affricate *ch*, on the other hand, is a completely new phoneme (cf. 2.1. for graphemics). Second, palatal stops must have been assibilated to postalveolar affricates (see below) only after the prealveolarization of affricates: there is nothing like **búci* from *búči* (< *búti*) ‘work’. The development in fricatives took the reverse direction: prealveolar fricatives have been ultimately postalveolarized, i.e. **s > š* (e.g. *so > šo* ‘what’, the imperfect suffix *-as > -aš*) and **z > ž* (e.g. *bizo > bižo* ‘well, sure, of course’). At the beginning, the prealveolars *s* and *z* obtained an apicoalveolar pronunciation, which may still be heard in some cases. In most instances, however, the pronunciation is postalveolar today, and the new postalveolar fricatives have merged with the old ones (cf. *šov* ‘six’ and *užarel* ‘to wait’).

Both processes, the prealveolarization of the postalveolar affricates and the postalveolarization of the prealveolar fricatives, could be independent of each other, and it is not possible to state their relative chronology. It is only clear that the change **s > š* took place after the so-called *s*-aspiration, i.e. there are no forms like **romeša* ‘with a husband’. The change **č > c* might have been provoked by the absence of the voiced postalveolar affricate in the local Slovak dialects, where **č > š* (Vážný 1934: 291); the change in Romani must be later. Both the prealveolarization and the postalveolarization affect all Hungarisms and some Slovakisms, e.g. *karáčoňa* ‘Christmas’ (from Hungarian *karácsony*), *ci* ‘whether’ (from Slovak *či*), *koncinel* ‘to finish, cease’ (from Slovak *končiť*); *mušaj* ‘must’ (from Hungarian *muszáj*), *bliško* ‘near, close’ (from Slovak *blízky*), *škamaráťinel peš* ‘to make friends’ (from Slovak *škamarátiť sa*), *šmutno* ‘sad’ (from Slovak *smutný*); *žapojinel peš* ‘join in’ (from Slovak *zapojiť sa*), or *žaxráňinel* ‘to save, rescue’ (from Slovak *zachrániť*). Later and *ad hoc* loanwords from Slovak retain their *č*, *dž*, *s*, and *z*, e.g. *časi*³⁷ ‘times’, *gardista* ‘guardist

³⁷ This form is borrowed from standard Slovak, i.e. not from the dialectal *šasi*.

[member of the Slovak fascist guards in WWII]’, or *partizáno* ‘partisan, guerilla’. It is interesting that while most borrowed prefixed verbs are affected by the changes, e.g. *šplňinel* ‘to fulfil’ (from Slovak *splniť*), the thematic verbs with Slovak prefixes are not (see also 3.22.), e.g. *roschingerel* ‘to tear up’ (cf. *chingerel* ‘to tear, cut’ and Slovak *roztrhať* ‘to tear up’). Nevertheless, it cannot be excluded that some words borrowed after the changes have been phonologically adapted.

In some Romani varieties in eastern Slovakia, e.g. in Spiš, Prešov, and the Štítnik River valley, oral palatal stops have assibilated into postalveolar affricates, i.e. **t’ > č* (e.g. *bút’i > búči* ‘work’) and **d’ > dž* (e.g. *phend’om > phendžom* ‘I said’). No NSC variety has participated in this change. The assibilation may be connected to the absence of the palatals *t’* and *d’* in local Slovak dialects³⁸: they have changed to prealveolar affricates (so-called *dzekanie*, e.g. **d’et’i > dzeci* ‘children’) in most Eastern Slovakia dialects, or to dental stops in the relevant parts of the Štítnik River valley (e.g. **d’et’i > deti*; cf. Vážný 1934: 291, Štolc 1994: 83). On the other hand, many ESR varieties retain the palatal stops, although they are missing in local Slovak. A few words with original palatals are attested only in their assibilated form in ESR, e.g. *dživ* ‘rye’ (< **d’iv < *giv*), or *džombra* ‘stomach’ (from Hungarian *gyomor*, perhaps through a Slovak dialectal form).³⁹ The Romani dialect of Svidník has changed the oral palatal stops into postyotated velars, e.g. **bút’i > bukji*.

Finally, there was a reverse change in Zohra NSC: **dž > d’* (e.g. **džanel > d’anel* ‘to know’, **džungálo > d’ungálo* ‘dirty’, **džuvli > d’uvli* ‘woman’, or **gádžo > gád’o* ‘non-Rom’), but not **č > t’*. The new voiced palatal stop merged with the old one (cf. *hed’icko* ‘of hills’); thus, both unvoiced but neither of the original voiced affricates now exist in Zohra. A similar de-assibilation occurred in the adjacent NC dialects, but only medially⁴⁰, cf. *gád’o*, but *džánel*.

2.7. Gemimates

Gemination or consonant length⁴¹ as a phonological feature in the original Central dialects was only present in the opposition between the simple *r* and the geminate *rr*. The opposition

³⁸ Lipa (1963: 15) offers a specific explanation for the assibilation in Prešov Romani.

³⁹ Hübschmannová et al. (1991: 248) give only *slugadžis* ‘soldier’ (< **slugadžis*), but cf. Lipa’s (1963: 151) *slugadžis* and Teplica Romani *šlugadži* (< **slugadži*), not **šlugadži* (< **slugadži*).

⁴⁰ Or lexically determined?

⁴¹ We will not differentiate geminated and long consonants here.

was retained in the pre-war Czechia Romani⁴², and it still exists in some WSR dialects, e.g. in Šaštín, Jablonica, Hradište, and Čachtice (but not in CSR); we have recorded *barr* ‘stone’, *čorro* ‘poor’, and *jarro* ‘flour’ in western Slovakia. The only remnants of the geminate *rr* in NSC (attested only from “Nógrád” Romani) can be found in the non-attributively used adjectives *čorro* ‘poor’ and *korro* ‘blind’ (see 2.10.).

There is no doubt that the main impetus for the development of geminates in the Hungarian-bilingual NSC dialects has been the influence of Hungarian.⁴³ The geminates in Hungarian loanwords are usually retained in these varieties, e.g. Šóka *akkor* ‘then’, *cigaretta* ‘cigarette’, *rukkolinel* ‘to enlist, join the army’, Farkašda *čillapítinel* ‘to soothe’, *kotta* ‘music note sign’, or “Nógrád” *sállinel* ‘to fly’, while they have been mostly adapted in the Slovak-bilingual NSC dialects, e.g. Zohra *akor* ‘then’. In some cases, the geminate is adapted even in the Hungarian-bilingual varieties, e.g. *čepo* ‘a bit, a little’ (from *csepp* ‘drop, bead’), or “Nógrád” *frišítinel* ‘to refresh’ (from *frissít*). Exceptionally, a geminate may arise through derivation: e.g., “Nógrád” *bajnoko* ‘male champion’ borrowed from Hungarian plus the suffix *-kiň-* (cf. 3.6.) result in *bajnokkiňa* ‘female champion’.

Further supplies of geminates in the Hungarian-bilingual NSC varieties are the assimilations in consonant clusters and, rarely, gemination of simple intervocalic consonants. Most assimilations are progressive with sonants involved. The change **rd > *dd > d*, which may explain the difference between *cidel* ‘to draw’ and *phudel* ‘to blow’ in the SC dialects and the NC *cirdel* and *phurdel*, is pre-Hungarian (cf. *cidel* and *phudel* in Arli). Nevertheless, the assimilation of the vibrant *r* also occurs in the recent changes **pr > pp (> p)* and **rl > ll* in Farkašda and “Nógrád”. The assimilations take place only intervocalically and there seem to be other limitations, e.g. *upe* < *uppe* ‘on’ (< **upre*; cf. 3.23.); *čilla* ‘once, in those days’ (< **čirla*⁴⁴), or *kello* ‘throat’ (< **kerlo*), but usually *kerla* ‘s/he will do’.⁴⁵ The assimilation **nl > ll* across inflectional boundaries occurs in Šóka Romani, e.g. *gellahi* ‘s/he was reading’ (< **genlahi*) and *tecillahi* ‘s/he, it was liked’⁴⁶ (< **tecinlahi*); cf. the non-assimilated *phirnahi*

⁴² Puchmajer uses one grapheme for two different sounds: the syllabic *ř*, e.g. in *břli* ‘bee’, *křčma* ‘pub’, *křko* ‘bitter’, *křlo* ‘voice’, *křmo* ‘worm’, *křno* ‘bad’, and the non-syllabic *rr*, e.g. in *čarrel* ‘to lick’, *čorro* ‘poor’, *xrrixil* ‘pea’, *jarro* ‘flour’, *karro* ‘thorn’, *korro* ‘blind’, *morre* ‘hey’, *porr* ‘feather’, and *purrum* ‘onion’.

⁴³ Geminates are common in some Western Slovak dialects, too, e.g. in Čachtice Slovak *jenna* ‘one’ (< **jedna*), *millo* ‘soap’ (< **midlo*), or *masso* ‘meat’ (< **maso*). We have not investigated their influence on WSR.

⁴⁴ Čaba Romani retains *čirla*, while Klinóca possesses the specifically assimilated *činja*.

⁴⁵ The hypothesis that the assimilation **rl > ll* occurred before the vocalic elision of the type **kerela > kerla* (see 3.13.) is not plausible since the elision is common to all NSC dialects (and therefore likely to be older than the variety-specific assimilations).

⁴⁶ The grammatical subject of the Romani verb is the thing liked, while the experiencer is in the dative, e.g. Šóka *tecinel mang’adi čhib* ‘I like this language’, literally ‘likes to me this language’. Analogical constructions exist both in Hungarian (cf. *tetszik nekem ez nyelv*) and Slovak (cf. *páči sa mi tento jazyk*).

‘you[-PI]/they were walking’. Geminates may also arise through the vowel syncope in some verb forms (see 3.13.), e.g. *džannahi* ‘you[-PI]/they knew’ (< *džanenahi*), *tecinnahi* ‘you[-PI]/they were liked’ (< *tecinenahi*), or *khellahi* ‘s/he danced’ (< **khelelahi*).

Another consonant which may be assimilated (in accord with Hungarian morphophonology) is the palatal approximant *j*: **šj* > *šš*, **ňj* > *ňň*, **tj* > *tʔ* and perhaps after the other palatals or postalveolars in Farkašda, e.g. *bacilušša* ‘bacilli’ (< **bacilušja*), or *lakatošša* ‘locksmiths’ (< **lakatošja*). The form *paššol* ‘to lie’ (< **pašjol* < **pašʔol*) shows that this type of assimilation occurred after the delateralization, i.e. quite recently. In Čobánka and Šóka, the assimilation is just in process, cf. Čobánka *rokoňňa* ‘relatives’ (< **rokoňja*), or Šóka *vagónňňa* ‘railway carriages, wagons’ (< **vagónja*), but the non-assimilated Čobánka *vónatja* ‘trains’, or Šóka *cimbalošja* ‘cymbalo players’. The change does not occur in Čaraďica, e.g. *bútošja* ‘workers’, and in the other Slovak-bilingual varieties. The assimilation **ňd* > *dʔ* in Farkašda and “Nógrád” Romani must be recent, too, since Šóka retains the non-assimilated cluster, e.g. Šóka *oňďa* vs. Farkašda *odďa* ‘there [direction]’.

The old cluster in **gudlo* ‘sweet’ has not been retained in any NSC variety, but it is reflected in the non-attributive “Nógrád” *gullo* (vs. the attributive *gulo*, cf. 2.10.). The non-base forms of the noun *dél* ‘God’ (< **devl* < **devel*) keep the consonant cluster, e.g. *devleskero* ‘God’s’, which has been assimilated in the diminutive in NSC, i.e. *delóro* < *dellóro* (< **devlóro*) vs. NC *devlóro*. Klinóca Romani as well as the NC dialects retain the original cluster in *khabni* / *khabňi* ‘pregnant’, while Farkašda Romani possesses the assimilated *khamni*.

There are only a few instances of consonant assimilation (other than just sonority assimilation) across word boundaries, namely Čaba *keramme* (< **kerav me*) ‘I make, do’ and Teplica *ája dzi k’amende u naprindzardžam neš* (< **naprindzardžam leš*) ‘he came all the way to us and we did not recognize him’.

In the Hungarian-bilingual varieties, simple intervocalic palatals and sibilants may be geminated, e.g. Čobánka, Šóka, Farkašda *eňňa* (< *eňa*) ‘nine’, *keťti* (< *keťi*) / *kiťti* (< *kiťi*) ‘how many, how much’, *aťti* (< *aťi*) ‘so many, so much’, *asso* (< *aso*) ‘such’ etc. The spontaneous gemination is lexically limited, and occurs mostly in bisyllabic words. The words *láčho* ‘good’, *gádžo* ‘farmer, non-Romani person’, and *gádži* ‘female farmer, non-Romani woman’ have the variants *laččho*, *gaddžo*, and *gaddži*, respectively, in Šóka, Farkašda, and Biskupica: the gemination is usually compensated by the vocalic shortening, but we have also recorded *gáddžo* in Šóka. It may be important that the voiced affricates are always geminated intervocalically in Hungarian. (For *čučča* ‘tits’ and *kafidďa* ‘tables’ see 3.2.). Finally, the

initial *s* of the copula may be geminated after a vowel of the preceding word, e.g. *Biskupica ladžan pumen, hod' Roma ssan* 'they are ashamed of being Roms', *lačči gódi le ssáj* 'he had good brains', *Šóka meg akkor nassa ništa* 'still at that time there was nothing', or *nassine odoj, kaj kample te oven* (elic.) 'they were not where they should have been'.

2.8.-2.11. Vowels

2.8. Stress

No Central Romani dialect of Slovakia conforms to the conservative stress pattern. Apart from a few conservative features, such as the antepenultimate stress in the genitive (e.g. *romeskero* 'of a husband'), the penultimate stress has been generalized in ESR. One of the sources of this generalization was the contact with Eastern Slovak dialects, in most of which the stress falls on the penultimate syllable, too.⁴⁷ Western and Central Slovak dialects as well as standard Slovak and Hungarian possess the initial stress, which is reflected in the majority of Romani varieties of western and central Slovakia, including almost all NSC dialects.⁴⁸

In Zohra Romani, however, the process of imposing the initial stress has not yet been completed. The stress may be variantly only non-initial (e.g. *vakerasahi* 'we were talking'), both non-initial and initial (e.g. *vakerasahi*), or only initial (e.g. *vakerasahi*). The non-initial stress is mostly penultimate, and less often antepenultimate or final. The antepenultimate stress occurs in the genitive, e.g. *bratrancoskero* 'of a male cousin', and in the non-contracted imperfect forms (see 3.13.), e.g. *mangasahi* 'we were begging', *vakernahi* 'they were talking', or *bojuinlahi* 's/he was fighting'; the final stress (except for monosyllaba) is present only in the contracted future forms (see 3.13.), e.g. *kerá* 'I will do' and in a few function words such as *odoj* 'there' (cf. the same stress in Vend); and the penultimate stress everywhere else, cf. [4] and [5].⁴⁹ A stressed syllable does not imply a long vowel, and vice versa, e.g. *čóribe* 'theft', or *mláťinasahi* 'we were threshing'.

The conservative stress in Zohra has been retained in the oblique cases of nouns except for the accusative, e.g. *romestar* 'from a husband', *Mikulovate* 'in Mikulov', *mašinenca* 'with machines', or *amenge* 'to us', while the penultimate stress in the nominative and accusative of the thematic nouns [4:a] is innovative, e.g. *kurko* 'week', *čacipe* 'truth', *čhavóre* 'children', or *d'uvjen* 'women [accusative]'. It is important that the penultimate stress also applies to

⁴⁷ In the extreme east (in the so-called Soták and Uh Slovak dialects) this limitation does not hold true and the stress conditions need further research (Štolc 1994: 122).

⁴⁸ Prospective remnants of the conservative stress pattern remain to be discovered.

⁴⁹ Symbols used in the tables: A = antepenultimate stress, P = penultimate stress, F = final stress, asterisk = conservative stress

loanwords [b], which possess the initial stress in the current source languages, e.g. *muzikanto* ‘musician’ (from Slovak *muzikant*), or *sanitka* ‘ambulance car’ (from Slovak *sanitka*). Thus, the stress pattern does not contribute to the thematicity dichotomy of the inflectional morphology in nouns (see 3.2 and 3.3.). The conservative stress in adjectives has been lost, too, e.g. *d'ungálo* ‘dirty’.

[4]

	NOM	ACC	DAT	GEN
a.	<i>čhavóro</i>	<i>čhavóre</i>	<i>čhavóreske</i>	<i>čhavóreskero</i>
b.	<i>bratranco</i>	<i>bratranco</i>	<i>bratrancoske</i>	<i>bratrancoskero</i>
	P	P	P*	A*

In Zohra Romani verbs [5], the conservative stress on personal suffixes is present only in the non-syncopated future and imperfect forms (see 3.13.). It has been moved towards the beginning of the word in the syncopated forms, and replaced by the penultimate stress in the present and the preterite⁵⁰, e.g. *d'anav* ‘I know’, *phageres* ‘you break’, or *sikad'a* ‘s/he showed’.

[5]

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT	PRETERITE
1SG	P <i>vakerav</i>	F* <i>vakerá</i>	P* <i>vakeráhi</i>	P <i>vakerd'om</i>
2SG	P <i>vakeres</i>	P* <i>vakereha</i>	A* <i>vakeresahi</i>	P <i>vakerd'al</i>
3SG	P <i>vakerel</i>	P <i>vakerla</i>	A <i>vakerlahi</i>	P <i>vakerd'a</i>

The antepenultimate stress in Zohra is mostly conservative, and the final stress in verbs can be easily explained by the contraction (see 3.13.). The principal problem is the explanation of the innovative penultimate stress in view of its absence in any recent contact language of Zohra Romani. It is possible that the conservative instances of the penultimate stress were the source of the innovation. It is likely that there was a similar stage in the development of the other NSC dialects.

⁵⁰ There is no conditional irrealis form in our recordings of Zohra Romani.

2.9. Vocalic quality

Most Central Romani varieties in Slovakia possess the five vocalic phonemes which are common in many other Romani dialects: *a*, *e*, *o*, *i*, and *u*, and their phonematically long counterparts (see 2.10.). In Farkašda and Šóka Romani, there is one more vowel due to the influence of the local Hungarian dialects: the short low front *ä* [æ]. It appears especially in a stressed syllable in Hungarian loanwords, e.g. *täštviro* ‘brother’ (from the dialectal *testvır* ‘sibling’), *käzdinel* ‘to start’ (from *kezd*), *dä* or even [da] ‘but’ (from *de*), and also in the superlative prefix (see 3.7.), e.g. *läkšüžeder* ‘the purest’. It may also occur in unstressed syllables, e.g. *tebñirä* ‘mostly’ (cf. *többyire*), *pärsä* ‘sure, of course’ (cf. *persze*), or *kävärinel* ‘to mix’ (cf. *kever*). The noun ‘teacher’ may be pronounced both *tanító* and *tänító* in Šóka Romani (cf. standard Hungarian *tanító*). If the low front *ä* occurs in inherited words, then it usually comes from a stressed mid front *e*, often before a liquid, e.g. *khär* ‘house’, *khälen* ‘to dance’, *bäršiko* ‘-year old’, or *däs* ‘ten’. In Farkašda, the low front *ä* originates in the unstressed low middle *a* in *zijän* ‘damage’ (vs. Šóka *zijan*). The phonological status of the vowel *ä* remains unclear: it seems that at least in a majority of the inherited words it is in allophonic relationship with *e*; the grapheme /e/ will be used for both [e] and [æ] below.⁵¹ There seems to be no influence of Slovak dialectal *ä* [æ] in the Slovak-bilingual varieties of Romani.

Šóka and Farkašda Romani stick to the phonetic realization of the low vowels in the local Hungarian dialects where, unlike standard Hungarian, short *a* is illabial and long *á* is labial, e.g. *kapál* ‘to dig’ is pronounced [kɒpa:l] in the standard language, but [kapɒ:l] in the dialect. Similarly, *akán* ‘now’ is pronounced [akɒ:n] in Šóka and Farkašda Romani. In some idiolects of Šóka Romani, the long *á* sounds like [ɔ:], and it cannot be excluded that in some varieties it has merged with the old *ó* phonologically.

Hungarian front labialized vowels are phonologically adapted by delabialization in all NSC varieties, e.g. Klinóca *tindérkiña* ‘nymph, fay’ (cf. Hungarian *tündér*, see 3.6.), Lieskovca *tirinel* ‘to suffer’ (from *tűr*), Zohra *ftinel* ‘to heat’ (from *füt*), Šóka *šikerilinen* ‘thrive, be succesful’ (from *sikerül*), *tebñire* ‘mostly’ (from *többyire*), Farkašda *irga* ‘pouched marmot, gopher’ (from *ürge*), or “Nógrád” *gedra* ‘hole’ (from *gödör*). In some cases, the long word-final labialized *ő* is de-umlauted, e.g. Farkašda *felhó* (< **felhóvo*, see 3.3.) and “Nógrád” *fejhóvo* (from *felhő* and the dialectal *fejhő*, respectively), or “Nógrád” *tidóko* ‘lungs’ (from *tüdő*). In other cases, illabial consonants were already present in Hungarian dialects, e.g.

⁵¹ As is the praxis of native speakers.

“Nógrád” Romani *girindo* ‘pole-cat’ from dialectal *girind*, not from standard *gőrény* (cf. Imre 1971: 189). Exceptionally, but not only in *ad hoc* borrowings, labialized vowels are retained in Šóka and Farkašda Romani, e.g. *göndörno* ‘curly’ (from Hungarian *göndör*), *sületišnapo* ‘birthday’ (from Hungarian dialectal *sületišnap*), or *üzleto* ‘shop, store’ (from *üzlet*).

Many Hungarisms in various Romani dialects contain an *í* (or *i*) in place of a standard Hungarian *é*, e.g. *dílos* ‘midday’ in Bohemian Romani (cf. standard *dél*), *nípos* ‘people’ in ESR (cf. *nép*); Lieskovca Romani *temetíši* ‘funeral’ (cf. *temetés*), Šóka *ileto* ‘life’ (cf. *élet*), *kípo* ‘picture, painting’ (cf. *kép*), *niha* ‘sometimes’ (cf. *néha*), *vígzinel* ‘to bring to an end, complete, finish’ (cf. *végz-*), Farkašda *somsído* ‘neighbour’ (cf. *szomséd*), *zenísi* ‘musician’ (cf. *zenész*), “Nógrád” *giga* (cf. *gége* ‘larynx’), or *pinteko* ‘Friday’ (cf. *péntek*). It is a matter of individual lexemes in individual Romani varieties whether the raising **é > í* was an adaptational process in Romani, or whether the raised forms were already borrowed from Hungarian dialects. The raising is much more common in Hungarian of Selice and Vlčany than in “Nógrád” (Imre 1971: 120), which corresponds to a relatively high number of non-raised items in “Nógrád” Romani, e.g. *élo* ‘edge’ (from *él*), *épitinel* ‘to build’ (from *épít*), or *érinel* ‘to get ripe’ (from *érik*).

2.10. Vocalic quantity

Vowel length in ESR is bound to stressed syllables. This is also the case of Eastern Slovak, where, moreover, any stressed vowel is phonetically long. The bilateral implication does not seem to hold for ESR in general: the statement “vowels get long in stressed syllables” in Hübschmannová et al. (1991: 611) must be specified or reexamined. On the other hand, in Western and Central Slovak dialects as well as in Hungarian, vowel length is not bound to stressed syllables, nor to any position in the word. The former also holds true in Romani dialects of central and western Slovakia, i.e. in CSR, WSR, and NSC. Generally, vowel length in Slovakia Romani belongs to those phenomena which will need much more attention.⁵²

In his dialectal survey, Lída (1965: 12-13) gives no information on vocalic quantity, and in his description of the ESR variety from Humenné district, he only states that “vowel length often fluctuates; unlike in Czech, it is not phonological” (1963: 43). Nevertheless, he differentiates long vowels in spelling. One may find them in a few monosyllaba: *bár* ‘garden’, *bár* ‘stone’, *dúr* ‘far’, *há* / *hát* ‘yes’ (from Hungarian), *íč* ‘yesterday’, and *káj* ‘where’; and especially in the penultimate of many polysyllabic words, e.g. *fóros* ‘town’,

⁵² NC examples in this paper (except for specifically ESR examples) will contain long vowels as they may be found in most NC dialects, i.e. irrespective of their shortening in ESR.

phírel ‘to walk, go’, *ráti* ‘at night’, *tável* ‘to cook’, *amáro* ‘our’, *románes* ‘in Romani’, *barikáno* ‘proud, conceited’, *lavutáris* ‘musician’. Only exceptionally a long vowel appears in the final syllable: in the negated *nadúr* ‘not far’, and in *šukár* ‘beautiful, handsome’. Words of similar phonological structure may differ in quantity of their vowels, e.g. *tumáro* ‘your[-PI]’ and *tosara* ‘in the morning’.

Most loans from the actual contact languages of the NSC dialects, i.e. Hungarian in the Hungarian-bilingual varieties and Slovak in the Slovak-bilingual ones, retain their vocalic quantity, i.e. long vowels remain long, and short vowels remain short. Only apparent exceptions are the cases of the type *vejo* ‘son-in-law’ or “Nógrád” *egeri* ‘mouse’ from Hungarian *vő* and *egér*, respectively, since the Romani forms are based on the non-base stems (see 3.3.) of the Hungarian nouns: *eger-* and *vej-*, respectively. Romani imposes no principle limitation on the quantity of neighbouring vowels in loanwords, e.g. *fácáni* (from Hungarian *fácán* ‘pheasant’).⁵³ However, as a consequence of the morphological adaptation of inflectible loans (see 3.3., 3.8., and 3.18.), their last syllable cannot contain a long vowel, the only exception being the contracted forms of the type *hordó* ‘barrel’ (< **hordóvo*) in some varieties (see 3.3.).

Although some Serbocroatisms⁵⁴ appear to have retained their vocalic quantity in Romani, e.g. *drágo* ‘dear’ (from *drág*), other cases show that the issue is more complex, cf. the shortening in *mlino* ‘mill’ (from *mlín*), and the lengthening in *bríga* ‘grief’ (from *briga* ‘care, worry’). It is likely that the original long vowels in Serbocroatian loans were shortened, and that the contemporary long vowels have been brought into existence only later (after the inception of the phonological vocalic quantity due to Hungarian influence). Cf. also the recently arisen length in Farkašda and Šóka *prósto* vs. short “Nógrád” *prosto* ‘non-Romani man, farmer’ (from Serbocroatian *prost* ‘simple, common, gross’, cf. 1.2.). Vowel length may be lost in some Hungarisms, too, especially in the Slovak-bilingual varieties, e.g. *Lieskovca tirinel* ‘to suffer’ (from *tűr*).

The inflectional formants which contain a long vowel are: the *-á* and *-áhi* in the 1st singular future and imperfect verb forms, respectively (see 3.13.); the *-áhi* and *-éhi* of the 3rd person conditional irrealis forms (see 3.15.); the nominative singular masculine *-á* in demonstratives (see 3.11.); and the gerund suffix *-indú* (see 3.16.).

⁵³ No research has been undertaken to find out whether there is some interference of the so-called Slovak rhythmical law into Romani: a limitation on neighbouring lengths exists in most Central Slovak dialects as well as in standard Slovak, e.g. *pekný* ‘nice’ vs. *krásny* ‘beautiful’, not **krásný*.

⁵⁴ In the whole paper, vocalic length in Serbocroatian words is symbolized by an acute. Tones are not indicated, since they are not relevant for Romani.

In contrast to recent borrowings (especially from Hungarian), there cannot be more than one long vowel in older non-derived inflectional stems in NSC. Apart from monosyllaba, only a very small number of pre-Hungarian words have a long vowel in their stem-final syllable; these exceptions are *holév* / *holóv* ‘trousers’, and *šukár* ‘beautiful, handsome’ (the same exception could be observed in Humenné Romani). If there is a vocalic length in a non-derived polysyllabic word, then it is nearly always in the penultimate, e.g. the bisyllabic *áčhel* ‘to stay’, *ánde* ‘inside’, *ármin* ‘cabbage’, *áver* ‘other’, *bálo* ‘pig’, *bóri* ‘daughter-in-law’, *jílo* / *ilo* ‘heart’, *kúči* ‘cup’, *lóló* ‘red’, *lóve* ‘money’, *mát’hi* (etc., cf. 3.2.) ‘fly’, *náne* ‘is not’, *phába* ‘apple’, *šéro* ‘head’, *táha* ‘tomorrow’, *tável* ‘to cook’, the trisyllabic *amáro* ‘our’, *angáli* ‘arms’, *endáni* ‘relative’, *korkóri* ‘alone’, *khangéri* ‘church’, *piráno* ‘lover’, and the quadrisyllabic *kamukóre* ‘seemingly, ostensibly’.

Vocalic and consonantal quantity may be functionalized in some thematic adjectivals in NSC. A long vowel or a geminated consonant in an adjective may be shortened if the adjective is used attributively, e.g. “Nógrád” *báro* ‘big, great’ (vs. *baro kurko* ‘the week of Passion’), *čáčo* ‘right’ (vs. *čačo va* ‘right hand’), *láčho* ‘good’ (vs. *lačhi vója* ‘good mood’), *pháro* ‘heavy, difficult’ (vs. *phare šéreskero* ‘slow-witted’, literally ‘of heavy head’), and *čorro* ‘poor’ (vs. *čoro čhávo* ‘poor guy’), or *gullo* ‘sweet’ (vs. *gulo dad* ‘father of whole blood’). The same holds true for the plural possessive pronouns (see also 3.9.) *amáro* ‘our’ (vs. *amaro kher* ‘our house’) and *tumáro* ‘your[-PI]’ (vs. *tumari čhaj* ‘your[-PI] daughter’), and the shortening is paralleled by a vocalic syncope in the singular possessive pronouns (see 3.9.). As far as the geminated consonants are concerned, the phenomenon has not been attested but in “Nógrád” Romani (cf. 2.7.), and the functionalization of vowel length needs further research in the other NSC varieties (for *lačcho* vs. *láčho* ‘good’ etc. cf. 2.7.).

One of the sources of long vowels in non-derived pre-Hungarian words is the elision of the phoneme *v*. It is often elided after a vowel and before a liquid (e.g. in **evl*, **ovl*, **uvl*, **avl*, and **avr*), causing a lengthening of the preceding vowel. The following instances are common to all NSC dialects: *dél* ‘God’ (< **devl* < **devel*), *kólo* ‘soft’ (< **kovlo*), *šúlo* ‘swollen’ (< **šuvlo*), *álom* / *ájom* ‘I came’ (< **avljom*) plus the other preterite forms of this verb, and *ári* ‘out’ (< **avri*). In Biskupica, one also finds *džúli* ‘woman’ (< **džuvli*). If the *v* is elided before the participle suffix *-d-* (see 3.14.), the preceding vowel is not lengthened, e.g. *garudo* ‘hidden’ (< **garuvdo*), or *sikad’a* ‘s/he showed’ (< **sikavdja*). In Šóka, Farkašda, and Biskupica, an original word-final *v* has been elided after a labial vowel, with a lengthening effect upon the latter, e.g. *šó* ‘six’ (< **šov*), *phú* ‘earth’ (< **phuv*), or *sú* ‘needle’ (< **suv*). We have also recorded *phú* in Budča. Rác’s spelling (*šov*, *phuv* etc.) may be morphological, i.e.

the development might have also appeared in “Nógrád”. In most cases, long vowels in pre-Hungarian NSC words originate in simple lengthening of their short counterparts, most frequently before the liquids *r* or *l*. A survey of Rácz’ dictionary shows that the most common long vowel in the NSC basic lexicon is *á*, while *i* is the least frequent.

Apart from a few exceptions such as *pekel* ‘to roast, bake’ vs. *péko* ‘roasted, baken’ or *dúr* ‘far’ vs. *dureder* ‘farther’, stem vowel quantity is kept throughout the inflectional paradigm of a word. The length of a base word vowel is usually retained in derivations. Nevertheless, instances of shortening in derivations are quite numerous in NSC, e.g. *saňol* ‘to become thin’ from *sáno* ‘thin’ (vs. *kájol* ‘to grow black’ from *kálo* ‘black’), *čáčipe* ‘truth’ from *čáčo* ‘right’ (vs. *párnipe* ‘whiteness’ from *párno* ‘white’⁵⁵), or *šuřarel* ‘to dry [st.]’ from *šúko* ‘dry’ (vs. *hólarel* / *hójarel* ‘to make [so.] angry’ form *hóli* ‘anger’).

In some cases, a short vowel becomes long in the derived word in NSC, e.g. *rátiko* ‘of a night’ from *rat* ‘night’ (vs. *ákhoriko* ‘of a nut, walnut’ from *ákhor* ‘nut’). A more or less regular lengthening is caused by the suffixes of the old ‘ablative’ and ‘locative’ (see 3.1.), and, in most instances, by the suffix *-be*, which derives abstract nouns (see 3.6.) from the *a*-verbs (see 3.13.). It is the immediately preceding syllable that is lengthened, e.g. *khér-al* ‘from house, home’ and *khér-e* ‘at home, home’ (from *kher* ‘house’), *maškár-al* ‘in the middle’ derived (from *maškar* ‘between’), and *ekethán-e* / *khetán-e* / apocopated *kethán* ‘together’ (originally **jekhethán-e* from *jekh* ‘one’ plus *than* ‘place’), and *džábe* ‘gait, walking’ (from *džal* ‘to go’), *hábe* ‘food’ (from *hal* ‘to eat’), or *patábe* ‘trust, belief’ (from *paťal* ‘to believe, think’).

There are some inherently long derivational suffixes in NSC, e.g. the adverbial *-ón-* (see 3.8.), the diminutive *-ór-* (see 3.6.), the noun suffix *-ár-* (see 3.6.), and, in many NSC as well as NC varieties of Slovakia, but not in “Nógrád”, the adjectival *-án-*, *-vál-*, and *-ál-* (see 3.8.), e.g. *erďavóne* ‘in an ugly manner’ (from *erďavo* ‘ugly’), *kheróro* ‘little house’ (from *kher* ‘house’), or *románo* ‘Romani’ (from *Rom* ‘Rom’). In the case of *čhavóro* ‘little boy, child’, the long stem vowel of *čhávo* ‘Romani guy, son’ is not retained. Words consisting of a stem with a long vowel plus an inherently long derivational suffix are the only instances of two neighbouring lengths in pre-Hungarian lexemes, e.g. *šúžóne* ‘in a clean manner’ (from *šúžo* ‘clean’).

⁵⁵ Deadjectival abstract nouns retain the geminated consonants of the adjectives in “Nógrád”, e.g. *čorripe* ‘poverty, penury, need’ from *čorro* ‘poor’.

Instances of interdialectal vocalic quantity variation need to be searched into. It seems that “Nógrád” Romani contains less vocalic lengths than, say, Šóka Romani, e.g. *alav* ‘word’ and *anav* ‘name’ in the former (and also in Lieskovca), but *álav* and *ánav* in the latter.

2.11. Word-final apocope

A characteristic feature of the NSC dialects is the frequent apocope of a word-final vowel before another vowel in the flow of speech. In many Romani dialects, the apocope regularly occurs in the constructions of a preposition plus the article, e.g. ESR *andro*⁵⁶ *kher* ‘in the house’ (< **andre o kher*, cf. *andre miro kher* ‘in my house’), while in NSC, the apocope is not syntactically limited.

The following types of word forms ending in a vowel and affected by the apocope have been recorded: prepositions, e.g. Čaraďica *k’amende* ‘at our place’ (< **ke*), Farkašda *angl’odá kher* ‘in front of that house’ (< **angle*), *and’iškola* ‘at school’ (< **ande*); coverbal particles, e.g. Šóka *mang’asso kipo ánd’avel štár šel koroni* ‘such a painting costs me four hundred crowns’ (< **ánde*); the particles *te* ‘also’ and *avka* ‘in such a way, well’, e.g. Teplica *t’amáro gav* ‘also our village’, Šóka *me niha džav avk’andi kočma* ‘I rarely go to a pub’; interclausal and intersentential conjunctions, e.g. Litava *d’avka* ‘but in this way’ (< **de avka*), Farkašda *kan’amen* ‘when we’ (< **kana*); the copula forms *hi* and *náne*, e.g. Litava *džanes ka h’odá?* ‘do you know where it is?’, Šóka *nán’odí kvalita* ‘it is not of that quality’; the imperfect forms in *-ahi*, e.g. Čaraďica *sar odá len akharnah’užár* ‘how did they call them – wait a minute’, Šóka *vakerkerasah’avka* ‘we used to talk like this’, *delah’o brišind* ‘it was raining’; noun plurals, e.g. Šóka *t’odla Rom’ase sar amen* ‘also these Roms [are] such as we [are]’ (< **Roma*), Litava *o gádž’odá na šund’e?* ‘did not the farmers hear it?’ (< **gádže*), Chyžné *štár džén’odoj* ‘four people there’ (< **džene*); substantival oblique cases, e.g. Lieskovca *hal p’odoj* ‘man išt da’ (< **pe*), Biskupica *lesk’igen dukhal o va* ‘he aches in his hand very much’ (< **leske*), Šóka *o Rom ole grasteh’at’i géja ...* ‘the Rom went with the horse for so long ...’ (< **grasteha*); the 3rd singular preterite forms, e.g. *o rašaj podajind’amen le Němcenge* ‘the priest gave us away to the Germans’ (< **podajinda*); etc.

The length of the apocopated vowel is irrelevant, e.g. Šóka *od’ande mro šéro áchol* ‘that stays in my head’ (< **odá*). The front vowels (*e* and *i*) are apocopated without any limitation, while all instances of an *a*-apocope are due to another low vowel. On the basis of our limited

⁵⁶ The regular apocope is not indicated by an apostrophe in the standard ESR orthography, i.e. *andro* (not *andr’o*), but *k’odá?* ‘who is it?’ (< **ko odá*). We conform to this convention also in the examples from other varieties.

data, it seems that the back vowels (practically *o*) are not apocopated in NSC, e.g. Šóka *me mindeneko ári genav ándal* ‘I read everything out of it’ (i.e. not **mindenek’ári*).

3. Morphology

3.1.-3.6. Nouns

3.1. Inflection

The Layer I cases are the nominative, accusative, vocative, and in some varieties the directive (see 3.4.). The vocative plural suffix is *-ale* in NC, and *-alen* in the NSC dialects, e.g. Klinóca *nípalen* ‘people’, *princalen* ‘princes’, and *királalen* ‘kings’. The last vocative also appears in the dissimilated form *királanen*. Beside the old ‘locative’ and ‘ablative’, there is another adverb / lexicalized Layer I ‘case’ in some NSC varieties: the temporal in *-kor* was first borrowed within loans from Hungarian, e.g. Farkašda *karáčoňkor* ‘at Christmas’ from *karácsonykor* (cf. *karáčoňa* ‘Christmas’ from *karácsony*), *hušvítkor* ‘at Easter’ from *hušvítok* (cf. *hušvíto* ‘Easter’ from dialectal *husvít*), and the pronominal *valamikor* ‘then, in those days’, *akármikor* ‘any time’ (see 3.12.). Later, the suffix spread to a few non-Hungarian temporal nouns, too, e.g. Hradíšť’a *epašratkor* ‘at midnight’ (derived from *epašrat* ‘midnight’).

Most Layer II case suffixes, which are added to the oblique stems (see 3.2. and 3.3.), are identical in all Central dialects: dative *-ke* / *-ge*, locative *-te* / *-de*, ablative *-tar* / *-dar*, and instrumental *-ha* / *-ca* (see 2.5.); only the genitive suffix is dialectally diverse. Most NSC varieties use the so-called long and non-syncopated genitive forms (with the suffix *-ker-* / *-ger-*), e.g. *dadeskero* ‘father’s’, or *lengero* ‘their’. In many of them, e.g. in Zohra, Šóka, Farkašda, Čaba, Čaraďica, Budča and Očova Romani, the syncopated forms (with the suffix *-kr-* or *-gr-*) are missing at all, as they are in Humenné ESR and in the Et dialect of Roštár. On the other hand, attributively used syncopated forms prevail in Czechia Romani and WSR. Our single instances of the genitive from Čobánka and from the Et dialect of Chyžné are also syncopated.

A very special case is represented by Biskupica Romani, which regularly uses the so-called short forms (with the suffix *-k-*), e.g. *laki néna hi leski romni* ‘her aunt is his wife’, *lesko kipo* ‘his picture’, *dadesko dad* ‘father’s father’. The local Vlax influence cannot be excluded, but the contacts between the Biskupica Romani and the Vlax speakers do not seem to be extensive at all. Moreover, we have not identified any other specifically Vlax features in our data. If one assumes a historical link between Čobánka and Biskupica Romani, then *lako* ‘her’ in the latter may have developed from *lakro*, which is present in the former. Exactly in the

same way *mo* ‘my’ in Biskupica Romani developed from *mro*, which has been retained in Čobánka (see 3.9.). The reason that *mo* in “Nógrád” and Farkašda Romani is not paralleled by **lako* etc. is that at the time when the change **CrV > CV* took place in genitives and possessive pronouns, these varieties did not have the syncopated genitive forms; and indeed, even today they retain the non-syncopated ones (see above). So, it is quite possible that both the syncopated long genitives and the short genitives in some NSC varieties arose through internal development.

The ablative may be used with the ablative prepositions *kathar* and *andar* (see 3.23.) in Farkašda, e.g. *ój sáhi kathar amendar* ‘s/he was from our place, community’, *korkóri kathar pestar siklija uppi lavuta* ‘he himself learned to play violin’, or *andar mandar lavutári n’ovla* ‘I will not become a musician’, literally ‘from me a musician will not become’. The ablative is common in Farkašda, but not in “Nógrád”, and the other NSC dialects⁵⁷, cf. *kathar amende* or *andar mande*. According to Rácz, an interesting variation between an essive preposition plus the ablative case, and an ablative preposition plus the locative case exists in “Nógrád”, e.g. *ande sostar / andar soste* ‘from what’, *angle mandar / anglar mande* ‘from in front of me, előlem’.

In some instances, a synthetic construction in ESR corresponds to an analytic one in NSC, and vice versa. The ablative seems to be more common in the former dialect, e.g. ESR *phureder mandar* (beside *phureder sar me*) vs. NSC *phureder sar me* ‘older than me’, or ESR *ma cirde man balendar* vs. Farkašda *ma cid mre bala* ‘do not pull my hair’. In NSC, the dative is usual in the predicate, e.g. Farkašda *nasvajake diťhos* vs. ESR *diťhos nasval’i* ‘you[-Sg, female] look ill’, Tarnóca *Beťáriske l’akarnahi* vs. ESR *vičinenas les Beťáris* ‘they called him Urchin’.⁵⁸ The synthetic locative is common with appellatives in NSC, e.g. Farkašda *sake khereste bešnahi jekh čaládo* vs. ESR *andre sako kher bešelás jekh famil’ija* ‘each house was inhabited by one family’, Farkašda *harneder dromeste ája* vs. ESR *xarňard’a peske o drom* ‘s/he cut the way short’, or Šóka *mukjom man dromeste* vs. ESR *mukhl’om man pro drom* ‘I set out for the journey’.

There is no noun with the nominative plural equal to the singular in NSC and ESR; only a few nouns in WSR and Czechia Romani possess this morphological neutralization, e.g. Čachtice *vast* ‘hand(s)’. Nevertheless, the number of thematic nouns designating elementary temporal units is syntactically neutralized in simple constructions with numerals, e.g. ESR *duj d’ives* ‘two days’, *štar čhon* ‘four months’, *keci berš* ‘how many years’, but *duj ori* ‘two

⁵⁷ The ablative after the preposition *andar* exists in Vekerdi’s (1983: 15) Romungro.

⁵⁸ But cf. the accusative in Čaraďica *odola ... sar odá len akharnahi?* ‘those ... how did they call them?’.

hours' (an athematic noun), *d'ivesa* 'days' (no numeral), and *duj bare d'ivesa* 'two long days' (an attribute). The neutralized forms may alternate with the plurals in some NSC varieties, e.g. Farkašda both *ket'i berš* and *ket'i berša* 'how many years', *trin berš* and *trin berša* 'three years'. Other nouns are usually not⁵⁹ neutralized, e.g. Šóka *si odoj štár vad' pándž Roma* 'there are four or five Roms'.

3.2. Thematic nouns

According to their base form suffix, the thematic nouns can be divided into *o*-masculines (e.g. *raklo* 'non-Romani guy'), *i*-feminines (e.g. *rakli* 'non-Romani girl'), zero-masculines (e.g. *phral* 'brother'), and zero-feminines (e.g. *phuv* 'earth'). The zero-masculines include a special inflectional subclass of abstract nouns (see also 3.6.). The singular oblique formant of most masculines is *-es-*, of the abstract nouns *-as-*, and of feminines *-a-*. The plural oblique formant of both genders is *-en-*. The nominative plural suffix of the masculine *o*-nouns is *-e* (cf. the *o*-adjectives, 3.7.), while the other thematic nouns of both genders have *-a*.⁶⁰

The final *n*, which has been lost in the base form of the abstract nouns (cf. 2.4.) in the SC dialects, resurfaces in the non-base forms in NSC, while the inflection has been completely restructured in Roman [6].

[6]

	NC	NSC	Roman
NOM SG	<i>čaćipen</i>	<i>čaćipe</i>	<i>čaćip-e</i>
NOM PL	<i>čaćipen-a</i>	<i>čaćipe-n-a</i>	<i>čaćip-ča</i>
OBL SG	<i>čaćipn-as-</i>	<i>čaćip-n-as-</i>	<i>čaćip-es-</i>

In many nouns, there is a segmental or non-segmental modification (e.g. yotation, palatalization, *-ij-*) of the base stem in the oblique and/or plural forms, e.g. the oblique singular stem *phuv-j-a-* (of *phuv* 'earth'), the oblique plural stem *phuv-j-en-*, and the nominative plural form *phuv-j-a*. The main difference between the NC and the NSC dialects consists in the reflexes of yotation.

⁵⁹ An exception may be observed in Šóka *štár ROĐINA odoj bešel még* 'four families still live there' (i.e. not the plural *rod'ini*). The regular noun for 'family' in Šóka Romani is the Hungarism *čaládo*. The employment of an *ad hoc* borrowing from Slovak (the speaker probably was not sure that we would understand the Hungarism) opened the way to Hungarian interference (cf. *családok* 'families', but *négy család* 'four families').

⁶⁰ In Farkašda Romani, the plural of the masculine *džukel* 'dog' is *džukle* (as if of **džuklo*).

Originally, there were three thematic subclasses of feminines in Romani: the *i*-feminines, where the vocalic *i* of the base form appears as a yod in the non-base forms, e.g. *romn-i* ‘wife’ ~ **romn-j-a-*, and two subclasses of the zero-feminines. Some zero-feminines were yotated in their non-base forms (the “soft” subclass), e.g. *phen* ‘sister’ ~ **phen-j-a-*, while others were not yotated (the “hard” subclass), e.g. *džuv* ‘louse’ ~ *džuv-a-*. The yod caused palatalization of preceding dentals⁶¹ (cf. 2.2.) in both dialect groups of Central Romani, e.g. **romnja-* > *romňa-* and **phenja-* > *pheňa-*. The yod has been retained after *r* and labials in the SC dialects, but lost in NC, e.g. NSC *pírja-* (of the *i*-feminine *píri* ‘pot’) or *phuvja-* (of the soft zero-feminine *phuv* ‘earth’), but NC *píra-* and *phuva-*. Both dialect groups have lost the yod after sibilants, e.g. **kučja-* > *kúča-* (of the *i*-feminine *kúči* ‘cup, mug’).

Thus, nearly⁶² all thematic NC feminines with a stem in a dental have been palatalized in their non-base forms, e.g. the plural of the *i*-feminines *angrust’a* ‘rings’, *thard’a* ‘brandies’, *lubňa* ‘whores’, *džuvl’a* ‘women’, and of the zero-feminines *raťa* ‘nights’, *phurd’a* ‘bridges’, *pheňa* ‘sisters’, or *moľa* ‘wines’, while the other feminines do not exhibit any obligatory stem modification. The animate *i*-feminines may extend their plural stems by *-ij-* in the NC dialects, e.g. *rakla* / *raklija* in the nominative plural (of *rakli* ‘non-Romani girl’), *rakl’en-* / *raklijen-* in the oblique plural, but only *rakl’a-* in the oblique singular.

In the NSC dialects, the thematic feminines are more richly subclassified in their non-base forms than in NC: synchronically, they are either palatalized, yotated, or unmodified (i.e. non-yotated and non-palatalized). As in the NC dialects, nearly all feminines with a stem in a dental (including *armin* ‘cabbage’) are palatalized. The distribution of the yod is complex and still not perfectly understood. The zero-feminines in a sibilant or *j* are unmodified (for the *ik*-feminines see below). If there is a yod in a zero-feminine, it usually follows a labial or *r*, but the reverse implication does not hold true, e.g. Farkašda *zárja* ‘hair [plural] of body’, *čhamja* ‘faces’, but *lima* ‘phlegms’, *puruma* ‘onions’, *pušuma* ‘fleas’, *hévja* ‘holes’, *holévja* ‘trousers’, *phuvja* ‘earths’, *suvja* ‘needles’, but *džuva* ‘louse’.

In many cases the opposition between the phonologically similar yotated vs. unmodified zero-feminines in NSC is historical, e.g. in the case of *suvja* (historically soft) vs. *džuva* (historically hard), while in others, a change in the subclass membership of an individual noun must have occurred: e.g., the noun *čhib* ‘tongue, language’ originally belonged to the hard subclass, but now it is yotated in SC (cf. the plural *čhibja*, or Roman *čibča* < **čibja*). The lack

⁶¹ There were probably no yotated feminines with velar-ending stems.

⁶² The noun *armin* ‘cabbage’ in the NC dialects must have belonged to the hard subclass of the zero-feminines at the time of the palatalization, cf. the plural *armina*, not **armiňa* in ESR.

of yotation and palatalization may be also due to a change of gender: the new feminine retains its hard non-base stems, e.g. Farkašda *angara* ‘coals’, or “Nógrád” *bala* ‘hair [plural]’, and *vošta* ‘lips’. It seems that the contact of Budča, Lieskovca, and Očova Romani with the adjacent NC dialects has led to the loss of yotation in the thematic feminines, e.g. *čhiba* ‘tongues, languages’, not **čhibja*.

The yod of the NSC *i*-feminines is usually missing after sibilants, e.g. *čúča* ‘tits’, *gádža* ‘non-Romani women, female farmers’, or *paramisa* ‘tales’. Nevertheless, we have also recorded *čučča* and *gaddža* in Farkašda, which may a) come from the historical yotated form **čučja* and **gadžja*, b) reflect a secondarily restituted yod, and/or c) be connected to the spontaneous intervocalic gemination (cf. 2.7.). The geminate in the Farkašda Romani form *kafidža* (the nominative plural of the *i*-feminine *kafidi* ‘table’), in the stead of the expected simple palatal – i.e. **kafid’a* as *gód’a* (of *gódi* ‘brain, mind’), is likely to be connected to the expansion of the yod in the athematic masculines (see 3.3.) in the same variety, especially in the type *somsidža* (the plural of *somsido* ‘neighbour’).

The feminine *jakh* ‘eye’ is unmodified in Farkašda and Šóka (i.e. *jakha* etc.), but it has the palatalized plural forms in Klinóca, “Nógrád”, Čaba, and Zohra: the nominative *át’ha* ‘eyes’ (< **akhja*), and the oblique *át’hen-* (< **akhjen-*) etc. The adjective is palatalized, too, e.g. Klinóca *biját’hálo* ‘unscrupulous, ruthless’ (cf. Slovak *bezočivý* ‘arrogant, saucy’), while the singular oblique is hard: *jakha-*. It is likely that the stem-modifying yod arose through metathesis of the initial one, i.e. **jakha* > **akhja*. The difference between the NSC varieties with and without the palatalized plural can be old. The yotation split such as is present in the declension of *jakh* in Klinóca etc. does not seem to be common in NSC: usually if there is a yod in the oblique singular, there is also a yod in the plural, and vice versa. An exception may be the declension of the *ik*-nouns in some NSC varieties (see below).⁶³

The morphophonological alternation between the dental in the base form and the palatal elsewhere has been removed by generalizing the palatal in the palatalized zero-feminines with the stem in *n* (but not the other dentals) in Klinóca and Hradíšť’a Romani, e.g. *pheň* ‘sister’, *meň* ‘neck’, *armiň* ‘cabbage’, *asviň* ‘tear’, *mát’hiň* ‘fly’, *papiň* ‘goose’, *patriň* ‘leaf’, but *bast* ‘luck, happiness’, *rat* ‘night’, *phurd* ‘bridge’, *mol* ‘wine’ etc. We have recorded *phurdž* ‘bridge’ (### **phurd’*), but *rat* ‘night’ in the Et dialect of Teplica.

⁶³ Another possible exception is the noun *kopal* ‘stick’ in “Nógrád” Romani (Rácz 1994: 116-117): the singular oblique is unmodified (*kopala-*), while the plural is presented as palatalized (*kopaja*, *kopajen-*) in a paradigm table. At another place (Rácz 1994: 113), however, the plural *kopala* is given.

Nearly all thematic masculines are hard in the Central dialects. There is one exception in ESR, where the plural of the noun *angušt* (or *angušto*) ‘finger’ is usually *angušt’a*. In NSC, both *angušt* and *brišind* ‘rain’ are palatalized in the plural. The palatalizations are not phonologically conditioned, cf. *kašta* ‘trees’, or *danda* ‘teeth’. The few thematic *i*-masculines, namely *páni* ‘water’, ESR *vódi* ‘soul’ (already feminine in many NC dialects), and NSC *sviri* ‘hammer’ contain reflexes of the historical yod in their non-base forms.⁶⁴

In many Romani dialects, there is a set of thematic *i*-feminines of Asian or Greek origin which are extended by a final *k* or *n* (the *ik*- and the *in*-nouns, respectively). The *ik*-feminines in NSC are *burňik* ‘palm’, Klinóca *čubňik* / Farkašda *čuňňik* ‘whip’, *dórik* ‘tie, string’, *raňik* ‘rod, twig’, or Klinóca *porik* ‘tail’, while *dori* and *pori* is *k*-less in the NC dialects. Puchmajer gives both *čupňi* ‘whip’ and *čupňik* ‘cat-o’-nine-tails’ (an untrustworthy semantic opposition); only the latter is common in ESR. On the other hand, *raňi*, *raňik*, or even *raňig* exist in ESR, while Puchmajer had only the *k*-less *raňi*. All *ik*-nouns inflect like zero-feminines in both the NSC and the NC dialects. Their stems are unmodified in the latter as well as in some NSC varieties, e.g. Klinóca *porika* ‘tails’. Farkašda Romani possesses yotated plural forms, e.g. *čuňňikja* ‘whips’, or *čuňňikjenca* ‘with whips’, while the situation in the oblique singular is not clear, cf. yotated *dórikjaha* ‘with a string’, but hard *čuňňikaha* ‘with a whip’.

The *in*-nouns in the NC dialects are, for example, *armin* ‘cabbage’, *avgin* ‘honey’ in some Slovakia varieties / *avdin* in Bohemia, *karfin* ‘nail’, *khurmin* ‘millet, groats’, *pajtrin* ‘leaf’ in Bohemia and some Slovakia varieties / metathetized *prajtin* in most ESR varieties, *papin* ‘goose’, and *zumin* ‘soup’. The noun *avgin* / *avdin* is an original masculine, although Puchmajer files it with feminines; the original feminine *karfin* has shifted its gender in ESR. The Bohemian and WSR counterpart of ESR *kl’igin* ‘padlock’ is a simple *i*-feminine: *kl’idi* ‘lock’ or ‘key’. The *in*-feminines in NSC include, for example, *armin*, *papin*, *patrin* ‘leaf’, and the rare *aňin* ‘honey’, *kličin* ‘padlock’, and *khurmin* (Vekardi 1983: 17, 88, 91); the noun ‘soup’ is *zumin* in “Nógrád”, but the *n*-less *zumi* in Zohra and Farkašda, and variantly *zumi* / *zumiň* in Klinóca. Moreover, Klinóca Romani has spread the final *-ň* to *mát’hiň* ‘fly’, and variantly to *ásviň* ‘tear’ (beside *ásvi* and *ásva*). Most *in*-nouns inflect like the zero-feminines, e.g. *papiňa* ‘geese’. In the NC dialects, however, the noun *pajtrin* / *prajtin* behaves like an *i*-feminine (**pajtri* / **prajti*). The plural form being *pajtra*, *prajta*, or *prajta*, *-in* must be considered a nominative singular suffix; similarly in *karfin* with the plural *karfa*. In Klinóca Romani, on the other hand, *patriň* has a regular plural of a zero-feminine: *patriňa*. The single

⁶⁴ The noun *sviri* also existed in Bohemian Romani. The *i*-masculine *sviri* as well as **skami* (originally a feminine) has been extended by *nd* in ESR, i.e. *svirind* and *skamind*.

plural form *asviňa* serves for all three Klinóca singulars. The *n*-less Zohra and Farkašda *zumi* ‘soup’ forms the regular nominative plural *zumja*.

The stem alternations of *va* ‘hand’ ~ *vast-* (*vasta* ‘hands’, *vasteha* ‘with a hand’) and *gra* ‘horse’ ~ *grast-* (*grasta*, *grasteha*) are common to all SC dialects; they are not present in *bast* ‘luck, happiness’, *bibast* ‘bad luck’, and *trast* ‘iron’ (cf. 2.4.). The plural of the noun *dive* / *dí* ‘day’ is *divesa*. In Klinóca Romani, the masculines with the oblique singular stem in *št* lose the final stop in the base form, i.e. *voš* ‘lip’ ~ *vošt-* (*vošta*, *vošteha*), *kaš* ‘tree, wood’ ~ *kašt-* (*kašta*, *kašteha*), and *anguš* ‘finger’ ~ *angušt-* (*angušt’a*) ~ *angušt-* (*angušteha*).

The Šóka, Farkašda, Biskupica, and Budča feminines *phú* ‘earth’ and *sú* ‘needle’ as well as the Šóka and Farkašda numeral *šó* ‘six’ (cf. 2.10.) may be considered to be surface forms of {phuv}, {suv}, and {šov}, respectively. The reason is that the consonantal *v* resurfaces in their non-base forms, e.g. Farkašda *phuvja* ‘earths’, *suvjaha* ‘with a needle’, or *šovenca* ‘with those six’.

Most Asian and Greek nouns in Romani belong to the thematic inflectional subclasses. There are only a few exceptions, some of which are old: e.g., the NSC feminine *lindra* ‘sleep’ (as well as NC *lindra* / *indra*) of Indic origin inflects like the athematic feminines in *-a*. There is a mechanism in some NSC varieties by which some Asian nouns, mostly feminines, have become the athematic feminines: the original nominative plural in *-a* turns into the base form, e.g. Farkašda, Klinóca and “Nógrád” *phába* ‘apple’ (originally *phábaj*), Klinóca and “Nógrád” *ásva* ‘tear’ (in Klinóca beside the original singular *ásvi* and the extended *ásviň*), Klinóca *čeňa* ‘earring’ (originally *čeň*), “Nógrád” *čhora* ‘moustache’ (originally the masculine *čhor*), *drákha* ‘grape’ (originally *drákh*), *gója*⁶⁵ ‘sausage’ (beside *gój* ‘intestine’), *mát’ha* ‘fly’ (originally *mát’hi*), or *mirikla* ‘pearl’ (originally *mirikli*). After the singularization of the old plurals, new athematic plurals are regularly formed, e.g. *phábi*, or *čeňi*.

The reverse exception, i.e. full (thematic) integration of a newly borrowed noun is much rarer: e.g., the noun *mozi* ‘cinema, movies’ (from Hungarian *mozí*) is an thematic *i*-feminine in most NSC dialects as well as in ESR. For the athematic integration of some other *i*-final nouns (of the type *bácsi*) see 3.3.

Individual nouns may belong to differing subclasses in different dialects: The noun meaning ‘bone’ is fully integrated in NSC (the zero-masculine *kokal* or the *o*-masculine *kokalo*), while Bohemian Romani had the athematic *kokalos*; the NC dialects of Slovakia possess *kokal* or *kokalos*. The noun ‘strap’ is fully integrated in “Nógrád” (the zero-masculine

⁶⁵ In many varieties, including ESR, the form *gója* is plural and means ‘entrails’.

sirim), but not in ESR (*sirimos*) or Bohemian Romani (the metathetized *simiris*). The “Nógrád” noun *patav* ‘rag etc.’ is a zero-masculine, while the NC dialects have the *o*-masculine *patavo*.⁶⁶ The ESR noun *verdan* ‘cart’ employs variantly some zero-masculine forms (e.g. *verdaneha* ‘by a cart’) and some irregular forms (e.g. *verdeha* ‘by a cart’). In Bohemian Romani as well as in NSC, the noun *verda* has lost the final consonant; in NSC, it seems to inflect as an athematic *a*-masculine. Etc.

3.3. Adaptation and athematic nouns

There are five athematic subclasses common to all Central dialects, one feminine and four masculine. Irrespective of whether the nominative singular formant of the athematic masculines is *s*-less or not (cf. 2.4.), the vowels of the formants constitute the markers of subclassification. One may speak of athematic *o*-masculines, *i*-masculines, *a*-masculines, and *u*-masculines. Leaving aside the vocative (cf. 3.2.) and directive (see 3.4.) cases, the markers of masculine subclassification as well as the suffix *-a-* in the athematic feminines remain identical throughout the singular paradigm of any noun [7]. The oblique plural suffix is *-en-* for all subclasses.

[7]

	MASCULINE				FEMININE
	<i>o</i> -masc.	<i>i</i> -masc.	<i>a</i> -masc.	<i>u</i> -masc.	
NOM	<i>-o(-s)</i>	<i>-i(-s)</i>	<i>-a(-s)</i>	<i>-u(-s)</i>	<i>-a</i>
OBL	<i>-o-s-</i>	<i>-i-s-</i>	<i>-a-s-</i>	<i>-u-s-</i>	<i>-a-</i>

Gender of a noun borrowed into Romani depends on criteria such as 1) natural or conventional sex of the referent, 2) grammatical gender of the noun in the source language, 3) grammatical gender of the Romani noun which is being replaced by the borrowing, or 4) shape of the final part of the stem in the source language.

According to the first criterion, nouns denoting female referents are integrated into the feminine subclass, while those denoting males and persons of irrelevant sex are integrated into one of the masculine subclasses, e.g. Hungarian *komunista* ‘communist’ (unmarked sex) becomes masculine in Romani. The second criterion cannot apply to Hungarian, which lacks the grammatical gender. Slavic masculines and feminines mostly retain their gender in

⁶⁶ With the zero-masculine nominative plural *-a* in Bohemian Romani.

Romani, while neuters become masculines. A gender shift of a Slavic noun in Romani is common only with names of localities (see 3.5.). On the contrary, the gender in Romani may help to identify the source language, e.g. it is more likely that the masculine *mišos* ‘mouse’ in ESR comes from the Serbocroatian masculine *miš* than from the Slovak feminine *myš* (Lípa 1965: 18); the Slovak or Czech noun was borrowed as the feminine *miša* into Bohemian Romani (Puchmajer 1821: 62).

The third criterion cannot concern newly borrowed concepts and it is especially important with Hungarisms (because of their lack of gender). For example, the Hungarian nouns *világ* ‘world’ and *virág* ‘flower’, in spite of their almost identical phonological shape, are integrated as the masculine *világo* and the feminine *virága*, respectively, in Šóka Romani: the only explanation seems to be the gender of their pre-Hungarian equivalents, namely the masculine *svito* ‘world’ and the feminine *lulud’i*⁶⁷ ‘flower’. The gender of the newly borrowed noun may be conceived by its parallel use with the older noun for some time, cf. Klinóca *világo* beside *svito*.

The fourth criterion concerns only those borrowings whose gender integration cannot be decided according to the first and the second criteria, namely Hungarisms denoting impersonal (asexually conceived) referents. All such nouns ending in an *a* or *e*⁶⁸ in Hungarian become feminines in NSC Romani, e.g. *bráča* ‘viola’ (from *brácsa*), *iškola* ‘school’ (from *iskola*), *fečka* ‘swallow’ (from *fecske*), or “Nógrád” *giga* ‘larynx’ (from dialectal *gíge*). Also some nouns ending in a *VC* cluster, in a liquid or in the palatal approxinant are integrated as feminines (see below).

There is only one *u*-masculine common to both the SC and the NC dialects, namely *papu(s)* ‘grandfather’.⁶⁹ The distribution of nouns borrowed as masculines among the remaining masculine subclasses is often governed by the shape of the final part of the base form in the source language. The subclass integration is not problematic, if the final part of the base form in the source language corresponds to one of the subclassification vowels in Romani: nouns ending in *o*, *i* (for the exceptional *mozi* ‘cinema, movies’ cf. 3.2.), and *a* are integrated into the athematic subclasses of the *o*-masculines, the *i*-masculines, and the *a*-masculines, respectively, e.g. *caklo(s)* ‘glass’ from Serbocroatian dialectal *caklo*, *báči(s)*

⁶⁷ Attested in Hungarian Rumungro (Vekerdi 1983: 103). The noun *lulud’i* used by some speakers of the NC dialects of Slovakia (and Czechia) is only a recent borrowing from Vlax. The fact that Hungarian *virág* ‘flower’ was not integrated as a feminine in ESR (cf. the masculine *virágos*) may be explained by the very absence of the feminine *lulud’i* in the (traditional) NC dialects.

⁶⁸ Czech feminines in *e* would be adapted in the same way. There are no such feminines in Slovak and Serbocroatian.

⁶⁹ The noun *kuku* ‘egg’, which exists only in the Vendic dialects, also belongs to this subclass.

‘uncle’ (cf. 1.2.) from Hungarian *bácsi*, or *gazda(s)* ‘farmer, house-keeper, lord’ from Slovak *gazda*. Cf. also the Farkašda *i*-masculine *kifli* ‘roll’ from Hungarian *kifli*.

The few loans of the Slovak neuters in *ie* (and its dialectal equivalents) or *e* are integrated into the subclass of the *o*-masculines, in analogy to the more numerous neuters in *o*, e.g. *moro(s)* ‘sea’ from Slovak *more*⁷⁰, or *nebespečo* ‘danger’ in Zohra Romani from the Slovak dialectal *nebespeči* (cf. standard *nebezpečie*). For the integration of Hungarian nouns in *ó*, *ú*, and *u* see below.

Most nouns in a labial, dental (except for *n*, see below), or velar consonant, as well as in the palatal *d'* or the affricate *c*, are integrated as the *o*-masculines, e.g. Farkašda *nípo* ‘people’ (from Hungarian dialectal *níp*), *majmo* ‘monkey’ (from Hungarian *majom*, *majm-*), *kabáto* ‘coat’ (from Hungarian *kabát*), *hango* ‘voice’ (from Hungarian *hang*), *hed'o* ‘hill’ (from Hungarian *hegy*), or *klinco* ‘nail’ (from Serbocroatian *klinac*, *klinc-*). Most nouns in *š*, *č*, or the palatal *l'* become the *i*-masculines, e.g. Farkašda *álmáši* ‘station’ (from Hungarian *állomás*), Čobánka *kováči* ‘smith’ (from Serbocroatian or Slovak *kováč*), or Budča *vel'iteľi* ‘commander’ (from Slovak *veliteľ*). Hungarian nouns ending in a consonant preceded by an elidable vowel (e.g. *er*, *ör*, *or*, *on*, *ok*, or *og*, sometimes *om*) are integrated as feminines, e.g. “Nógrád” *epra* ‘mulberry’ (from *eper*, *epr-*), *d'omra* ‘stomach’ (from *gyomor*, *gyomr-*), *gedra* ‘hollow’ (from *gödör*, *gödr-*), *močka* ‘bago’ (from *mocsok*, *mocsk-*), *horga* ‘rod and line, hook’ (from *horog*, *horg-*), or *cimbalma* ‘cymbalo’ (from *cimbalom*, *cimbalm-*).

The subclass integration in NSC of nouns ending in the sonants *r*, *l*, *j*, *n*, or in the sibilants *s* and *z* is not sufficiently determined by the shape of the final part of their base form. There are a few feminines from Hungarian words ending in *r*, *l*, or *j*, e.g. “Nógrád” *húra* ‘string’ (from *húr*), *álla* ‘chin’ (from *áll*), *and'ala* ‘angel’ (from *angyal*), *baja* ‘calamity, evil, trouble’ (from *baj*), or *bivaja* ‘buffalo’ (from *bivaly*). It seems that the nouns ending in an original *j* which did not become feminines in Romani has been integrated as the *o*-masculines, e.g. *ganajo* ‘manure, dung’ (from **ganaj*, cf. standard Hungarian *ganéj*), while the nouns ending in a *j* which has arisen from the palatal lateral (cf. 2.2.) are *i*-masculines, e.g. *kráji* or *kiráji* ‘king’ (cf. Slovak *kráľ* and Hungarian dialectal *királ'*, respectively).

The subclass integration in NSC of the masculines which end in *r*, *l*, *n*, *s*, or *z* in the source language seems to be governed by their syllabic length: bisyllabic nouns become *i*-masculines, e.g. *d'ikeri* ‘mirror’ (from Hungarian dialectal *gyűkör*), *idoli* ‘idol’ (from Hungarian *idol*), *vásoni* ‘canvas’ (from Hungarian *váson*), *rokoňi* ‘relative’ (from *rokon*; for

⁷⁰ The noun *moros* in ESR is a loan of the Slovak dialectal *moro*.

the palatalization cf. 2.2.), *baňási* ‘miner’ (from Hungarian *bányász*), or *vitézi* / *vitízi* ‘hero’ (from Hungarian *vitész* or dialectal *vitíz*), while shorter and some longer nouns are integrated into the subclass of the *o*-masculines, e.g. *žíro* ‘fat’ (from Hungarian *zsír*), *falo* ‘wall’ (from Hungarian *fal*), *plino* ‘gas’ in Budča (from Slovak *plyn*), *méso* ‘lime’ (from Hungarian *mész*), or *blúzo* ‘blouse’ (from Hungarian *blúz*), and Klinóca *magazino* ‘magazine’, or “Nógrád” *Balatono* (the name of the lake of Balaton). The segment *-ár-* implies the membership in the subclass of the *i*-masculines (also in the NC dialects), e.g. *határi* ‘frontier’ (from Hungarian *határ*), and also *lavutári* ‘musician’ (from trisyllabic **lavutar*, cf. 4.1.). In compounds, the syllabic length of the last word in the source language is decisive, e.g. Farkašda *teštvíro* ‘brother’ (from Hungarian dialectal *testvér* ‘sibling’, cf. *test* ‘body’ and *vír* ‘blood’) and *onokateštvíro* ‘male cousin’ (cf. standard Hungarian *unukatestvér* ‘cousin’) are *o*-masculines, since Hungarian *vír* is monosyllabic and would be integrated as **víro*.

There are a few exceptions to the tendencies given above, e.g. *ezero* ‘thousand’ (from Hungarian *ezer*), i.e. usually not **ezeri* in NSC, or *duhano* ‘tobacco’ (from Serbocroatian *duhan*). It seems that the integration into the subclass of the *o*-masculines was more common in the past. Although contemporary interdialectal variation within the NSC dialects cannot be excluded, it is true that even the NC dialects behave very similarly to NSC. The most important difference is that the nouns ending in *n* (including the bisyllabic ones) are more commonly integrated as the *o*-masculines in NC. Both dialect groups, and perhaps even individual varieties, may differ in the gender of some Hungarisms, e.g. ESR *fala* vs. NSC *falo* ‘wall’, or ESR *bajos* vs. NSC *baja* ‘calamity, evil, trouble’.

Two types of morphological integration may be distinguished: First, the base form of a noun in the source language is identical with the base form of its loan in Romani (disregarding the masculine *-s* in most NC dialects, cf. 2.4.). Second, the noun gets adapted in Romani. The first type of integration occurs with the Slavic neuters in *o*, Slavic and Hungarian nouns in *a*, and the few Hungarian nouns in *i*, e.g. Klinóca *nebo* ‘heaven, sky’ (from Serbocroatian *nebo*), NSC *gizda* ‘pride’ (from Serbocroatian *gizda* ‘decoration, luxury, grace’), ESR *bačas* ‘chief shepherd’ (from Slovak *bača*), or Farkašda *báči* (from Hungarian *bácsi* ‘uncle’). Nouns ending in a consonant are adapted by adding the Romani inflectional formant, e.g. Klinóca *svito* ‘world’ (from Serbocroatian dialectal *svit*), or ESR *napast’a* ‘intrusive person, nuisance, portent, obsession’ (from the Serbocroatian feminine *napast* ‘temptation, trouble, nuisance’). Romani inflectional formants cause deletion of a word-final *e*, *ie*, *i* etc., e.g. Farkašda *irga* ‘pouched marmot, gopher’ (from Hungarian *ürge*).

The Hungarian nouns ending in a labial or labialized vowel are adapted by a special adaptational suffix -v-, and integrated into the subclass of the athematic *o*-masculines or, more rarely, the athematic feminines in Lieskovca, Očova, Klinóca, Čobánka, and “Nógrád” Romani, e.g. Lieskovca *halgatóvo* ‘slow melancholy song’ (cf. *hallgató*- ‘for listening’), Očova *fatúvo* ‘boy’ (from *fattyú* ‘bastard, boy’), Klinóca *boršóvo* ‘pea’ (from *borsó*), *háborúvo* ‘war’ (from *háború*), *brúgóva* ‘contrabass’ (cf. the standard *bőgő*), Čobánka *búčuvo* ‘feast, banquet’ (from *búcsú*), *rádijóvo* ‘radio’ (from *rádió*), “Nógrád” *ášóvo* ‘spade’ (from *ásó*), or *leketóva* ‘apron’ (cf. *lekötő*- ‘to be bound’). In Šóka and Farkašda Romani, such Hungarian nouns are usually not⁷¹ morphologically adapted in their base forms, e.g. the feminines *bégó* ‘contrabass’, or *leketó*, and the masculines *háború*, *tanító* ‘teacher’, *tó* ‘pond, pool, lake’, *vonó* ‘bow of a music instrument’, or *Židó* ‘Jew’.⁷² The feminines may be adapted even in these varieties, e.g. Farkašda *bégóva*, or *fedóva* ‘lid’ (from *fedő*).

Apart from the common adaptation of Hungarisms ending in a labial vowel, there are a few such nouns which take the suffix -k- in NSC, namely *borjúko* ‘calf’ in Farkašda or *borňúko* in “Nógrád” (from standard *borjú* and dialectal *bornyú*, respectively), and *tidóko* ‘lungs’ (from *tüdő*) in “Nógrád”. The same element appears in *tiviško* (cf. standard Hungarian *tövis* or *tüske* ‘thorn’), which means ‘thorn’ in Farkašda and “Nógrád”, and ‘hedgehog’ in many other varieties, including ESR. It is possible that the forms with -k- were already borrowed as such from Hungarian dialects.

With nouns which contain an elidable vowel in their base form, it is the non-base stem that is adapted, e.g. Farkašda *klinco* ‘nail’ (from Serbocroatian *klinac*, *klinc*-), or *majmo* ‘monkey’ (from Hungarian *majom*, *majm*-). Hungarian nouns with an irregular 3rd person possessive stem, get adapted in this very stem, e.g. Klinóca *tetejo* ‘roof, top’ (from *tető*, poss. *tetej*-), or Farkašda *vejo* ‘son-in-law’ (from *vő*, poss. *vej*-), but the regular *felhó* / *felhóvo* (from the base stem *felhő*, not the possessive *felhőj*-).

The nominative plural suffix of both the athematic feminines and the athematic *a*-masculines is -i in all NSC varieties as well as in the NC⁷³ dialects, e.g. Farkašda *göröd’điňňi* (of *göröd’điňňa* ‘melon’, cf. standard Hungarian *görögdinnye*), Šóka *fantáziji* (of *fantázija* ‘fantasy’), Čobánka *patkovi* (of *patkova* ‘horseshoe’), Klinóca *phábi* (of *phába* ‘apple’), *sobi*

⁷¹ Instances of the lack of adaptation in Čobánka Romani are perhaps rather code-switches: no less modern unadapted nouns than *bistošító* ‘insurance company’, or *televízijó* ‘television’ have been recorded.

⁷² Although the labial vowel is frequently long, nouns in short *u* are adapted in the same way, e.g. Farkašda *batú* ‘rucksack’ from Hungarian *batyu*. “Nógrád” and Pilis form would be **batúvo*.

⁷³ Including the old *a*-masculine *xartás* ‘smith’ in ESR; the nominative plural suffix of its equivalent in Bohemian Romani was -a.

(of *soba* ‘room’), Zohra *školi* (of *škola* ‘school’), ESR *ambreli* (of *ambrela* ‘umbrella’⁷⁴); Šóka *komuništi* (of *komuništa* ‘communist’), Čaradžica *gardisti* (of *gardista* ‘guardist’), Klinóca *meštri* (of *meštra* ‘teacher’), or ESR *bandisti* (of *bandistas* ‘member of a music band’).

Most athematic *i*- and *o*-masculines in Bohemian Romani had the nominative plural suffix *-i*, e.g. the Graecism *foros* ‘town’, or the Hungarisms *binos* ‘sin’ and *šogoris* ‘brother-in-law’. Only a few loans of Greek neuters retained their plural in *-a*, e.g. *sapuňis* ‘soap’ and *kokalos* ‘bone’. In v. Sowa’s WSR dialect, the nominative plural suffix of the athematic *i*-masculines was mostly *-a*, e.g. *ribara* (of *ribaris* ‘fishman’). In ESR, both suffixes (i.e. *-a* and *-i*) can be used with both the *o*-masculines and the *i*-masculines: their distribution is partly determined by semantics (*-a* being preferred by nouns designating humans), partly by formal considerations (the segment *ar*⁷⁵ implying the suffix *-a*); both suffixes are often used variantly.

The athematic *i*-masculines in NSC reflect the nominative plural suffix **-ja* in Šóka, Farkašda, Čaradžica, Čobánka, and “Nógrád”. The yod palatalizes preceding dentals, e.g. Farkašda *borbija* (of *borbili* ‘barber’); it has been retained after *r* and *m*, e.g. *lavutárja* (of *lavutári* ‘musician’), *papírja* (of *papíri* ‘paper’), or “Nógrád” *iskámja* (of *iskámi* ‘chair’), and lost after some sibilants, e.g. Farkašda *zenisa* (of *zenísi* ‘musician’), *vitíza* (of *vitízi* ‘hero’), or Čobánka *kováča* (of *kováci* ‘smith’). After palatals and *š*, the yod is either kept, or assimilated to the preceding consonant: the plural forms of the *i*-masculines *baciluši* ‘bacillus’, *bútoši* ‘worker’, *lakatoši* ‘locksmith’, *rokoňi* ‘relative’, and *vagoňi* ‘railway carriage, wagon’ are given in 2.7. The assimilation has become a synchronic morphophonological rule in the varieties in question. In most NSC varieties, on the other hand, the only attested *i*-masculine plural suffix is *-a*, e.g. Očova *lavutára*, Litava *papíra*, Klinóca *žandára* (of *žandári* ‘policeman’), *vitéza* (of *vitézi* ‘hero’), or Zohra *papiroša* (of *papiroši* ‘paper’).

It is difficult to say which of both suffixes (**-ja* and *-a*) is the original one. The yod in the former could originate in analogy with the thematic yotated feminines, e.g. *lavutárja* as *bárja* ‘gardens’, or with the nominative singular *-i*, i.e. **lavutári-a* (> *lavutárja*). It is not likely that the yod once existed and has been lost in Klinóca, i.e. **lavutárja* > *lavutára*, since it is retained in the original yotated feminines there, e.g. *bárja*. The plural *királ’a* (of *királi* ‘king’)

⁷⁴ A word borrowed from English (possibly through Slovak dialects) and brought by Roms and Slovaks working in the USA at the beginning of this century.

⁷⁵ The segment *ar* is often a morphological marker of an agent, e.g. *lavutaris* ‘musician, violin player’ (cf. *lavuta* ‘violin’). The plural suffix *-a* of the agent nouns has been generalized for all nouns containing the segment *ar*, including the non-human ones, e.g. *bugeľaris* ‘purse’.

need not presuppose a historical form **királja*, since the palatalization may be a synchronic morphophonological rule copied from the feminines etc. Budča Romani even has the non-palatalized *tunela* (of *tuneli* ‘tunnel’). Unfortunately, we lack sufficient data to describe the exact distribution and the development of the suffixes.

The original nominative plural suffix of the athematic *o*-masculines was *-i* in NSC, which is the one attested from most varieties, e.g. Zohra *Servi* (of *Servo* ‘Slovak’), *muzikanti* (of *muzikanto* ‘musician’), Čaraďica *partizáni* (of *partizáno* ‘guerilla, partisan’), Budča *gestapáki* (of *gestapáko* ‘member of Gestapo’), Klinóca *fali* (of *falo* ‘wall’), *hed'i* (of *hed'o* ‘hill’), *herci* (of *herco* ‘actor’), or “Nógrád” *gombi* (of *gombo* ‘button’). It is also retained in many athematic *o*-masculines in Šóka, Farkašda, and Čobánka, e.g. *ezeri* (of *ezero* ‘thousand’), *kabáti* (of *kabáto* ‘coat’), *klinci* (of *klinco* ‘nail’), *petali* (of *petalo* ‘horseshoe’), *sveti* (of *sveto* ‘feast’), or *šincegi* (of *šincego* ‘rail nail’, cf. Hungarian *sínszeg*).

In Farkašda, some athematic *o*-masculines with the stem in a dental contain a palatal geminate plus an *a* in the nominative plural, e.g. *barát'ľa* (of *baráto* ‘friend’), *somsíd'd'a* (of *somsído* ‘neighbour’), *čalád'd'a* (of *čaládo* ‘family’), or *duhaňňa* (of *duhano* ‘tobacco’). There may be a yod after a velar, e.g. *onokja* (of *onoko* ‘grandson’, cf. standard Hungarian *unoka* ‘grandchild’). In Čobánka, the yod, which caused the gemination in Farkašda, is retained after the palatals (cf. 2.7.), e.g. *vónat'ja* (of *vónato* ‘train’).⁷⁶ It is likely that the yod in the *o*-masculines is due to a morphological analogy with the nominative plural of the *i*-masculines, i.e. *onokja* and **barátja* as **rokoňja* (later *barát'ľa* as *rokoňňa*). The innovations do not affect pre-Hungarian and some Hungarian words (cf. Čobánka *sveti* ‘feasts’, Farkašda *kabáti* ‘coats’ above), and with some Hungarianisms they are facultative, e.g. the nominative plural of Farkašda *üzleto* ‘shop’ is both *üzleti* and *üzleťľa*.

The feminines and masculines adapted by *-v-* in Klinóca etc. inflect exactly like the athematic feminines and the athematic *o*-masculines [8]; the adaptational suffix is a part of the inflectional stem. In Šóka and Farkašda, on the other hand, the *-v-* usually appears only before the nominative plural *-i*, e.g. *baťuvi* ‘rucksacks’, or *bégóvi* ‘contrabasses’, but it may also occur in some feminine forms, e.g. *fedóvaha* ‘with a lid’. In the oblique cases of masculine nouns, the inflectional formant immediately follows the vocalic stem, e.g. *vonóha* ‘with a bow’, *Židóske* ‘to a Jew’, or *tanítónge* ‘to teachers’. The suffix *-v-* in the nominative plural shows that the Šóka type inflection developed from the Klinóca type, i.e. by contraction:

⁷⁶ The development **vónatja* > *vónatja* > *vónat'ľa* reflects copying the synchronic rule of Hungarian morphophonology whereby an underlying yod geminates preceding palatals and geminates plus palatalizes preceding dentals.

**hordóvos-* > *hordós-*, **hordóven-* > *hordón-*, and **hordóvo* > *hordó* ‘barrel’. This development, which corresponds to the distribution of the contracted *dí* (< **dive*) ‘day’ in the NSC dialects (cf. also *čhávo* > *chá* in some varieties), connects Šóka and Farkašda Romani to the Vendic dialects (cf. Vekardi 1984: 68, Halwachs 1996: 11; in Vend moreover **hordóvi* ### *hordój*).

[8]

	Klinóca	Šóka	Klinóca	Šóka
NOM SG	<i>hordó-v-o</i>	<i>hordó</i>	<i>brúgó-v-a</i>	<i>bégó(-v-a)</i>
OBL SG	<i>hordó-v-os-</i>	<i>hordó-s-</i>	<i>brúgó-v-a-</i>	<i>bégó(-v-a)-</i>
NOM PL	<i>hordó-v-i</i>	<i>hordó-v-i</i>	<i>brúgó-v-i</i>	<i>bégó-v-i</i>
OBL PL	<i>hordó-v-en-</i>	<i>hordó-n-</i>	<i>brúgó-v-en-</i>	<i>bégó-n-</i>

The segment *-v-* in *papu-v-ja* ‘grandfathers’ in Farkašda Romani is analogical to the *-v-* in the nominative plural of the Hungarisms ending in a labial vowel. Contrary to the latter (cf. e.g. *baťu-v-i* of *baťu* ‘rucksack’), the noun *papu* possesses the progressive nominative plural suffix *-ja* (see above).

3.4. Directive (illative) case

In some NC as well as NSC Romani varieties, names of inhabited localities possess a special case form of direction (movement to a locality), e.g. *Čadcu* ‘to Čadca’, as against the location, expressed by the locative case form, e.g. *Čadcate* ‘in Čadca’. In other Romani varieties, the locative case or, more rarely, an analytical construction of the preposition *and(r)e* plus the nominative of the local noun, e.g. *and(r)e Čadca*, express both direction and location. The directive case form is not based on the oblique stem, i.e. the directive suffix *-u* immediately follows the basic stem. In this respect, it resembles the Layer I synthetic forms (cf. 3.2.). Unlike the lexicalized old locatives and ablatives, the directive case form is fully productive within a functionally definable class. Moreover, it has a fully predictable meaning and must be therefore considered inflectional. Only exceptionally, nouns other than the names of localities possess the directive, e.g. Budča *partizánu* ‘to partisans, i.e. to the place they are / were staying’.

The directive exists in Čobánka, Čaraďica, Budča, Lieskovca, and Očova NSC varieties as well as in many WSR and CSR dialects, e.g. in Šaštín, Čachtice, and in the Ct dialect of Prenčov. However, there is no mention of it in v. Sowa’s and Kalina’s (1882) descriptions of

their WSR varieties. An example of the directive was also recorded in the pre-war Moravian Romani, as far west as in the southwestern Moravian village of Vosoudov: *Beču* ‘to Vienna’ (Lesný 1916: 216 and 1934: 611).⁷⁷ The directive case form must have existed here already before the end of the 18th century, when the settlement of Vosoudov Roms started, since their contacts with Slovakia Romani after this date are not likely. On the other hand, the directive case is not attested in other pre-war varieties of Czechia: Bohemian Romani as described by Puchmajer (and Ješina) uses the locative as its functional equivalent, e.g. *Jerixoste* ‘to Jericho’ (Puchmajer 1821: 78), *Treboňate* ‘to Třeboň’, or *Melnikoste* ‘to Mělník’ (Ješina 1886: 19, 24), and there is no instance of the directive in the Moravia Romani texts recorded by v. Sowa (1893) in Boskovice and by Mann (1947) in Oslavany.

The dialectal distribution of the directive clearly shows that it could not be present in the common SC Romani: it is absent from most NSC varieties (e.g. Farkašda, Šóka, Klinóca, or “Nógrád”) as well as from the Vendic dialects. The NSC varieties in question must have either shared an innovation with some Moravian, WSR and CSR dialects, or they must have borrowed the suffix and the morphological pattern from the neighbouring NC dialects. The latter hypothesis would be quite likely, if the directive were not present in Čobánka. The origin of the pattern as well as of the suffix itself is obscure: Slovak can hardly be the source of this innovation, as it uses prepositional constructions not only for the directive, but also for the locative and the ablative functions.⁷⁸ On the other hand, the Slovak origin of the innovation is logical on geographical grounds (cf. the Slovak minority in Csobánka).

3.5. Names of localities

A great number of nouns in Central Romani which designate inhabited localities belong to the athematic feminine subclass (cf. 3.3.). In many instances, the gender, the base form, and the inflectional stem of the noun in Romani agree with Slovak, e.g. *Bistrica* (cf. Slovak *Bystrica*), *Budča*, *Čadca*, *Kokava* etc. Also Hungarian local names ending in *-a* automatically fall within this subclass, e.g. *Kaša* ‘Košice’ or *Korpona* ‘Krupina’ from Hungarian *Kassa* and *Korpona*, respectively. Slovak feminine local names ending in long *-á* simply shorten the vowel in Romani, e.g. *Očova* or *Handlova* from Slovak *Očová* and *Handlová*, respectively.

⁷⁷ Lesný translates it ‘into a thicket’ (1916) or ‘into a forest’ (1934). Although he was acquainted with the form *veš* ‘forest’ (1916: 215), he was probably misled by the resemblance of the stem *Beč-* to the Persian noun meaning ‘forest’: *béš* as he cites it (1916: 207), which he thought to be the source of the Romani noun. In fact, *Béča* or *Bécis* (borrowed from Hungarian *Bécs*; beside *Vidňa* from Slovak and/or Czech) is the Romani name of Vienna.

⁷⁸ The hypothesis that the Slovak accusatives of the type *Čadcu* (cf. the nominative *Čadca*) may be used as directives in some Slovak dialects has not been confirmed.

In some cases, however, the Slovak masculine, neuter or inherently plural nouns become feminine singulars by morphological adaptation of the base form, e.g. *Lieskovca* from the Slovak masculine *Lieskovec* (non-base stem *Lieskovc-*), *Hraďišťa* from the Slovak neuter *Hraďište*, or *Poňika*, *Šmižaňa*, or *Nováka* from the Slovak pluralia tantum *Poniky*, *Smižany*, and *Nováky*, respectively. Similarly, the consonant ending Hungarian local names get adapted by the Romani feminine singular suffix *-a*, e.g. *Farkašda* ‘Vlčany’, *Klinóca* ‘Klenovec’, *Požoma* ‘Bratislava’, *Šóka* ‘Selice’, *Uhela* ‘Nové Mesto nad Váhom’, or *Zoľoma* ‘Zvolen’ from Hungarian *Farkasd*, *Klinóc*, *Pozsony*, *Sók* (a neighbourhood of Selice), *Újhely*, and *Zólyom*, respectively. There are only few exceptions to the feminine adaptation of names of localities, e.g. the masculines *Poltári* (in Očova Romani), *Sliači*, or *Košo* (in Budča Romani) from Slovak *Poltár*, *Sliač*, and *Koš*, respectively.

The Romani local names of Hungarian origin need not reflect an actual or recent Hungarian bilingualism of the speakers of the respective variety (e.g., the Slovakia capital is called *Požoma* not only in Šóka and Farkašda Romani, but also in Čachtice and other places in western Slovakia, where Hungarian has never been spoken as a popular language). It seems that outside the Hungarian linguistic area only bigger towns have their names of Hungarian origin in Romani. Moreover, the further away from the socioeconomical sphere of the respective town one goes, the higher the likelihood that the town will be called by the current administrative, i.e. Slovak name in local Romani varieties. Nevertheless, preserving the old administrative Hungarian names in the Slovak linguistic environment shows that cryptic motivation could also be in play.

3.6. Nouns: derivation

Abstract nouns in NSC are productively derived from verbs and adjectives; desubstantial, deparicipial, and other derivations are rare. Often the meaning of an originally abstract noun has become more concrete and less predictable. Deadjective nouns are formed by the suffix *-ipe*, e.g. *thulipe* ‘thickness’ (from *thúlo* ‘thick, fat’). Nouns derived from the *C*-verbs and the SPs use *-ibe* or *-ipe*, e.g. “Nógrád” *dikhibe* ‘look’ (from *dikhel* ‘to see, look at’), or *bijipe* ‘thaw’ (from *bijol* ‘to melt, thaw’), while those derived from the *a*-verbs usually contain the suffix *-be* (for morphophonology cf. 2.10.), e.g. *hábe* ‘food, eating’ (from *hal* ‘to eat’). If the *a*-verbs exceptionally derive nouns by *-ipe* or *-ibe*, the nouns are formed as if they were derived from the *C*-verbs, e.g. *dukhipe* ‘pain, grief’ (from *dukhel* ‘to hurt’ as if from **dukhel*).

The distribution of the individual abstract noun suffixes in verbs exhibits dialectal variation. Rácz’ dictionary contains only a few deverbal *-ibe* derivations, while they seem to be more

common in the other NSC varieties, cf. Šóka *vakeribe* vs. “Nógrád” *vakeripe* ‘talk, narrative’ (from *vakerel* ‘to talk, speak’), Zohra *čóribe* vs. “Nógrád” *čóripe* ‘theft’ (from *čórel* ‘to steal’). Also all desubstantial abstract nouns are formed by *-ipe* in “Nógrád” Romani, e.g. *lukestipe* ‘army, military service, being a soldier’, while we have recorded *lukestibe* in Budča. Moreover, different suffixes may be employed to express different meanings within one variety, which is a phenomenon known from ESR, too. For example, *maripe* (from *marel* ‘to beat’) in “Nógrád” Romani means ‘beating’, while *maribe* means ‘fight, brawl’ (and ‘war’ e.g. in Budča, Očova, Litava, and Prenčov Romani).

The Hungarian abstract noun suffix *-ság* ~ *-ség* was borrowed into Romani within Hungarian loans, e.g. ESR *hamišagos* ‘makebelieve’ (from *hamisság*). In the NC dialects, the athematic formant *-i-šag-os* has become a regular device for deriving abstract nouns from borrowed verbs; the *i* comes from the verbal adaptational suffix *-in-* (see 3.18.). The Hungarian abstract noun formant also applies to non-Hungarian items, e.g. Bohemian Romani *hrmišagos* ‘thunder’ (from the Slovakism *hrminel* ‘to thunder’), ESR *pisišagos* ‘writing, script’ (from the Slavism *pisinel* ‘to write’; cf. 4.1.), and also *kamišagos* ‘debt’ (from the original *kamel* ‘to want, love, owe’). The Romani abstract noun with a Hungarian stem need not agree with its Hungarian semantic equivalent, e.g. ESR *irišagos* ‘script’ (from *irinel* ‘to write’) vs. Hungarian *írás*.

The distribution of the segment *-šág-* ~ *-šég-* / *-šíg-* in the NSC dialects is restricted to loans of whole Hungarian words, e.g. Šóka *fogšágo* ‘captivity’ (from *fogság*), or *keteleşigo* ‘obligation’ (from dialectal *kötelesség*). The reason for this limitation is that the thematic suffix *-ipe* (etc.) is used to derive abstract nouns even from borrowed verbs, e.g. “Nógrád” *molinipe* (i.e. not **molišágo* or similar) from *molinel* ‘to pray’. The thematic suffix also derives abstract nouns from borrowed adjectives (which are not athematic in NSC, see 3.7.), e.g. *žutipe* ‘yellow colour’ (from the Serbocroatism *žuto* ‘yellow’). It is important that even the NC abstract nouns from borrowed (and athematic) adjectives employ the thematic suffix, e.g. ESR *šargipe* ‘yellow colour’ (from the Hungarism *šargo* ‘yellow’).

Formation of diminutives in ESR conforms to the thematicity dichotomy. Thematic nouns, numerals, some adverbs, and some pronouns use the suffix *-or-*, e.g. *pheñori* from *phen* ‘sister’, or *čunoro* from *čuno* ‘a little’, while athematic nouns etc. possess distinct formants: the suffix *-ic-* in feminine nouns and some adverbs, e.g. *blakica* from *blaka* ‘window’, *sikrica* from *sikra* ‘a little’, and the formant *-V-č[-is]* in masculine nouns (*-V-* is the vocalic exponent of subclassification), e.g. *hangocis* from *hangos* ‘voice’, *lavutaricis* from *lavutaris* ‘musician’, *xart’acis* from *xart’as* ‘smith’, or *papucis* from *papus* ‘grandfather’. Out of

borrowed words, only adjectives (and their deadjectival adverbs) form thematic diminutives in ESR, e.g. *kedvešnoro* (from *kedvešno* ‘pleasant, nice, amiable’) as the original *tatoro* (from *tato* ‘hot’).

In NSC, the dichotomy has been partly dissolved. Diminutives of borrowed nouns often have the thematic morphology, e.g. *Klinóca blokóri* from *bloka* ‘window’, *falatóro* from *falato* ‘morsel, mouthful’ (from Hungarian *falat*), *hangóro* from *hango* ‘voice’ (from Hungarian *hang*), *vodróro* from *vodro* ‘bed’ (see 4.1.), or *Šóka virágóri* from *virága* ‘flower’ (from Hungarian *virág*). The athematic feminine *ic*-diminutives, however, are still used with some feminines, e.g. *Klinóca lavutica* (from *lavuta* ‘violin’), *mačkica* (from *mačka* ‘cat’), or *patakica* (cf. Hungarian *patak* ‘brook’). In *Klinóca* and *Hrad’išťa Romani*, a special suffix *-at’-* (with the athematic *i*-masculine inflection) may derive diminutives from both athematic and thematic masculines, e.g. *Klinóca táňirati* (from *táňiri* ‘plate’), *Hrad’išťa petalati* (from *petalo* ‘hoof, horseshoe’), *nebat’i* (from *nebo* ‘heaven, sky’), or *kerekati* (from *kereko* ‘wheel’), and also *Klinóca lóvati* (from *lóvo* ‘coin, money’), *Hrad’išťa gónati* (from *góno* ‘sack’), or *šérati* (from *šéro* ‘head’).⁷⁹ There is an uncertain form *fótáči* (from *fóto* ‘stain’) in *Farkašda Romani*; the affricate may be a result of a different adaptation of the original palatalized consonant. *Hrad’išťa Romani* appears to possess one more masculine diminutive suffix (*-ar-*), which probably arose through contamination of *-ór-* and *-at’-*, e.g. *vudararo* (from *vudar* ‘door’). All the three masculine diminutive formations may be used variantly with some nouns in *Hrad’išťa*, e.g. *verdat’i* / *verdóro* / *verdaro* (of *verda* ‘cart’). Exceptionally, the thematic and a new diminutive suffix may be combined in some varieties, e.g. *Očova čhajórička* (cf. *čhaj* ‘Romani girl, daughter’, its regular diminutive *čhajóri*, and the Slovak feminine diminutive suffix *-ičk-*).

The original devices of forming names of female persons or animals are, apart from a lexical relationship (e.g. *papu* ‘grandfather’ – *baba* ‘grandmother’), a change of the inflectional subclass (e.g. *kirvo* ‘godfather’ – *kirvi* ‘godmother’⁸⁰), or the suffix *-ni* (e.g. *manuš* ‘male human being’ – *manušni* ‘female human being’). New suffixes which form names of female persons have been borrowed from Serbocroatian: *-kiň-* and *-iň-*. In the NC dialects, they have been mostly retained as part of a few borrowed ethnic terms, e.g. *Rusos* ‘Russian’ – *Ruskiňa* (borrowed from Serbocroatian *Rus* – *Ruskinja*), or *Vlaxos* ‘Vlax Rom’ –

⁷⁹ We were first inclined to see the origin of this diminutive suffix in a contamination of the Serbocroatian suffixes *-ić-* and *-ak-* (i.e. **-ac-*). More likely, however, the whole formant *-at’i* comes from the Greek diminutive formant *-ak’-i* (Victor Friedman, personal communication): cf. the masculine *xerak’i* derived from the neuter *xeri* ‘hand’. The diminutive *petalati* could be then a direct Graecism.

Vlaxiňa (from *Vlah – Vlahinja*),⁸¹ and they do not seem to be productive.⁸² New ethnic terms and other sex pairs of personal nouns are borrowed from Slovak or Czech together with their derivational relationship, e.g. *Slovákos – Slovenka* or *Slovačka* (from Slovak *Slovák – Slovenka* or dialectal *Slovačka*), or *učiteľis* ‘teacher’ – *učiteľka* (from Slovak *učiteľ – učiteľka*).

Unlike Slovak and Czech, Hungarian does not usually mark sex in ethnic and professional terms. If sex must be distinguished, the female terms are specified by nouns such as *nő* ‘woman’, e.g. *tanító* ‘teacher, male or female’ and the compound *tanítónő* ‘female teacher’. Thus Romani cannot borrow sex pairs from Hungarian together with their derivational relationship. Instead, the Hungarian-bilingual varieties of NSC make a full use of the Serbocroatian suffix *-kiň-*, which has become productive: any personal noun borrowed from a sex-indifferent⁸³ Hungarian noun can derive a female counterpart by it, e.g. Šóka *tanító* ‘teacher, male teacher’ – *tanítókiňa* ‘female teacher’, “Nógrád” *bajnoko* ‘male champion’ – *bajnokkiňa* ‘female champion’ (cf. Hungarian *bajnok* ‘champion’), Farkašda *teštvíro* ‘brother’ – *teštvírkiňa* ‘sister’ (cf. Hungarian dialectal *testvír* ‘sibling’), or *katolikuši* ‘Catholic man’ – *katolikuškiňa* ‘Catholic woman’ (cf. Hungarian *katolikus* ‘Catholic person’). The Hungarian noun *tündér* ‘nymph, fay’, which denotes a female being in the cultures in question, has been borrowed as *tindérkiňa* into Klinóca Romani, i.e. adapted as if derived from a non-existent masculine **tindéri*.

There are only few *kiň-*derivations derived from Serbocroatian stems, e.g. Klinóca *mešterkiňa* ‘female teacher’ (cf. *meštra* ‘male teacher’), or Šóka *próstkíňa* ‘non-Romani woman, female farmer’ (from *prósto*, cf. 1.2.; only the syntagma *próstiki džuvli* is used in Farkašda). The suffix *-iň-* in NSC is limited to a few ethnic terms such as *Rumungriňa*, *Ungriňa*, or *Serviňa* (derived from *Rumungro*, *Ungro*, and *Servo*, respectively; cf. 1.2.). The last two terms are less common in the Slovak-bilingual NSC varieties than *Ungričkiňa* and *Servičkiňa*, which contain the complex formant compounded of Slovak *-ičk-* and Serbocroatian *-kiň-*.

To sum up, a structural property of Hungarian (the lack of derivational expression of sex) which could create a structural gap in Romani (personal nouns borrowed from Hungarian

⁸⁰ In Farkašda, only the syntagma *džuvliki džukel* ‘female dog’ can be used for *džukli* ‘bitch’, a word common in most Romani varieties.

⁸¹ The pair *Čexos* ‘Czech’ – *Čexiňa* in ESR was rather borrowed from Eastern Slovak *Čech – Čechiňa* than from Serbocroatian *Čeh – Čehinja*.

⁸² But cf. ESR *giľoškiňa* ‘female singer’ derived from *giľošis* ‘male singer’ (for the suffix *-oš-* see below).

⁸³ A counterexample: the noun *vő* ‘son-in-law’ denotes a male person (i.e. is not sex-indifferent). It is borrowed as *vejo* into NSC, but nothing like **vejkiňa* has replaced the original *bóri* ‘daughter-in-law’.

would not differentiate sex, contrary to the pre-Hungarian ones) activated the latest borrowed devices which could fulfil the gap.⁸⁴ The *kiň*-derivations are productive in Hungarian-bilingual varieties of NSC and common in Klinóca. It is likely that the (contact) productivity of the *kiň*-derivations ceases with Slovak-bilingualism, i.e. that it is blocked by the potential of borrowing personal nouns together with derivational markers of sex. We do not know how many Hungarian or older *kiň*-derivations have been retained in Budča, Očova, and Lieskovca Romani.

Desubstantival personal nouns may be derived by the suffix *-ár-* of multiple origin, which is productive in the NC dialects, e.g. ESR *ambrel'áris* 'person who repairs umbrellas' (derived from *ambrela* 'umbrella'). The Hungarian suffixes *-s*, *-os* (etc.) of similar function were borrowed together with the Hungarian nouns first, e.g. Farkašda *bégéši* 'contrabass player' (from *bőgős*), or ESR *kujdušis* 'beggar' (cf. standard *koldus*). Now the suffix *-oš-* may apply to non-Hungarian words in both the NC and the NSC dialects, e.g. Klinóca *prahoši* 'a dusty person' (from the Serbocroatism *praho* 'dust, ash'), or ESR *ciralošis* 'person who likes floury meals' (from the thematic *ciral* 'curd').

NSC has lost the derivation of names of trees from names of their fruits by the suffix *-in*, which has been retained in the NC dialects (as well as in Roman), e.g. *akhorin* 'walnut-tree' from *akhor* 'nut, walnut'. Farkašda, Šóka, and "Nógrád" Romani use periphrasis of the type *ákhoriko kašt* 'walnut tree', which may be a structural borrowing from Hungarian (cf. *diófa* 'walnut-tree', a compound of *dió* 'walnut' and *fa* 'tree'). There are also semicalques such as *čeriko kašt* from Hungarian *csérfa* 'cherry-tree', *akáciko kašt* from *akácfa* 'acacia-tree' etc.

An interesting example of compounding is *kaňhajáro* 'egg' in Šóka and Farkašda Romani (cf. *kaňhi* 'hen', and the lost **járo* 'egg'), which disambiguates the original homonymy between *járo* 'egg' and 'flour'. The homonymy is retained in Klinóca and "Nógrád" Romani, while Bohemian Romani, and Šaštín and Čachtice WSR differentiate *járo* 'egg' vs. *jarro* 'flour', and ESR has *jandro* 'egg' vs. *(j)aro* 'flour' (see also 4.1.).

3.7.-3.8. Adjectives

3.7. Inflection and comparison

The case agreement of an anteposed adjective in NSC is almost always restricted to the opposition of the nominative and the oblique. The full case agreement of an anteposed

⁸⁴ In Serbocroatian, the suffix *-inj-* is limited to stems ending in a velar, while *-kinj-* has much less restricted distribution. This explains why it was the latter which has become productive in NSC. The low number of

adjective, which is optionally used in some NC varieties, including ESR (Lípa 1963: 78, Lípa 1965: 31-32), is not common in NSC. The only instances of the full adjectival agreement we have recorded are in the accusative plural and come from written elicited sentences in Klinóca Romani, e.g. *ón dikhle dūjen čhāven* ‘they saw two boys’, *valasaven kheren hi bange fali* ‘some houses have crooked walls’. The influence of Hungarian, where only demonstrative but no adjective attributes agree with their heads, precludes the development of the full agreement in the Hungarian-bilingual varieties.

A most interesting phenomenon in NSC is that borrowed adjectives are morphologically fully integrated, having exactly the same declension as the original *o*-adjectives [9:a], e.g. Šóka *utóšoni zlatka* ‘the last gilder’, Budča *žadni būti* ‘no work’, *postalske lukeste* ‘insurgent soldiers’, *lóve vojnové* ‘war money’, Očova *mri daj sl’ahi asi slabi* ‘my mother was such infirm’, Lieskovca *pravi romani čhib* ‘true Romani language’, *smutočne d’ila* ‘mourning songs’, or Klinóca *ruske básnički* ‘Russian poems’.

[9]

	NOM			OBL	
	SG:MASC	SG:FEM	PL	SG:FEM	SG:MASC=PL
a.	-o	-i	-e	-’a	-e
b.	-o	-o	-a	-on-a	-on-e

In the NC dialects, the borrowed adjectives have a specific declension and mostly the specific adaptational suffix *-on-* in the oblique forms⁸⁵ [b]. This athematic inflectional subclass also contains adjectives derived by the athematic derivational suffixes (e.g. *-ik-*, *-oš-*, *-n-*, or *-ast-*; see 3.8.), e.g. ESR *xartiko buti* ‘smith’s work, product’. Adjectives derived by these suffixes in NSC, of course, decline as the thematic *o*-adjectives, e.g. Šóka *ungriki čhib* ‘Hungarian language’, Lieskovca *gadžike d’ila* ‘non-Romani songs’, or Klinóca *servike básnički* ‘Slovak poems’.

The situation in the Et dialect of Teplica is more complex: the nominative plural forms of borrowed adjectives are fully integrated, e.g. *ňemecke šlugadža* ‘German soldiers’, *cele dživeša* ‘the whole days’, while the feminine nominative singular forms are fully integrated only if they are predicative, e.g. *i daj áchija šmutni* ‘mother was sad’. Otherwise the feminine

Serbocroatian *kiň*-derivations reminds us of Greek inflectional noun morphology mostly applied to post-Greek lexicon and retained only in a few Graecisms.

nominative singular forms of borrowed as well as of the athematically derived adjectives are only athematically integrated, e.g. *presila německo* ‘German numerical superiority’, *i áver világiko vojna* ‘the second world war’, and also *harčikuno búči* ‘smith’s work, product’. A fully integrated oblique plural form has been recorded in Chyžné: *težke zbraňenca* ‘with heavy arms’, but only *československo brigáda* ‘Czechoslovak brigade’ is attested from the Ct dialect of Prenčöv.

The fully integrated inflection in the plural in the Et dialects must have been borrowed from NSC (cf. 4.3.), while the feminine singular athematic suffix *-o* is a retained NC feature. In this connection, it is interesting to see that it is the feminine nominative singular athematic form (i.e. not the nominative plural) which is easily borrowed by some speakers of NSC into their idiolects: cf. *ano d’ecko nemočnica* ‘in a nursery hospital’ in the speech of a Litava Romani speaker living in Zvolen, or *elšeno trieda* ‘the first class’ beside *elšeni trieda* in the speech of a Klinóca Romani speaker who often reads in ESR.

The full integration of borrowed adjectives must be an old innovation in the SC dialects since it is common to all of them. The full integration of Serbocroatian and Hungarian adjectives in Roman was a pre-stage to the attributive indeclinability of German adjective loanwords (Halwachs 1996: 37-42), a phenomenon which waits for its explanation. The old athematic inflection has been retained by the adjectival *sako* ‘every’ in Zohra, Budča, and “Nógrád” Romani, but not in Farkašda (e.g. *sake khereste* ‘in every house’, i.e. not **sakone*). For the old oblique suffix of the athematic subclass (*-ón-*) in some deadjectival adverbs see 3.8.

The subclass of the zero-adjectives in NSC contains comparatives (and superlatives), and a few adjectives of the positive degree, e.g. *áver* ‘other’, *god’aver* ‘wise’, *kuč* ‘expensive’, and *šukár* ‘beautiful’. In Roman as well as in v. Sowa’s (1887: 64-65) WSR dialect, the zero-adjectives do not decline when not substantivized, while in Bohemian Romani (at least comparatives) and in ESR, they have the same suffixes in the oblique case as the *o*-adjectives, e.g. Bohemian *baredere manušeskero* ‘of the bigger man’ (Puchmajer 1821: 24), or ESR *dikhav la šukara čha* ‘I see the beautiful girl’.

The only zero-adjective form which can have a positive suffix (*-a*) in NSC is the nominative plural, e.g. Šóka *god’avera nípi* ‘wise people’, *áver Roma* ‘other Roms’, Farkašda *legbaredera káveházi* ‘the greatest cafés’, or Kokava *ola phuredera Roma* ‘these older Roms’. In Farkašda Romani, the suffix seems not to occur with the adjective *šukár*, but

⁸⁵ The thematic participles (such as *kerdo* ‘done’, see 3.14.) constitute a special adjectival subclass in ESR: they decline like the thematic adjectives in the nominative, and like the athematic adjectives in the oblique.

we have recorded *šukára čháve* ‘beautiful children’ in Čobánka. Individual NSC varieties also differ in the presence or absence of the suffix in the predicate, cf. the elicited Šóka *valasave Roma valamikor ČOREDERA sinéhi sar ávera*, but Klinóca *valasave Roma st’e valamikor ČOREDER sar ávera* ‘some Roms were once poorer than others’; or Farkašda *čaládo sáhi zorálo, te BUTERA sinéhi* ‘the family were strong, if they were more numerous’.

It seems that the zero-adjectives were originally indeclinable in the Central dialects, which state has been retained in Roman and in some NC dialects. Other NC dialects have innovated through an analogy with a different inflectional subclass of adjectives (namely, with the *o*-adjectives), while in NSC the analogy has been with the substantivized forms of the same subclass, e.g. **áver Roma > ávera Roma* ‘other Roms’ as *ávera* ‘the others’, with various lexical or grammatical limitations and inconsistencies in different varieties.

Attributive numerals in the oblique case decline as the *o*-adjectives in the NC dialects as well as in Klinóca Romani, e.g. *dikh’om JEKE*⁸⁶ *čháve* (elic.) ‘I saw one boy’, *dikh’la čak JEKA čha* (elic.) ‘s/he saw just one girl’; Čaba Romani has *and’a JÉKHA džuvja* ‘s/he brought a woman’. In Šóka Romani, only the numeral ‘one’ may have a positive inflectional suffix, and only in the masculine singular oblique, e.g. *dikjom JÉKHE čhavóre* (elic.) ‘I saw one kid’, but *dikja čak JÉKH čha* (elic.) ‘s/he saw just one girl’, *ón dikle DÚJ čhavóren* (elic.) ‘they saw two kids’, and *ánde akhard’a pre TRÍN čhaje* ‘he [the king] called in his three daughters’. Cf. also Teplica *amen bešahaš andre JEKHE kherórešte* ‘we lived in a little house’.

The comparative degree of adjectives and adverbs is formed synthetically by the suffix *-eder*, with a few irregularities in both the NC and the NSC dialects, e.g. *god’aveder* (of *god’aver* ‘wise’), *buter* (of *but* ‘many, much’), or the suppletive *feder* (of *lačho* ‘good’). The superlative consists of the comparative form plus the superlative prefix. The prefix *leg-* in the NSC varieties as well as in the other SC dialects is borrowed from Hungarian. The NC dialects of Slovakia show greater diversity: *jeg-* (eastern and central Slovakia), *neg-* (central and eastern Slovakia), *meg-* (central Slovakia), and *naj-* (the whole Slovakia). The prefix *naj-* in some eastern Slovakia varieties seems to be a recent borrowing from Slovak, while in WSR and in Bohemian Romani it may be of an older date, i.e. Serbocroatian. The prefix *jeg-* must be the oldest superlative prefix in central and eastern Slovakia: it is either a grammaticalization of the numeral *jekh* ‘one’, or a result of contamination of Hungarian *leg-* with the numeral. The prefix *neg-* is a contamination of the older *jeg-* and Slovak *naj-*, while

⁸⁶ Contrary to Čaraďica and Šóka Romani as well as the Et dialect of Teplica, the underlying form of the numeral ‘one’ in Klinóca Romani does not contain the aspirated *kh*.

meg- may be a grammaticalized *meg* ‘still’, which fits into the series phonetically (i.e. *Ceg-*). The Et dialect of Chyžné has borrowed the NSC suffix, e.g. *legbareder* ‘the biggest’, while Teplica Romani uses *jeg-*, e.g. *jegbarvaleder* ‘the richest’. The last suffix has been borrowed as a rare variant into Klinóca. Our Litava Romani speaker used *megfeder* [mekfeder], probably an idiolectal borrowing from Zvolen Romani. In all Slovakia dialects, the final voiced velar of the prefixes *Ceg-* is assimilated in sonority to following voiceless consonants,⁸⁷ e.g. Zohra *legfeder* [lekfeder] or Teplica *jegfeder* [jekfeder] ‘the best’.

3.8. Adjectives: adaptation and derivation; deadjectival adverbs

There is a striking contrast between the adaptation of Hungarisms and the words borrowed from Slavic languages: both Serbocroatian and Slovak adjectives are sufficiently adapted by Romani inflectional formants (cf. 3.7.), e.g. *dugo* ‘long’, *erd’avo* ‘bad’, *červeno*⁸⁸ ‘red’, or *vojnovno* ‘war, martial’ in Budča Romani from Serbocroatian *dug*, *rdav* ‘rusty, bad’, and Slovak *červený* and *vojnový*, respectively. It is the non-base stem that is adapted, e.g. Farkašda *cilo* ‘whole’ from Serbocroatian dialectal *cil-*, not from the base form *cio*. On the other hand, for Hungarian adjectives to be integrated in Romani, a specific adaptational suffix (beside the inflections) is needed: most Hungarisms are adapted by the suffix *-n-*, e.g. Šóka *utóšono* ‘last’ (from dialectal *utósó*; cf. standard *utolsó*), “Nógrád” *d’oršno* ‘swift, quick, nimble’ (from *gyors*), or ESR *ešebno* ‘first, fore’ (cf. *elsőbb*).

The derivational suffix *-av-*, which is borrowed from Serbocroatian (and retained in the pair *gizda* ‘pride’ vs. *gizdavo* ‘proud’), appears as a device of adaptation in “Nógrád” *d’engavo* ‘weak’ (from Hungarian *gyenge*), and in RácZ *jekformavo* ‘identical’, a semicalque of Hungarian *egyforma*.

The NSC and the NC dialects share most derivations by the inherited suffixes *-an-* / *-án-* (e.g. *bakráno* ‘sheep, mouton’, *baláno* ‘pig, piggish, pork’, *grastáno* ‘horse’, *rajkáno* ‘lord, manorial’, *románo* ‘Romani’, or *šošojáno* ‘of a hare / rabbit’), *-un-* (e.g. *angluno* ‘fore, first, previous’, *kaštuno* ‘wooden’, *masuno* ‘meat, fleshy’, or the irregular *somnakuno* ‘golden’), *-val-* / *-vál-* (e.g. *ratválo* ‘bloody’), and *-al-* / *-ál-* (see below). For vocalic length of some suffixes see 2.10. The suffixes *-an-* and *-un-* may also apply to athematic nouns in NSC, e.g. Farkašda *borjúkáno* derived from *borjúko* ‘calf’ (cf. standard Hungarian *borjú*), *kečkáno*

⁸⁷ The prefix *jeg-* is often written as *jekh-* / *jek-*, and *neg-* as *nek-* even before voiced consonants. The voiced variant, however, is basic, since it occurs before vowels, e.g. *jegostatñeder* ‘the last, the least important’ (Lípa 1963: 80); cf. also Šóka *legintelligenteder* ‘the most intelligent’.

⁸⁸ Used in the term *Červeno krížo* ‘Red Cross’ (cf. Slovak *Červený kríž*); the regular word meaning ‘red’ is *lóló*.

derived from *kečka* ‘goat’ (from Hungarian *kecske*), *irgáno* derived from *irga* ‘pouched marmot, gopher’ (from Hungarian *ürge*), and, in a few cases, in ESR as well, e.g. *cipuno* from the Greacism *cipa* ‘skin’, or *cakluno* from the dialectal Serbocroatism *caklo* ‘glass’.

Originally, there were two groups of the *al*-adjectives in Romani: those which contained a yod, e.g. **dzarjalo* ‘hairy’ (derived from *dzar* ‘hair’), and those which did not, e.g. **zoralo* ‘strong, powerful’ (derived from *zor* ‘strength, power’). In both NC and SC, a yod plus a preceding dental were preserved as a palatal consonant (cf. 2.2.), e.g. *papiňálo* ‘goose’ (< **papiñjalo*). Not all stems in a dental, however, belonged to the yotated subclass, cf. Farkašda *thudálo* ‘milk, milky’, i.e. not **thud’álo* < **thudjalo* (the NC dialects possess the *val*-adjective *thudválo*). The yod following other than dental consonants was lost in the NC dialects, e.g. *čarálo* ‘grassy’ (< **čarjalo*). Thus, while the NSC dialects differentiate the unmodified, the palatalized, and the yotated *al*-adjectives, the last subclass does not exist in the NC dialects. This difference between both dialect groups reminds us of an analogical one in the thematic feminines (cf. 3.2.).

If there is a synchronic yod in a NSC *al*-adjective, it mostly follows an *r* or *v* of the root, e.g. *bárjalo* ‘stone’ (derived from *bár* ‘stone’), *čárjalo* ‘grassy’ (from *čár* ‘grass’), *hevjalo* ‘holey, leaky’ (from *hév* ‘hole’), *sirjalo* ‘garlic’ (from *sir* ‘garlic’), *thuvjalo* ‘smoke, smoky’ (from *thuv* ‘smoke’), *zarjalo* ‘hairy’ (from *zár* ‘hair’), or the substantivized *štárjalo* ‘four’ (from the numeral *štár* ‘four’). The reverse implication does not hold true, cf. *džuválo* ‘lousy’ (from *džuv* ‘louse’), *gerálo* ‘mangy’ (from *ger* ‘scab’), or *jiválo* ‘snow’ (from *jiv* ‘snow’). Most NSC de-feminine *al*-adjectives are yotated or palatalized, but there is also a number of unmodified ones, e.g. *gerálo* or *džuválo*. An important difference in comparison with thematic nouns (cf. 3.2.) consists in the fact that there is a number of yotated de-masculine *al*-adjectives, e.g. *bárjalo* or *thuvjalo*.

The suffix *-ik-* in the NC dialects requires the athematic inflection (cf. 3.7.) and derives adjectives mostly from athematic nouns, e.g. ESR *breziko* (from *breza* ‘birch’), *čexiko* (from *Čexos* ‘Czech’), or *xartiko* (from *xartás* ‘smith’). In NSC, the *ik*-adjectives may be derived from thematic nouns, too, e.g. Farkašda *eftaberšiko* ‘seven-year old’ (from *efta berš* ‘seven years’), Klinóca *čhajóriko* (from *čhajóri* ‘little girl’), *manušiko* (from *manuš* ‘man, human being’), “Nógrád” *ákhoriko* (from *ákhor* ‘nut, walnut’), *biboldiko* (from *biboldo* ‘Jew’), *brišindiko* (from *brišind* ‘rain’), *diviko* (from *dive* ‘day’), *džuvliko* (from *džuvli* ‘woman’), *gaviko* (from *gav* ‘village’), *kurkiko* (from *kurko* ‘week’), or *věšiko* (from *věš* ‘forest’). The adverbs derived from those *ik*-adjectives which refer to ethnicity possess the suffix *-a*, e.g. *ungrika* ‘in Hungarian, in Hungarian manner’ from *ungriko* ‘Hungarian’.

The Hungarian suffixes *-s-*, *-os-* (etc.) are mostly borrowed together with the Hungarian adjectives, e.g. Farkašda *krumplišno* ‘potato’ (from dialectal *krumplis*), *paradičomošno* ‘tomato’ (from *paradicsomos*), “Nógrád” *ajánlatošno* ‘advisable’ (from *ajánlatos*), or ESR *kedvešno* ‘kind, dear, nice, pleasant’ (from *kedves*). In a few cases, the complex formants *-oš-* or (rarely) *-eš-*, which consist of the Hungarian derivational suffix plus the Romani adaptational suffix, derive adjectives from non-Hungarian nouns, e.g. Farkašda *tíralošno* (from the thematic *tíral* ‘curd’), ESR *kotorošno* ‘patched, spotted’ (from the thematic *kotor* ‘piece, part, patch’), *dzeškošno* ‘tasteful’ (from the dialectal Slovakism *dzeška* ‘taste, mood’), or *buterešno* ‘superfluous’ (from the thematic comparative *buter* ‘more’). The *oš-* adjectives (etc.) possess the athematic morphology in the NC dialects, even if derived from thematic nouns.

The adjectives derived by *-ast-* and *-utn-*, which are common in ESR, have not been recorded in NSC. The former suffix was borrowed from Slovak *-ast-* (but cf. also Serbocroatian *-ast-*), which renders a smaller degree of the property designated by a base adjective. The suffix may also apply to pre-Slovak adjectives, e.g. ESR *šargasto* ‘yellowish’ derived from the Hungarianism *šargo* ‘yellow’ (cf. Slovak dialectal *žltasť* from *žltý*), or *gulasto* ‘sweetish’ from the thematic *gulo* ‘sweet’ (cf. Slovak *sladkasť* from *sladký*). The desubstantial use of the suffix *-ast-*, which is typical only for the Eastern Slovak dialects, has been also borrowed into ESR, e.g. *bradasto* ‘bearded’ (derived from the Slovakism *brada* ‘beard’), or *čangasto* ‘long-legged’ (from the thematic *čang* ‘leg’).

The oblique suffix of the original athematic subclass of adjectives (*-ón-*, cf. 3.7.) has been retained in adverbs derived from borrowed Slavic adjectives, i.e. in the old masculine accusative singular forms of the adjectives, e.g. *erd’avóne* ‘badly’ (see 4.1.), or Zohra *veselóne* ‘merrily’ (cf. Slovak *veselý* ‘marry’). Later, the suffix has spread to adverbs derived from some thematic adjectives, too, e.g. *tátóne* ‘hotly’, or *šúžóne* ‘cleanly’ (vs. NC *tátes* and *žúžes*).⁸⁹ The original forms without the suffix *-ón-* have been kept in the most frequent non-derived deadjectival adverbs such as *báre* ‘very, greatly’, *láche* ‘well’, or *šukáre* ‘beautifully’, as well as in the adverbs derived from the *an-* or *al-* adjectives, e.g. *románe* ‘in Romani’, or *zorále* ‘strongly’.

Some Hungarian adjectives have been borrowed together with their adverbs, e.g. *bistošno* ‘sure’ (from *biztos*) together with *bistošan* ‘surely’ (from *biztosan*). Borrowing the Hungarian adverbs in *-an* ~ *-en* ~ *-n* ~ *-on* is facilitated by the similarity of the suffixes to Romani *-one*.

⁸⁹ In NC, thematic adjectives contain the suffix only exceptionally, e.g. ESR *gulones* beside a more common *gules* ‘sweatly’.

A Hungarian deadjectival adverb may be borrowed without its adjective, e.g. *nad'on* ‘very, greatly’ (from *nagyon*) beside the common *báre*, but only *báro* ‘big, great’. The Slovak *inakšie* ‘in other way, otherwise’ has been borrowed as the comparative *inakšeder* into the Slovak-bilingual varieties.⁹⁰

3.9.-3.12. Pronominal words

3.9. Personal and possessive pronouns

Pronouns of the 1st and the 2nd persons do not show any significant variation in the Central dialects. Kalina (1882: 53) gives the forms **amengero* ‘our’ (instead of *amáro*) and **tumengero* ‘your[-Pl]’ (instead of *tumáro*), which seem to be artificially created by him in order to fit into the paradigm, since they are not attested anywhere else in the NC dialects. The syntactically unrestrained forms *míro* / *miro* ‘my’ and *tíro* / *tiro* ‘your’ are limited to eastern Slovakia varieties, including the Et dialects of Chyžné, Teplica, and Roštár, while in the NC dialects to the west – in CSR (including the Ct dialect of Prenčöv), WSR, and in Czechia Romani – as well as in most NSC varieties, only the syncopated forms *mro* and *tro* may be used as non-emphatic attributes. The syncopated forms, however, also variantly exist in ESR (e.g. Lída 1963: 85-87). In “Nógrád” Romani (Rácz 1994: 126) and perhaps elsewhere, the full forms may be used as non-attributes or emphatically, i.e. the syncope opposition *míro* – *mro* etc. is functionally parallel to the vocalic quantity opposition in *amáro* – *amaro* etc. (cf. 2.10.). In Biskupica and “Nógrád” Romani – but not in Šóka, Čaba, Čobánka and elsewhere, an elision of the liquid occurred in the syncopated forms: **mrV ### mV* and **trV > tV*, e.g. Biskupica *mo pra⁹¹* ‘my brother’, *odá man kamlaj, taj me rome, taj me čháv* ‘that one liked me, and my husband, and my son’. Farkašda Romani uses both *mro* and *mo* etc., so it seems that the liquid elision is a recent process. For the genitive forms of the 3rd person pronouns see 3.1.

The nominative of the 3rd person pronouns in most NC dialects contains a prothetic yod: *jov* ‘he’, *joj* ‘she’, and *jon* ‘they’. Only in the extreme east and northeast of Slovakia, e.g. in Prešov, Podskalka, Humenné, and Lodomirová, the forms *ov*, *oj*, and *on* are used. On the other hand, the non-prothetized forms occur in nearly all SC dialects, including NSC (where they contain a long vowel): *óv*, *ój*, and *ón*. Our Litava and Čaradica Romani speakers,

⁹⁰ The suffix *-š-* usually renders the comparative function in Slovak, e.g. the adjective *drahší* ‘more expensive’ (of *drahý* ‘expensive’) or the adverb *drahšie* ‘more expensively’ (of *draho* ‘expensively’). The form *inakšie* is quasi-comparative since it is synonymous with *inak*. Romani both calqued the quasi-comparative form (cf. *-eder*), and borrowed the Slovak comparative suffix within the stem *inak-š-*.

⁹¹ The noun *phral* ‘brother’ has lost its initial aspiration in Biskupica and Farkašda Romani.

however, use the NC prothetized *jov* etc. regularly. Budča, Očova, and Lieskovca Romani retain the non-prothetized forms, while the Et varieties as well as the Ct dialect of Prenčov have *jov* etc.

A very interesting phenomenon has occurred in some NSC varieties: gender distinction has been lost in the nominative of the 3rd person singular pronouns (there is no evidence of gender dissolution in the other cases) and variantly in the pronoun meaning ‘alone, oneself’. The original feminine form has been generalized for both genders, so *ój* now means both ‘she’ and ‘he’ (but cf. *leske* ‘to him’ vs. *lake* ‘to her’ etc.), and *korkóri* may render both ‘she herself, alone’ and ‘he himself, alone’, e.g. Šóka *ÓJ KORKÓRI andar leskeri gódi* ‘he himself from his mind’.

Hungarian is clearly the source of this innovation, but the contemporary geographical distribution of the innovative varieties does not correspond to the Hungarian linguistic area: the genderless *ój* is present not only in the Hungarian-bilingual Šóka, Farkašda, and “Nógrád” Romani, but also in the Slovak-bilingual Hradíšť’a, Kokava, and Klinóca Romani. On the other hand, Čaba Romani in Hungary retains the masculine *óv* ‘he’; this may be due to a weaker Hungarian influence in the past (cf. 1.4. for the contact with Slovak). The gender distinction is also retained in Zohra, Budča, Očova, and Lieskovca Romani, as a rare variant in Farkašda Romani (*ó* < **ov*, cf. 2.10.), and it has been either reintroduced or confirmed in Čarad’ica and Litava Romani together with the borrowed prothetized forms. We lack sufficient data on Biskupica, and Čobánka.

Was the loss of gender in the 3rd person pronoun’s nominative an innovation shared by many or some varieties, or did it occur independently in each of them? The fact that the generalization went just one direction – and the other direction is no less plausible as evidenced by the original masculine *ov* ‘s/he’ in Vend – speaks against the latter hypothesis. It seems very likely that at least the subgroup of Hradíšť’a, Kokava, and Klinóca Romani have shared this innovation. For their speakers, Hungarian must have been the first second language for a longer time than for the speakers of Budča, Očova, and Lieskovca Romani; there the distinction must be a retention, since borrowing from neighbouring NC dialects would have introduced the prothetized forms. With all probability,⁹² speakers of Budča, Očova, and Lieskovca Romani have lived longer in the Slovak linguistic environment.

⁹² Not necessarily: in theory, Klinóca (etc.) Romani speakers could have spoken both Hungarian and Slovak, respectively, for a longer time than Budča (etc.) speakers. This would imply that the latter left the South Slavic area later than the former, which does not seem to be the case.

VE 6/12/04 21:34

Comment: Chyba!Řetězec pro obrázek obsahuje nerozpoznané citace.

Continuing exclusive Hungarian bilingualism of “Nógrád” Romani speakers brought about another contact-induced change in the 3rd person pronoun’s morphology: the Hungarian plural suffix *-k* has been added to the original nominative plural form *ón*. The nominative forms in both languages are now structurally and phonetically similar: Romani *ój* – Hungarian *ő* ‘s/he’ and Romani *ónk* (Rácz 1994: 105, 129) – Hungarian *ők* ‘they’.

3.10. Reflexive pronouns

Reflexive pronouns in traditional Romani are used to refer to the 3rd person subject of a clause, e.g. ESR *sar pes vičinel?* ‘what is his/her name?’, but the non-reflexive *sar tut vičines?* ‘what is your name?’, or *šaj amen dovakeras* ‘we can make ourselves understood’. Owing to Slovak and/or Czech interference, the reflexive forms may also refer to the other persons, which is common in ESR, especially as spoken today in Czechia, e.g. *šaj pes dovakeras* ‘we can make ourselves understood’. The NSC dialects seem to retain the traditional use fairly well.

Irrespective of their use, the reflexive forms follow differing analogies in different varieties. The reflexive stem *p-* either has the formants of the 2nd person pronoun (“2p-forms”), or of the 3rd person pronoun, masculine in the singular (“3pm-forms”) [10]. The original personal reflexive in Romani was itself analyzable as a singular 3pm-form (i.e. *pes* as *les* ‘him’). The ancestor of the NC dialects analogically created the possessive reflexive with a singular 3pm-form (i.e. *peskero* as *leskero* ‘his’). Both forms, although formally singular, were used irrespective of number: this situation is retained in Bohemian Romani (e.g. Puchmajer 1821: 25-26) and WSR. In some varieties of Slovakia, specific plural 3pm-forms have been developed (i.e. *pen* as *len* ‘them’, and *pengero* as *lengero* ‘their’).

[10]

	2ND PERSON		3RD PERSON (MASCULINE)	
PERS SG	<i>pe-t</i>	<i>tu-t</i>	<i>p-e(s)</i>	<i>l-e(s)</i>
POSS SG	<i>p-íro</i> etc.	<i>t-íro</i> etc.	<i>p-esk(e)ro</i>	<i>l-esk(e)ro</i>
PERS PL	<i>p-umen</i>	<i>t-umen</i>	<i>p-en</i>	<i>l-en</i>
POSS PL	<i>p-umáro</i>	<i>t-umáro</i>	<i>p-eng(e)ro</i>	<i>l-eng(e)ro</i>

The SC dialects originally had the singular personal 3pm-form (i.e. the *s*-less *p-e* as *l-e*), but they also inherited (see Boretzky, this volume) a whole set of the 2p-form reflexives: the plural personal *pumen* (as *tumen* ‘you-[PI]’), the singular possessive **píro* (as *tíro* ‘your’),

and the plural possessive *pumáro* (as *tumáro* ‘your[-Pl]’).⁹³ Thus, most NSC dialects contain three 2p-form reflexives and one 3pm-form reflexive. This asymmetry has been partly removed in Biskupica Romani where the accusative of the singular personal reflexive acquired the suffix *-t*, which is an irregular accusative suffix present only in the singular 2nd person pronoun *tut*. However, the analogy is not perfect, since the form retains its 3pm-form stem (cf. *pet*, not **put*).

The 2p-forms are also used in the Et dialects of Chyžné, Teplica, and Roštár; the singular possessive reflexive *píro* is not syncopated there (cf. the non-syncopated singular personal pronouns, 3.9.). What is more interesting is that also the WSR variety of Šaštín uses the 2p-form reflexive *pro* (beside the 3pm-form *peskero*); we have no evidence of *pumen* or *pumáro* in Šaštín Romani. The 2p-forms or, more likely, the pattern of the 2p-analogy, have been borrowed from NSC into the Et dialects. This need not be the case of the Šaštín variety, which does not seem to be influenced by NSC in any other respect. Old independent creation of a 2p-form is possible. On the other hand, the 3pm-form *peskero* in Budča Romani is clearly borrowed from the neighbouring NC dialects.

3.11. Article and demonstrative pronouns

The (definite) article possesses the forms shown in [11:a] in most NC dialects of Slovakia,⁹⁴ including the Ct dialect of Prenčov. The NSC varieties differ in the nominative singular feminine form *i*, which has also been borrowed into the Et dialects. In Farkašda, Šóka, and “Nógrád” Romani [c], but not in Biskupica, Čaraďica, Čobánka, and elsewhere in NSC [b], the oblique stem is the innovative *ol-* of a demonstrative origin (see below) instead of the original *l-*.

[11]

	NOM			OBL	
	SG MASC	SG FEM	PL	SG FEM	SG MASC = PL
a.	<i>o</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>le</i>
b.	<i>o</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>le</i>
c.	<i>o</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>ola</i>	<i>ole</i>

⁹³ The NSC syncope in the singular possessive reflexive (i.e. **piro* > *pro*) and the consequent liquid elision in some NSC varieties (i.e. *pro* > *po*) parallels the developments in the 1st and the 2nd person singular possessive pronouns (cf. 3.9.), thus not giving up the 2p-form analogy.

⁹⁴ The archaic oblique forms without *l-* are reported to exist in some northern-central Slovakia varieties, and they were common in the pre-war Czechia Romani.

Immense interdialectal variation is a characteristic feature of Romani demonstratives; it is almost sure that a number of forms will remain unaccounted for in the following paragraphs. There are several demonstrative stems in the NC dialects in Slovakia: 1. *od-*, 2. *ad-*, 3. *ok-*, 4. *ak-*, 5. *okod-*, 6. *akad-*, 7. *kod-*, and 8. *kad-*.⁹⁵ One can observe that the odd stems contain an *o*, while the even ones an *a*. The *a*-stems were extended by another *a*, e.g. *ad-a-*, while some *o*-stems could be followed by any of both vowels, e.g. *od-o-* and *od-a-*. Individual NC dialects differ in the stems employed, in their function, and in their inflectional forms. The stems *okod-* and *akad-* are known from western Slovakia (e.g. v. Sowa 1887: 72) and some other dialects (e.g. Teplica), while the stems *kod-* and *kad-* are peculiar to some CSR and ESR varieties. Lípa (1963) gives only *od-a-*, *ad-a-*, and *ok-a-* for the ESR dialect of Humenné. In NSC, the stems *od-o-* and *ad-a-* are common, while *od-a-* (Zohra), *kod-o-* (Farkašda, Čaraďica, Litava, Lieskovca, and Klinóca), *akad-* (Nógrád), and *ok-o-* and *ok-a-* (Čobánka) are attested only in the varieties given in the parentheses.

The function of the *ok-* and *ak-* demonstratives in ESR is to express the greatest spatiotemporal distance, or absence of an object in the place and time of communication, e.g. *oka svetos* ‘the other world’. The close deixis (‘this’) is rendered by the *od-* (and *kod-*) demonstratives in some varieties, and by the *ad-* demonstrative in others (cf. Lípa 1963: 92–93, v. Sowa 1887: 70), including NSC. The stem *od-* is the most frequent and functionally unmarked. The function of the element *k-* in *kod-* (vs. *od-*) remains unclear.

Let us now look at all possible inflectional forms of the *od*-demonstrative⁹⁶ [12] in the Central dialects. There are two sets of long forms, with the *-o-* and the *-a-* augments, respectively, and the form *odija*.⁹⁷ The augment vowel could be syncopated [a] in some cases: *odoja* (or *odija*, or *odaja*) > **odja* > *od’a*, *odole* (or *odale*) > *odle*, and *odola* (or *odala*) > *odla*. After the syncope, the resulting consonant cluster could be simplified by dropping the *d* [b]: **odja* > *oja*, *odle* > *ole*, *odla* > *ola*. The forms *odá* and *odí* [c] must have arisen through a contraction of the long forms. Moreover, there is a specific nominative plural form *odona* and syncopated *odna* in Šóka Romani, e.g. *te odá ODONA čhavóra na háléhi, na site úléhi adádi erďavóne* (elic.) ‘if those children had not eaten that, they would not have had to be sick today’.

⁹⁵ For the origin of the stems see Boretzky, this volume.

⁹⁶ The *ok*-demonstrative possesses the following forms in most ESR varieties: *oka*, *oki*, the *o*-extended *okole*, *okola*, and the *a*-extended *okale*, *akala*. The *a*-stems are parallel to the *o*-stems (except for the non-existence of the *o*-extended forms).

⁹⁷ The *e*-extended form *odela* exists in Klinóca.

[12]

	-o-	-a-	-i-	a.	b.	c.
NOM SG MASC	<i>odova</i>	<i>odava</i>				<i>odá</i>
NOM SG FEM	<i>odoja</i>	<i>odaja</i>	<i>odija</i>	<i>od'a</i>	<i>oja</i>	<i>odi</i>
OBL SG MASC = OBL PL	<i>odole</i>	<i>odale</i>		<i>odle</i>	<i>ole</i>	
OBL SG FEM = NOM PL	<i>odola</i>	<i>odala</i>		<i>odla</i>	<i>ola</i>	
NOM PL	<i>odona</i>			<i>odna</i>		

The long *o*-extended forms are used in WSR (v. Sowa 1887: 70-72) beside the most simplified ('short') forms, e.g. both *odova* and *oda*, both *odole* and *ole*. Already at the time of v. Sowa, the nominative singular masculine short form could be used in the feminine, in the plural, or in the oblique; today, the short form *oda* is indeclinable in WSR, e.g. in Čachtice, Jablonica, or Šaštín Romani, but not in Prievídza and east of it. In most ESR varieties, only the short forms may be used attributively, i.e. *oda*, *ole*, *ola*; individual varieties have either *odi* (e.g. Humenné), or *oja* (e.g. Spiš, Chyžné) in the feminine. The long forms *odova* and *odava* (originally: nominative singular masculine) are only used for non-attributive impersonal deixis. The dialect of Humenné may employ the long *a*-extended forms attributively, but only in the oblique cases (Lípa 1963: 92-93), e.g. both *dikhav OLA čha* and *dikhav ODALA čha* 'I see that girl', but only *OLA Roma* 'those Roms'.

In NSC, only the short forms are used in the nominative singular masculine, and in many varieties in the feminine, too. Only Budča, Klinóca, and the Ct dialect of Prenčov possess the long form *odija*, e.g. Budča *me s'omahi tieš and'ODIJA vojna* 'I was in that war, too'. The short form *od'a* is attested from Lieskovca Romani, *oja* is mostly used in Klinóca (as well as in the Vendic dialects), and *odi* in Šóka, Farkašda, Čobánka, and "Nógrád" Romani. In the oblique and in the plural, the long and short forms are often used without any obvious functional differentiation, e.g. in Klinóca and Lieskovca. In Zohra Romani, the short forms are used attributively, while independent demonstratives possess the long forms, e.g. *OLA klinci kernahi* 'they made those nails', *ODOLEHA fitinnahi o gád'a* 'the non-Romani women heated with that', or *ODOLEN kedinde and'OLA plinove komori* 'those they took into those gas chambers'.

Only the long plural and oblique forms are attested from Očova, Farkašda, and "Nógrád" Romani. Šóka speakers mostly use the syncopated forms, and rarely the long ones. The lack of the short oblique forms of the *od*-demonstrative in Šóka, Farkašda, and "Nógrád" is due to

their past integration into the article paradigm (see above). The highest frequency of the unmarked *od*-demonstrative lead to a (further) grammaticalization of a part of its paradigm. Consequently, the short oblique forms of the *ad*-demonstrative (i.e. *ale*, *ala*) and the homonymous nominative plural *ala* have been lost, too.

The long plural and oblique forms of demonstratives in NSC must have existed parallelly with the short ones for quite a long time. The original forms which remained long must have been functionally different from (and more marked than) those which had been reduced in shape. Perhaps it was the sort of differentiation which occurs in Zohra Romani (i.e. independent vs. attributive); also the short demonstrative forms which were grammaticalized into the article function in some varieties had been used attributively before. In some varieties, however, the old functional differentiation has been lost, e.g. Klinóca *i Zuza s'ta néna ODOLE kováčiske*, *so s'amahi ič odoj* 'Zuza was the aunt of that smith whom we visited yesterday' and *no sar hála, mind'ár khabni péla – OLE trine boršóvendar* 'so as she ate [it], she immediately became pregnant – from those three peas'. In Klinóca, a new differentiation is coming into existence, the long forms clearly prevailing in the oblique and the short forms in the nominative plural. The "new"⁹⁸ syncope of the long forms (to yield *odle* and *odla*) in Šóka is a recent process. It is likely that the feminine form *oja* arose through a development shared by the NSC Klinóca Romani, the Et dialect of Chyžné, and the NC dialects to the north.

In Šóka, Farkašda, and Biskupica, the nominative singular forms of the neutral demonstrative (i.e. *odá* and *odí*) are often used in the function of the 3rd person pronoun, e.g. *čak korkóri amenge bašavlahi ODÍ* 'she [literally: that one] alone played to us'. On the other hand, the 3rd person masculine singular pronoun in Šóka and Farkašda may be used for impersonal or indefinite deixis, e.g. *sar LE te phenav* 'how shall I say it'. In Klinóca Romani, the neutral demonstrative must be employed. Cf. the elicited Klinóca *te ODA tri čhaj hala, ovla lake erd'avóne* and Šóka *te tri čhaj LE hala, erd'avóne ovla* 'if your daughter eats this, she will be sick'.

There is one more demonstrative in all Central dialects: *ková* (a long form of the *o*-augmented stem *k-*), which functions as an expletive (...), e.g. Biskupica *mo pral te mo bratranec te lesko KOVÁ kamaráto* 'my brother and my cousin and his ... friend'. The pronoun has a full range of substantival forms, including the directive case in those varieties where this case exists, e.g. Budča *othar gé'om KOVU Štubňu* 'from there I went to ... to

⁹⁸ The contemporary short forms must have gone through an "old" syncope (e.g. **odole* > **odle* > *ole*, cf. above) in the past.

Štubňa'. Excluding the nominative forms, the pronoun declines as a thematic noun of the intended gender, e.g. Čaraďica *má sjomahi po búťa KOVATE Pohorelice* 'I was already working in ... Pohorelice', or *otrávind'a leskere KOVE graste* 's/he poisoned ... horse'. The nominative singular is *ková* for both genders, and the nominative plural is *kovi* (as if athematic), e.g. Šóka *de si odla KOVI jóke* 'but there are those ...', or Očova *o Paľáčovci, valamikor, so sléhi odola báre KOVI, odola lavutára* 'the Paláč family, in those days, who were those great ..., those musicians'. At least in Šóka and Farkašda, there is the expletive adjective *koválo* (i.e. an *al*-adjective, cf. 3.8.), e.g. Šóka *i probléma hi KOVÁLI, sar le te phenav* 'the problem is ..., how shall I say it'.

3.12. Other pronouns and pronominal adverbs

The interrogative pronouns *so* 'what' and *ko* 'who' have a singular substantival declension. The oblique stems are *so-s-* and *ka-s-*, respectively. There are two irregularities in the declension of the latter pronoun in the NSC dialects: the accusative is not *s*-less, i.e. *kas* (vs. all other substantivals, cf. 2.4.), and the instrumental is based on the extended oblique stem **kasa-s-*, i.e. *kasaha*. The other oblique cases possess regular forms, e.g. the dative *kaske*. According to Rácz (1994: 130), both pronouns have specific oblique plural forms in "Nógrád" Romani: the stems are *so-n-* and *ka-n-*, respectively. This is clearly due to a recent influence of Hungarian.⁹⁹ The plural forms do not exist in Slovakia NSC dialects, not even in the Hungarian-bilingual ones, e.g. Šóka *odna murša, KASKE me diĵjom ando jakha* 'those men into whose eyes I looked', i.e. not **kange*.

The quantitative pronominal adverbs in NSC are *aŕi* / *aŕi* 'so much, so many' (vs. NC *ajci, adeci*) and the interrogative *kiŕi* / *kiŕi* / *keŕi* / *keŕi* 'how much, how many' (vs. NC *keci*). They may take the ordinal or the multiplicative suffix, e.g. "Nógrád" *kiŕito* 'what, at what numerical position', or *kiŕivar* 'how many times'. The qualitative pronominal adverb is *sar* 'how' and the adjectival pronoun is *savo* 'what, which' in NSC (cf. 2.5.). The full adjectival

⁹⁹ The borrowed phenomenon is just the existence of the morphological plural in these pronouns, i.e. not any concrete segment nor any concrete morphological pattern. There is a number of structural differences between both languages: First, "Nógrád" Romani does not mark the plural in the nominative. Second, Hungarian has no positive singular suffix (vs. Romani singular *-s-* in the oblique cases). Third, unlike Romani, there is a positive accusative suffix in the Hungarian pronouns (*-t* ~ *-et*).

	SG		PL	
	ROMANI	HUNGARIAN	ROMANI	HUNGARIAN
NOM	<i>ko</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>ko</i>	<i>ki-k</i>
ACC	<i>ka-s</i>	<i>ki-t</i>	<i>ka-n</i>	<i>ki-k-et</i>
DAT	<i>ka-s-ke</i>	<i>ki-nek</i>	<i>ka-n-ge</i>	<i>ki-k-nek</i>

asavo ‘such’ (vs. ESR *ajso*) is used in “Nógrád”, and rarely in Farkašda, e.g. Farkašda *k’amende na sah’ASAVE Roma* ‘there were no such Roms at our locality’; in most NSC varieties, including Šóka and Farkašda, the reduced *aso* (for geminated *asso* cf. 2.7.) is common. We have also recorded the *k*-stems *kasó* (< **kasavo*) in Čobánka, and *kac(c)avo* (< **kadsavo*) in Farkašda and Klinóca.

All NC as well as NSC dialects possess the temporal interrogative *kana* ‘when’, but there are slight differences in the form of the adverb ‘now’: cf. Zohra and Litava *akának*, Farkašda, Šóka, and Čobánka *akán* (cf. Vend *akán*), “Nógrád” *akani*, Budča *akánik*, Chyžné *akána*, and NC *akana*, *akanak*, *akanake*, *akanakes*, *akakanak*, or *akáňik*. Rácz’ dictionary contains *sokana* ‘always’ (cf. *so dúj* ‘both’, *so trin* ‘all three’), while in the other NSC varieties, the adverbs *mindíg* (from Hungarian *mindig*) and *furt* / *fur* (ultimately a Germanism) are used.

The local pronominal adverbs in the NC as well as in the NSC dialects may be classified into essives (direction, i.e. movement to or towards an object, or location) and ablatives (movement from or away from an object). The ablative adverbs also express motion through a medium. The most common essive adverbs in the NC dialects are *adaj* ‘here’, *odoj* ‘there’, and the interrogative *kaj* ‘where’, but there are further non-interrogative forms based on various demonstrative stems, e.g. *adej* (*ad-*), *akaj*, *ake* (*ak-*), *odej*, *odija* (*od-*), *kodoj*, *kodej* (*kod-*), *kokodoj* (*ko-kod-*), *okoj*, *oke*, or *okija* (*ok-*). Only the rare *arde* ‘here’ and *okle* ‘there’ seem to be specialized for direction. The ablative adverbs are the interrogative *khatar* ‘from where, which way’, the *a*-stems *adarig*¹⁰⁰, *adathar*, *athar* ‘from here, this way’, and the *o*-stems *odarig*, *odathar*, *othar* ‘from there, that way’.

The NSC dialects possess the essives *káj* / *ká* ‘where’, *adaj* ‘here’, and *odoj* ‘there’, and the ablatives *kathar* ‘from where, which way’ (for the place of aspiration see 3.23.), *áthar* ‘from here, this way’, and *óthar* ‘from there, that way’. Furthermore, Rácz gives *okoj* ‘over there’ for “Nógrád” Romani. The variant *ká* is peculiar to Klinóca Romani (cf. 3.24. for the formally similar pair *taj* / *tá*). Beside *adaj*, the specific *óde* ‘here’ is used in Klinóca, e.g. *hát, bešasahi ÓDE angle biš beršende* (elic.) ‘yes, we lived here twenty years ago’, or *me pametinaṽ kana ále o Rusi ÓDE* ‘I remember when the Russians came here’. While in Klinóca and Budča the essives do not differentiate location and direction, the adverbs *káj*, *adaj*, *odoj* in Zohra, Šóka, Farkašda, and “Nógrád” Romani are specifically locational, and the movement to or towards an object is expressed by *kija* ‘where’, *aňd’a* / *ad’d’a* ‘here’, and *oňd’a* / *od’d’a* / *od’a* ‘there’, respectively, e.g. Šóka *ole autoha ODOJ sáhi* ‘s/he was there with the

¹⁰⁰ The noun *rig* ‘side’ has been lost in many NC dialects of Slovakia.

car’ vs. *ój ONĎA sáľind’a téle* ‘s/he sat down there [to that place]’. The Farkašda and “Nógrád” variants with the geminate come from *oňd’a* and *aňd’a*, which are retained in Šóka; the Zohra form *od’a* is old (cf. Vend *ód’a* and Roman *oča* < **odža* < **ód’a*).

The relative pronouns and adverbs are identical with the interrogative ones in the NC dialects and in most NSC varieties, e.g. Šóka *naštig džas, kija kamas* ‘we cannot go where we want’ and *kija džas?* (elic.) ‘where are you going?’. “Nógrád” Romani has borrowed the Hungarian relative prefix *a-*: the above sentences would be *naštig džas, akija kamas* vs. *kija džas?*. Rácz gives the following relatives: *aso, ako, asavo* (homonymous with ‘such’), *asar, akáj, akija, akathar, akana* (vs. *akani* ‘now’), *akit’i, akit’ito, and akit’ivar*.

In Klinóca Romani as well as in ESR, the pronoun *so* may be used as a personal relative, while Šóka prefers the pronoun *ko*, e.g. elicited Klinóca *pindžares odole lavutári, SO avka šukáre bašavel?* vs. Šóka *pindžares odle zenísi, KO avka šukáre bašavel?* ‘do you know that musician who plays so beautifully?’. The personally used *so* must be followed by a personal pronoun if it is not the subject of the relative clause, e.g. elicited Klinóca *odá murš, SO LESKE dikhl’om ando átha* ‘the man to whose eyes I looked’, literally ‘the man what him I looked into eyes’ (vs. Šóka *odá murš, KASKE me dikjom ando jakha*). The absolute relative construction is common in Slovak (cf. *znáš toho hudobníka, ČO tak pekne hraje?*, and *ten muž, ČO som MU pozrel do očí*¹⁰¹), but it may be older in Romani.

Most negative pronouns and adverbs are formed from their interrogative counterparts by the suffixes *ni-* or *ňi-* (see below), e.g. Šóka *niko, nisavo, nisar, nikija* (or *nekija*), and *nikathar*. The negative corresponding to *káj* is *nikháj* (i.e. *-*kháj*). The temporal *nikana* or *ňikana*, which is used in some NSC varieties (e.g. in “Nógrád”), has been fully replaced by *šoha* (from Hungarian *soha*) in others and in many NC dialects (e.g. ESR). Slovak dialectal forms may be borrowed, too, e.g. ESR *ňigda* and Chyžné *ňikoda*. The isogloss between the dental *ni-* and the palatal *ňi-* correlates with the Hungarian and Slovak primary bilingualism, respectively. The former suffix was probably borrowed from Serbocroatian, while the latter one comes from Slovak (cf. also below).

The impersonal negative pronoun is most interesting: the oblique forms are derived in a regular way, e.g. *nisoske / ňisoske*, while the various nominative forms have been borrowed from contact languages; **niso* / **ňiso* does not exist. The Hungarian-bilingual varieties use the Serbocroatian *ništa* (facultatively reduced to *ništ* in Šóka), while the situation in the Slovak-bilingual dialects is more diverse: Čarad’ica and Budča Romani have *nič* or *ňiš*,

¹⁰¹ Beside *znáš toho hudobníka, ktorý tak pekne hraje?*, and *ten muž, ktorému som pozrel do očí*.

Prenčov *ništ* or *niš*, Klinóca and Chyžné *nič*, Zohra *ništ*, *ništ*, *niš*, or *niš* etc.; ESR varieties use *nič*, while Puchmajer's Bohemian and v. Sowa's WSR variety had *ništ* and *ništ*, respectively. Slovak dialects themselves exhibit great diversity: *nič* (also standard), *nic*, *ništ*, *niš*, and *ništ* (sic!). Only the *ništ* (and its palatalized or reduced variants) of Zohra Romani may be said with certainty to be a retention of the Serbocroatian word (cf. local Slovak *nic*), while in Prenčov, WSR, and Bohemian Romani, Slovak could be the source of the pronoun.¹⁰²

Although there is a suppletive relationship between the nominative and the oblique roots of the negative impersonal pronoun (*-šta*, *-č* etc. vs. *-s-*), the negative prefix itself remains uniform¹⁰³ and its uniformity is desirable, as may be seen from the fact that Hungarian *semmi* 'nothing' has not been borrowed into any Romani variety. Nor has been the Hungarian negative prefix *se(m)-*. If one takes into account the prompt borrowing of the Slovak negative prefix into the Slovak-bilingual varieties, it is clear that the similarity of the Slovak *ni-* to the Romani prefix of that time (Serbocroatian *ni-*) played an important role: in fact there was no borrowing of the former, but rather an assimilative adaptation of the latter.

The original indefinite prefix in the NC dialects was *vare*-¹⁰⁴, while all SC dialects borrowed *vala-* from Hungarian. A contamination of both, *vale-*, is used in the transitional dialects of Prenčov, Revúca and, beside *vala-*, in Teplica, but not in Chyžné, where the original NC prefix is retained. The prefix *vare-* has been contaminated by Slovak *da-* in some ESR varieties: *dare-*. Unlike the NC *varekana* / *darekana* 'once, in those days', the adverb *valakana* is not common in the NSC dialects: the whole *valamikor* has been borrowed from Hungarian. In Klinóca, Budča, and Čaradica Romani, but not in Zohra, or Šóka, all forms of the original *valasavo* are regularly contracted to *valaso* etc., e.g. Budča *ohrada VALASI* 'some fold'. In Čaradica Romani, we have recorded a loan of Hungarian *valami* 'something', which has been specialized into an estimative word, e.g. *keři amen sjah'odoj Roma? – VALAMI trijanda* 'how many Roms were we there? – some thirty [Roms]'. Some Slovak-bilingual varieties borrowed indefinite pronouns from Slovak, e.g. Zohra *nekero* 'some [which?]' beside *valasavo* 'some [what?]'. The prefix *si-* in Čobánka, e.g. in *siko* 'someone', must be a restructured loan of the Slovak suffix *-si* (cf. *ktosi* 'someone').

¹⁰² Pre-war German dialects can hardly be the source of *ništ* / *ništ* in Puchmajer's and v. Sowa's Romani: the German *ništ* was limited to northern Bohemia, most parts of Moravian Silesia, and a few enclaves in Slovakia (cf. Schwartz 1934).

¹⁰³ Or at least its variants are very similar, cf. v. Sowa's *ni-št* but *ni-ko*.

¹⁰⁴ The prefix *vare-* is one of a few possible Rumanian loans in the NC dialects (cf. also the particle *inke* / *hinke* 'still, yet' in some varieties). There is an areal affinity in the shape of the indefinite prefix in Rumanian (*oare-*), Hungarian (*vala-*), Slovak (*voľa-*), and Romani.

Further, there is a number of prefixes in Romani of Slovakia which express free-choice indefiniteness, e.g. *makar-* from Serbocroatian, *akár-* / *akar-* and *bár-* from Hungarian (the latter in some places possibly through Slovak), *bárs-* and *xoč-* / *xoc-* from Slovak etc. In NSC and in the Et dialect of Chyžné, the prefix *akár-* / *akar-* is used, and we have recorded *bár-* in Zohra. At least in ESR, the suffix *-kam* (grammaticalized *kames* ‘you want’) can be used in the same function, e.g. *kokam* < *kokames* ‘whoever’ (vs. *kas kames* ‘whom you want’). The whole Hungarian *akármikor* ‘any time’ is attested from Lieskovca. Farkašda and Klinóca Romani use *mindenfélíko* and *mindenfélo* ‘various’ (from Hungarian *mindenféle*), respectively, while ESR has borrowed *šelijako* from Slovak, and we have recorded the semicalque *šelihavo* / *šelijavo* (cf. *havo* < **savo* ‘what, which’, 2.5.) in the WSR dialect of Čachtice.

Farkašda and Šóka have borrowed the Hungarian prefix *minden-* ‘every’, e.g. in *mindenkáj* ‘everywhere [direction]’ (cf. Hungarian *mindenhova*), or *mindeneko* ‘every; everything’ (cf. Romani *sa-ko*). The pronoun *savóro* ‘all; everything, everyone’ exists in the NC dialects as well as in Zohra, Čaradžica, Očova, and Klinóca Romani. In its non-attributive use, it has been replaced by *mindeneko* in Šóka and Farkašda, and *sa* ‘all’ and *sako* ‘every; everything’ may be employed in a similar function, e.g. Šóka *me MINDENEKO ári genav ándal* ‘I read everything out of it [a journal]’, *vásoni, ráma, caklo, o lateksi, keverines MINDENEKO: odá SA lóvend’avel ánde* ‘canvas, frame, glass, the latex, you mix everything: all that costs money’, or Šóka *taj so mange tecinel, hát od’ande mro šéro áčhol, na SAKO, avka hi-jo* ‘and what I like, well, that stays in my head, not everything; this is how the things are’. The Farkašda and Šóka indeclinable pronoun *sogodi* ‘all, every, any’ is a functional equivalent of the attributively used *savóro* in the other NSC dialects, e.g. Farkašda *sa géle, SOGODI džéne géle* ‘they all left, all people left’ (vs. *savóre džéne*). The pronoun contains the Serbocroatian suffix *-god* (cf. Boretzky & Igla 1994: 262), and it represents another specific correspondence between Farkašda and Šóka Romani on the one hand, and Vend (cf. *sogudi*) on the other hand.

3.13. – 3.22. Verbs

3.13. Present stem forms

In the Central dialects, the imperative, present, future, imperfect, and conditional potentialis forms as well as the gerund (see 3.16.) are based on the present stem, while the participle, preterite, and conditional irrealis (see 3.15.) forms are based on the preterite stem (see 3.14.). The subjunctive as well as the infinitive are formed analytically (see 3.16.). The

future and the imperfect forms are derived from the present forms of the corresponding person and number by means of the future and the imperfect suffix, respectively (see below). The conditional potentialis of all verbs with the exception of the copula (3.17.) is identical with the imperfect, while the conditional irrealis is derived from the preterite by means of the imperfect suffix.

The future suffix is *-a* in NSC as well as in NC¹⁰⁵, while the shape of the imperfect suffix is an important distinctive feature between both dialect subgroups (see also 4.2.): *-ahi* in the SC and *-as* in the NC dialects (for *-as* > *-aš* in some Et varieties cf. 2.6.). In most NSC varieties we have investigated, the fast-speech variant of the suffix *-ahi* is a bisyllabic *-ai* or a monosyllabic *-aj*. In Biskupica Romani, however, *-aj* has become the only slow-speech variant, so an underlying {aj} must be assumed.¹⁰⁶ The apocopated variant of the suffix {ahi} is *-ah'* (cf. 2.11.).

There are two sets of person-and-number suffixes: the present set and the preterite set. The underlying forms of the present person-and-number suffixes are identical in all Central dialects [13]. In the so-called *a*-verbs (the inflectional stem ending in *a*, e.g. *dža-l* 'to go'), the present person-and-number suffixes immediately follow the present stem, while in the so-called *C*-verbs (the inflectional stem in a consonant, e.g. *ker-el* 'to do, make'), the suffixes are preceded by another morphological segment (a marker of subclassification): underlying {a} in the 1st person, and {e} in the 2nd and the 3rd persons.

[13]

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2/3PL
<i>a</i> -	{v}	{s}	{l}	{s}	{n}
<i>C</i> -	{a} {v}	{e} {s}	{e} {l}	{a} {s}	{e} {n}

Various morphophonological processes may occur before the future or the imperfect suffix: a) the aspiration (cf. 2.5.) in the 2nd singular and the 1st plural forms, b) the vowel syncope in the 3rd singular and the 2nd/3rd plural of the *C*-verbs, e.g. **kerela* > *kerla* 's/he will do, make', and c) the contraction in the 1st singular forms, e.g. **kerava* > *kerá* 'I will do, make'. There are four subgroups of the Central dialects which behave differently as far as the aspiration in verbs is concerned: the NC dialects, the Vendic dialects, most NSC varieties, and

¹⁰⁵ The future form *phenla* 's/he will say' may be used as praesens historicum in the NSC dialects. The irregular variant *phanla* (< *phenla*) is often employed in this function.

Šóka and Farkašda Romani (cf. 2.5.). In the NC dialects, the vowel syncope and the contraction either do not exist (in Bohemian Romani and WSR), or they are just optional (in most ESR varieties; only the contracted imperfect form is used around Humenné, cf. Lípá 1963: 105-106). On the other hand, both the vowel syncope and the contraction are obligatory in the SC dialects. The only¹⁰⁷ forms where the former is optional in NSC is the 2nd/3rd plural of verbs with the inflectional stem in *n*, e.g. Šóka *džanna* / *džanena* ‘you[-PI]/they will know’, *dógozinnahi* / *dógozinenahi* ‘you[-PI]/they worked’, but only *kernahi*, not **kernahi* ‘you[-PI]/they did, made’. The NSC future and imperfect forms of the *C*-verbs, both the underlying and the surface ones, are shown in [14].

[14]

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2/3PL
FUT	-á	-eha	-la	-aha	-(e)na
	+{a}	+{a}	+{a}	+{a}	+{a}
	{a} {v}	{e} {s}	{e} {l}	{a} {s}	{e} {n}
	+{ahi}	+{ahi}	+{ahi}	+{ahi}	+{ahi}
IMPF	-áhi	-esahi	-lahi	-asahi	-(e)nahi

The SPs (for their derivation see 3.19., for palatalization cf. 2.2.) originally inflected exactly like the *C*-verbs, and the segment **-ov-* formed a part of the inflectional stem [15].

[15]

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2/3PL
<i>C</i> -	-av	-es	-el	-as	-en
SP	*-ov-av	*-ov-es	*-ov-el	*-ov-as	*-ov-en

However, a specific inflectional subclass arose in most Central dialects after various phonetic developments had taken place. The common SC present and future formants of the SPs (after the above-mentioned aspiration, syncope, and contraction) are reconstructed in [16]. The contraction (**)ove* > **oe* > *o* [a] occurred not only in NSC, but also in the NC dialects. In ESR and Bohemian Romani, the contraction is obligatory in any form of a SP,

¹⁰⁶ A similar but surely independent development has occurred in Prizren Romani (see Boretzky, this volume).

while in NSC and especially in WSR, the uncontracted forms are retained beside the contracted ones.¹⁰⁸ The uncontracted forms are rare in NSC, cf. Farkašda *hajoves* ‘you understand’ (beside the more common *hajos*), or Klinóca *lól’uven* ‘you[-PI]/they grow red’ (beside *lól’on*). Unlike the Vedic dialects, the NSC / NC contraction **ove > o* did not affect other verbs than the SPs, cf. Vedic *sol* ‘s/he sleeps’ (vs. *sovel* elsewhere).¹⁰⁹

[16]

	*SC	a.	b.	c.
1SG	-ovav			-uvav
	-ová			-uvá
1PL	-ovas			-uvas
	-ovaha			-uvaha
2SG	-oves	*-oes	-os	
	-oveha	*-oeha	-oha	
3SG	-ovel	*-oel	-ol	
	-ovla		-ola	
2/3PL	-oven	*-oen	-on	
	-ovna		-ona	

If the syncope of the type **kerela > kerla* ‘s/he will do, make’ (see above) was shared by all SC dialects, then the NSC forms of the type *terñola* ‘s/he will grow young’ and *terñona* ‘you[-PI]/they will grow young’ originate in **terñovla* (< **ternjovela*) and **terñovna* (< **ternjovena*), respectively, i.e. there was an elision of the preconsonantal *v* [b] in NSC. This elision has not occurred in Vedic (cf. *terñovla*). An alternative explanation, the development

¹⁰⁷ The Očova non-syncopeated form *phenela* ‘s/he will say’ may be borrowed from the neighbouring NC dialects.

¹⁰⁸ According to v. Sowa’s (1887: 90) description of the WSR variety of Trenčianske Teplice, the 3rd singular and the 2nd/3rd plural forms are invariantly contracted, while the 2nd singular forms are invariantly uncontracted, e.g. *xal’ol* ‘s/he understands’ (*xal’ola* ‘s/he will understand’ etc.), *xal’on* ‘you[-PI]/they understand’ (*xal’ona* ‘you[-PI]/they will understand’ etc.), but *xal’oves* ‘you understand’ (*xal’oveha* ‘you will understand’ etc.). A similar grammatically conditioned difference exists in Roman, where the regular contraction occurs in the 3rd singular and the 2nd/3rd plural present forms, e.g. **ternjovel* ‘s/he, it grows young’ > *terñol* and **terñoven* ‘you[-PI]/they grow young’ > *terñon*, while the situation in the 2nd singular is more complicated: the future and the imperfect forms are uncontracted, e.g. **ternjoveha* ‘you will grow young’ > *terñojeha* (i.e. not **terñoha*), and the present form in *-ojs* assumes the development **ternjoves* ‘you grow young’ > **terñoes* > *terñojs* (cf. Boretzky, this volume). Generally, the forms of the least marked 3rd person tend to be shorter.

¹⁰⁹ Several facts point to the mutual independence of the Vedic and the NSC / NC contraction, respectively: a) the Vedic contraction is more general (cf. *sol* < **sovel* ‘s/he sleeps’), b) there is a whole set of similar contractions in the Vedic dialects (**uve > u*, **ave > a* etc.), and c) **oves > *oes* resulted in the contracted *os* in the NSC and the NC dialects, but in the diphthongized **ojs* in Vedic.

of the type **ternjovela* > **terñoela* > *terňola* (which is likely to have occurred in the NC dialects) would assume the contraction **ove* > **oe* > *o* to precede the vowel syncope in NSC, which is not likely.

Finally, some NC (e.g. ESR, but not Prievidza Romani and the dialects to the west of it) as well as NSC (e.g. Klinóca, “Nógrád”, but not Lieskovca, Šóka, or Farkašda) dialects have raised the **o* in the 1st person forms of the SPs into an *u* [c], e.g. *terňovav* > *terňuvav* ‘I grow young’, or *terňovaha* > *terňuvaha* ‘we will grow young’. Perhaps, the innovation was shared by Central dialects east of a meridional issoglos, irrespective of their genetic appurtenance (but cf. the independent raising in Prekmurje; Boretzky, this volume). The elision of the intervocalic **v* in the SPs and the consequent insertion of an antih hiatus yod, which occurred in Roman (e.g. **terdjovav* > *terčojav* ‘I stand’), is not attested from NSC.

The subclassification markers in the newly developed present inflectional subclass of the contracted SPs are: the suffix *-o-* in the contracted 2nd and 3rd person forms, and the complex formant {ov}{a} / {uv}{a} in the 1st person (e.g. in *terd'-ov-a-v* / *terd'-uv-a-v* ‘I stand’). The suffix *-ov* / *-uv* also appears in the 2nd singular imperative of the SPs (for the word-final change **uv* > *ú* see 2.10.), e.g. *terňov* / *terňuv* / *terňú* ‘grow younger!’.

Most *a*-verbs and *C*-verbs have no positive suffix in the 2nd singular imperative, e.g. *dža* ‘go!’, or *ker* ‘do, make!’. A few *C*-verbs, however, contain the imperative suffix *-e*, e.g. *le* ‘take!’ and *de* ‘give!’. In some NSC varieties and in the NC dialects, the original compounds of the verb *del* ‘to give’ (the so-called *d*-verbs or *d*-derivatives) keep its irregular imperative form, e.g. Hradíšťá Romani *cide* (of *cidel* ‘to pull’), and ESR *cirde* (of *cirdel* idem). In Šóka and Farkašda Romani, all *d*-verbs except for *del* itself have acquired the zero imperative forms, e.g. *cid* (of *cidel* ‘to pull’), *čumid* (of *čumidel* ‘to kiss’), *čhand* (of *čhandel* ‘to vomit’), *čhid* (of *čhidel* ‘to throw’), *ispid* (of *ispidel* ‘to push’), *ked* (of *kedel* ‘to gather, take’), *khand* (of *khandel* ‘to smell’), *phud* (of *phudel* ‘to blow’), *rod* (of *rodel* ‘to look for’), *trad* (of *tradel* ‘to drive’), or *vazd* (of *vazdel* ‘to lift’). The imperative suffix *-i* is used in *xu’i* (of *xu’el* ‘to jump’), *uri* (of *urel* ‘to dress’), and *ušt’i* (of *ušt’el* ‘to get up’) in ESR, and at least in *ušt’i* ‘get up, jump!’ in NSC.

The form of the 2nd plural imperative is homonymous with its indicative counterpart, e.g. *džan* ‘you[-Pl] go’ and ‘(you[-Pl]) go!’. This also holds true for the 1st plural in the NC dialects and perhaps also in some NSC varieties, e.g. *džas* ‘we go’ and ‘let us go!’. Slovak (as well as Czech) indicative of the 1st plural is often used in the imperative function (e.g. *ideme* ‘we go’ used as an appeal or command), although a specific imperative form also exists (e.g. *pod’me* ‘let us go’). In the Hungarian-bilingual varieties (cf. Rácz 1994: 106, LIPA 1965: 42),

the imperative function in the first plural may be implemented by the subjunctive form (together with the particle *te*; see 3.16.), e.g. *te džas* ‘let us go!’, this is in concord with the polyfunctionality of the Hungarian imperative-subjunctive mood.

3.14. Participle and preterite

Preterite forms of thematic verbs are mostly based on the participle stem, which usually consists of the present stem plus the participle suffix, e.g. *ker-d-* (of *kerel* ‘to do’). The participle suffix is determined by the present inflectional subclass, and by the stem-final consonant in the C-verbs. Most *a*-verbs possess the suffix *-n-* in the NSC dialects, e.g. *dara-n-* (of *daral* ‘to be afraid’), while the situation in the NC dialects is more complex. The SPs use the suffix *-il-* (cf. 2.2. for morphophonology) in both dialect groups, e.g. *terň-il-* (of *terňol* / *terňovel* ‘to grow young’).

In the C-verbs, the suffix *-d-* is employed after the sonants *n*, *r*, *l* (for *lel* see below), and after *v*, which itself is elided, e.g. *garu-d-* (of *garuvel* ‘to hide, cover’); only in one verb it is retained, and only in NSC: *dživ-d-* vs. NC *dži-d-* (of *dživel* ‘to live’). The suffix *-l-* is used after velars and labials and in the verb *phandel* ‘to bind’ (for the *d*-verbs see below), and in all NC and most NSC dialects also after *č*, e.g. *phuč-l-* (of *phučel* ‘to ask’). After the sibilants *š* and *s*, the suffix *-t-* was once employed in all Central dialects, e.g. *beš-t-* (of *bešel* ‘to sit, live’), but it has been replaced by *-l-* in many ESR varieties and variantly in Šóka, e.g. *beš-l-*; most NSC dialects as well as the transitional dialects of Prenčov, Chyžné, and Teplica retain the original state. In Klinóca and Hradíšť’a, the suffix *-t-* has even spread to the stems in *č*, e.g. *phuč-t-*.

The so-called *d*-verbs had originally the suffix *-in-*, which is still retained in all NC and NSC dialects in the verb *del* ‘to give’ itself: *d-in-*. The original irregular preterite stem *l-il-* of the verb *lel* ‘to take’ is retained in Budča, Očova, and variantly in Klinóca, while in Čaraďica, Farkašda and Šóka, the innovative *l-in-* prevails. The suffix *-in-* has replaced the original *-il-* in the irregular *ušt-il-* (of *ušt’el* ‘to get up’) in Farkašda and Hradíšť’a Romani, and the suffix is even more progressive in Biskupica, where it has expanded to the SPs with a stem in a lateral (cf. the lateral in *liňa*), e.g. *siklíňa* ‘s/he learned’ instead of the original *siklíja*; the palatal dissimilation (cf. 2.2.) has been retained (i.e. no **sikjíňa*).

Budča Romani as well as the Ct dialect of Prenčov still use *-in-* in the *d*-derivatives, e.g. *kedine* ‘they gathered’, *trádine* ‘they drove’, while in most NSC dialects the shape of the suffix was extended to *-ind-*, e.g. Zohra *kedinde*, Čaraďica *trádinge*, Farkašda *uštidingom* ‘I got, obtained’, Klinóca *kedinde*, *ispidinga* ‘s/he pushed’ etc. In v. Sowa’s WSR variety,

different *d*-verbs had differing suffixes, e.g. *ked-ind-* vs. *trad-in-*. In ESR as well as in the Et dialects of Chyžné and Teplica, the suffix has been syncopated to *-n-*, e.g. **xudine* > *xudne* (> *xune* in Teplica) ‘they got, grasped, held’, and it may be replaced by the expansive *-l-* in some ESR varieties, e.g. *xudne* > *xudle*. For the *d*-verbs’ participles in Klinóca see below.

The preterite of borrowed verbs is not based on the participle: The preterite stem is formed from the present stem by the suffix *-d-*, as if the stem adapted by *-in-* (see 3.18.) were an original *n*-final stem, e.g. Šóka *vígzind’a* ‘s/he finished’ as *phend’a* ‘s/he said’. The sequence of the adaptational and the preterite suffix (*-in-d-*) is likely to be the source of the extended participle suffix of the *d*-verbs (*-ind-*, cf. above). The athematic participle suffix is *-ime* in NSC and *-imen*¹¹⁰ in Slovakia NC dialects (cf. 2.4.), and the participle is indeclinable, e.g. Budča *amari slovenski vláda s’ahi podajime ko Němci* ‘our Slovak government was submitted to the Germans’ (cf. *podajinel pe* from Slovak *poddát sa* ‘submit, give in, give up’), Litava(–Zvolen) *s’omas obetime* ‘I was sacrificed’ (cf. *obetinel* from Slovak *obetovať* ‘to sacrifice’), or Šóka *amen ňumime sam* ‘we are oppressed’ (cf. *ňuminel* from Hungarian *nyom* ‘to press, print’).

The segment *-in-* is so closely connected to the participial suffix *-imen* in ESR that the thematic verb *pot’inel* ‘to pay’ can have both *pot’indo* and *pot’imen* as its participles. A specific feature of Klinóca Romani is that the suffix *-ime* has expanded to the participles of the *d*-verbs, e.g. *cidime* (of *cidel* ‘to draw’), or *kedime* (*kedel* ‘to gather, take’): the source of the parallelism between the *d*-verbs and the borrowed verbs in the participle, e.g. *cidime* – *livime*, is their parallelism in the preterite, e.g. *cidind’a* – *livind’a* (but cf. the non-parallel *cidel* ‘to draw’ vs. *livinel* ‘to shoot’, i.e. no **cidinel*). The Et dialects of Revúca and Chyžné have lost the suffix *-imen*, and there is no difference between the participles of the original and the borrowed verbs, e.g. Revúca *me som narod’indo Revúcate* ‘I am born in Revúca’ (cf. Slovak *som narodený*), or Chyžné *amen samas zasadlind’e* ‘we were planted, seated’ (cf. Slovak *zasadnúť* ‘to sit, take a seat’), i.e. no **narod’imen*, or **zasadlimen*. A similar loss has occurred in the pre-war Czechia Romani and perhaps also in some NC dialects of Slovakia.

The verb ‘to carry, bring, lead’ (NSC *ledž-el*, v. Sowa’s *lidža-l*, ESR *l’idža-l*) possesses the participle stems *ligad-*, *leged-*, and *liged-* in Čaraďica, Budča, and WSR, respectively, while in Biskupica, ESR, and the Et dialect of Teplica, the stems contain a nasal: *legind-*, *l’igend-* and *legend-*, respectively. The other irregular formations of the preterite are common to all Central dialects, e.g. *dža-* ~ **gél-* ‘to go’, *mer-* ~ **múl-* ‘to die’, *per-* ~ **pél-* ‘to fall’, *sov-* ~

¹¹⁰ Exceptionally *-men* in ESR *xol’amen* ‘angry’ (cf. *xol’asa’ol* ‘to get angry’).

sút- ‘to sleep’ etc. A new irregularity has arisen in NSC *av-* ~ *á-l-* (< **av-l-*) ‘to come’ (cf. 2.10.).

The preterite set of the person-and-number suffixes in the common SC Romani may be reconstructed as in [17]. Some intransitive verbs in the Vedic dialects have the participle-like forms not only in the 3rd plural, but also in the 3rd singular, e.g. *gélo* ‘he went’ and *géli* ‘she went’ (beside *géja* ‘s/he went’ in some Vedic varieties). Our NSC data do not contain any 3rd singular participle-like form. On the contrary, gender-indifferent forms of the type *géja* ‘s/he went’ are used with all intransitive verbs. This is an important feature connecting NSC with the NC dialects rather than with the Vedic ones. However, the loss of the participle-like 3rd singular preterite form must be a recent development at least in some NSC varieties, since it still existed, at least in remnants, in Farkašda Romani in the 60’s as attested by Lípa’s (1965: 40) *i gádži géli* ‘the non-Romani woman left’.¹¹¹

[17]

1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
* <i>jom</i>	* <i>jal</i>	* <i>ja</i> ~ *-o/-i	* <i>jam</i>	* <i>jan</i>	* <i>e</i>

Some eastern NSC varieties, namely Kokava, Klinóca, Litava, Hradíšť’a, and “Nógrád” Romani, as well as the NC dialects of the Upper Hron River (Horehroní) have gone further in the dissolution of the participle-like preterite forms: the participle / preterite suffix has also been palatalized in the 3rd plural by the analogy with the other preterite forms, e.g. *kerd’e* ‘they did’ (with the same stem as in *kerdom* ‘I did’ etc.) unlike the plural participle *kerde* ‘done’. Cf. Hradíšť’a *na s’e lačhe odola petala?* ‘were those lasts not good?’ (Banga 1993b: 56), or Litava *o gádž’odá na šund’e* ‘the Slovaks did not hear it’. It is likely that this phenomenon came into being as a common innovation in a continuous area (eastern NSC plus the adjacent NC dialects). All varieties to the west as well as the transitional dialects of Prenčov, Chyžné and Teplica retain the non-palatalized forms, e.g. *kerde* ‘they have done’. The participle-like formants are indicated by the equation sign in [18] (‘to go’).

¹¹¹ This is the only example given by Lípa. Today, the participle-like forms are not even acceptable for Farkašda speakers.

[18]

	Vendic	western NSC (etc.)	eastern NSC (etc.)
3SG	<i>gel=o – gel=i</i>	<i>gél'-a / géj-a</i>	<i>gél'-a / géj-a</i>
3PL	<i>gel=e</i>	<i>gél=e</i>	<i>gél'-e / géj-e</i>

3.15. Conditional irrealis

Only the conditional irrealis forms of the 3rd person exhibit interesting irregularities. Although the *s*-less 3rd singular preterite suffix *-a* (< **-ja*) is not limited to the SC dialects (cf. 2.4.), an important structural difference between the SC and the NC dialects concerning the *s*-lessness of the suffix is present in the conditional irrealis: Even in those NC dialects where the surface form is *-a*, e.g. *kerd'a* 's/he did, made', the underlying form should be constructed as *{'as}*, since a laryngeal appears in the conditional irrealis form, e.g. *kerd'ahas* 's/he would have done, made', i.e. not **kerd'aas* or similar. On the other hand, if NSC had an underlying *{'as}* despite its *s*-less surface form, the dissimilation rule (cf. 2.5.) would require a conditional irrealis form of the type **kerd'asahi*, which is not present in our data; *kerd'áhi* is the only and well attested form. The situation in the NSC and the NC dialects is summarized in [19].

[19]

	PRETERITE	CONDITIONAL IRREALIS
NSC	<i>{d} {'a} > -d'a</i>	<i>{d} {'a}+{ahi} > -d'áhi</i> <i>{d} {'*as}+{ahi} > *-d'asahi</i>
NC	<i>{d} {'as} > -d'a(s)</i>	<i>{d} {'as}+{as} > -d'ahas</i> <i>{d} {'*a}+{as} > *-d'aas, *-d'ás etc.</i>

The formation of the 3rd plural conditional irrealis is fairly uniform in NSC (unlike NC): it is based on the *s*-less 3rd plural preterite form, preserving its palatalization in the eastern varieties (cf. 3.14.). An irregularity may be observed in the resulting vowel: the underlying *{e}* and *{ahi}* fuse into *-éhi*, e.g. Šóka *kerdéhi* or Klinóca *kerd'éhi* 'they would have done'. It is difficult to say whether the NSC type of the 3rd plural conditional irrealis form is inherited from the common SC, since the other SC dialects have introduced a disarranging morphological innovation.

In the Vendic dialects, the regular 2nd plural conditional irrealis form has expanded to the 3rd plural, i.e. an assimilation has taken place of the homonymical structure of the conditional

irrealis subparadigm to that of the present and imperfect, cf. e.g. Roman *kerčanahi* and Vend *kerd'enahi* 'you[-Pl]/they would have done'. (A somewhat more complicated 2nd vs. 3rd person neutralization in the plural existed in Puchmajer's Bohemian Romani.¹¹²) The number neutralization has occurred in some NC varieties in Slovakia through an expansion of the original 3rd singular form to the plural, e.g. *kerd'ahas* 's/he, they would have done'.

Most NC dialects of Slovakia contain a surface laryngeal in the 3rd plural conditional irrealis: either the form is directly based on the 3rd plural preterite, e.g. Teplica *livinkerdehaš* 'they would have shot' (cf. *livinkerde* 'they shot'), or the 3rd person conditional irrealis forms of disparate numbers differ only in the absence/presence of palatalization, e.g. *kerdahas* 'they would have done' (cf. *kerd'ahas* 's/he would have done'). The WSR variety of Trenčianske Teplice employs the innovative 'intrusive' *n*, perhaps due to an analogy with the corresponding imperfect forms, e.g. *kerdenas* 'they would have done' as *kerenas* 'they did'.

3.16. Subjunctive, infinitive and gerund

Subjunctive forms in the Central dialects are identical with the corresponding present indicative forms with most verbs, while there are special subjunctive forms with the copula (see 3.17.). The subjunctive forms are mostly used with the preposed subjunctive particle *te*, or with modal particles such as *šaj*, *naštig* / *našti*, Šóka and Farkašda *nek* or NC *mi* (see 3.24.), e.g. Šóka *šaj ovel* 'maybe, it can be true', *naštig géjom* 'I was not allowed to go', *nek ovas saste* 'let us be healthy'. In "Nógrád" Romani, the particle *šaj* is followed by the indicative, e.g. *šaj hi* 'maybe, it can be true' (Rácz 1994: 45).

Infinitive probably did not appear in the Central dialects before the 19th century. Its inception from the Balkanic finite subjunctive construction (of the type *kamav te šunav* 'I want to hear') was in process at the beginning of the last century, but remnants of the finite construction still existed in this century. In all Central dialects, the original dependent verb in a subjunctive construction became invariant in a subjunctive¹¹³ form of the 3rd, i.e. the least marked, person. Individual varieties differ in the grammatical number of the invariant form, but the isoglosses do not correspond to the dialectal division between NC and SC.

Most NC dialects possess the 3rd singular infinitive, which we will call the *l*-infinitive, e.g. *kamav te šunel*. The non-finite construction in the last century Bohemian Romani, which was

¹¹² With some verbs, the 2nd/3rd plural conditional irrealis is simply based on the 2nd plural preterite form, e.g. *terñilanas* 'you[-Pl]/they would have grown young' (cf. *terñil'an* 'you[-Pl] grew young'), while with other verbs, the irrealis form contains the palatalization and the suffix consonant of the 2nd plural preterite plus the vowel of the 3rd plural preterite, e.g. *kerd'enas* 'you[-Pl]/they would have done' (cf. *kerd'an* 'you[-Pl] did' and *kerde* 'they did').

restricted to non-present tenses, was also based on the 3rd singular form, e.g. the preterite *kaml'om te šunel* 'I wanted to hear'. Only the NC dialects of the extreme east of Slovakia (Humenné, Michalovce) employ the *n*-infinitive, i.e. the one based on the 3rd (and the 2nd) plural form, e.g. *kamav te šunen*.

Nor the SC dialects are uniform: the Vendic subgroup has the *l*-infinitive, while the area of NSC is crossed by the *l*-/*n*- isoglosses. Zohra Romani in the extreme west of the NSC area and Čaraďica Romani employ the *l*-infinitive, which agrees with the situation in the adjacent NC dialects. The varieties of Podunajská nížina, i.e. Biskupica, Farkašda, Tarnóca, and Šóka Romani as well as the varieties in Hungarian Pilis and "Nógrád" possess the *n*-infinitive. The *n*-area continues to the northeast and includes Hrad'išťa, Kokava, and Klinóca Romani. Further to the east, in the Et dialects of Revúca, Chyžné, and Teplica, the *l*-infinitive is used, as well as in Budča, Lieskovca, and Očova NSC, again in contiguity with the adjacent NC dialects. Our speaker of Litava(–Zvolen) Romani uses the *l*-infinitive, which can be a feature of Zvolen Romani in his idiolect and/or the real state in his native dialect; the latter hypothesis is not unlikely concerning the *l*-infinitive in the nearby Ct dialect of Prenčov.

It is possible that the different types of the infinitive in Slovakia and northern Hungary arose as innovations shared by adjacent dialects irrespective of their genetic appurtenance. However, it is also possible that all NSC dialects once had the *n*-infinitive, and that Zohra, Čaraďica, Litava, Budča, Lieskovca, and Očova Romani borrowed the *l*-infinitive from the neighbouring NC dialects.

Rarely, the infinitive of a loan-verb is used in the form it has in the source language. Lípa (1965: 41) gives *géja dógozňi* 's/he went to work' in Farkašda Romani with Hungarian dialectal *dógozňi* (standard *dolgozni*) 'to work'. In Biskupica, we have recorded *nána sobodna andi zábava te ist* 'it was not possible to go freely to a ball' with the Slovak dialectal *ist* (standard *íst*) 'to go'. The two examples differ in a few respects: In the former case, the Hungarian synthetic infinitive form alone functions analogically to a Romani analytic infinitive construction, while *te ist* consists of both the Romani subjunctive particle and the Slovak synthetic infinitive form. Moreover, *dógozňi* can be interpreted by the speakers as a form of the Romani verb *dógozinen*, while it is more likely that there was an intraclausal code-switch in our Biskupica example between *te* and *ist*. Alternatively, *ist* can be considered a new suppletive form to *dža-* and *gél-* / *gėj-* 'go'.

¹¹³ The copula infinitive corresponds to the 3rd person subjunctive (i.e. not indicative) form.

The NC gerund suffix is *-indos* with the *C*-verbs and the SPs, and *-ndos* with the *a*-verbs, e.g. ESR *rovindos* ‘weeping’ (of *rovel* ‘to weep’), *pašl'indos* ‘lying’ (of *pašlol* ‘to lie’), or *prastandos* ‘running’ (*prastal* ‘to run’). Its NSC equivalent *-indú ~ -ndú* is attested from Farkašda and Šóka. If there were the development **ndos > -ndú*, then the irregular raising and lengthening of the vowel must be explained (cf. the regular *s*-lessness in the accusative singular of the animate athematic *o*-masculines, 3.2.). The gerund is usually formed from intransitive verbs.

3.17. Copula

Morphology of the copula is extremely diverse in the NSC dialects. In all of them, the present and past formants in the 1st and the 2nd person of the copula correspond to the preterite and conditional irrealis formants of other verbs, respectively [20]. The stem of these forms (Σ) also occurs in the past 3rd person singular and, somewhat modified ($\Sigma 1$) in some varieties, in the past 3rd person plural. The formant of the past 3rd person singular may be *-a* or *-áhi* or both, and that of the past 3rd person plural *-e*, *-éhi* or both, according to variety (see below).

[20]

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
a.	Σ -om	Σ -al		Σ -am	Σ -an	
b.	Σ -om-ahi	Σ -al-ahi	Σ -	Σ -am-ahi	Σ -an-ahi	$\Sigma 1$ -

The original stem *s-* is retained in Biskupica, Farkašda, Tarnóca, and Šóka, e.g. *som* ‘I am’, *somahi* ‘I was’, *sáhi* / *sa* ‘s/he was’. In the 1st and the 2nd persons, it may be also found in most NC dialects of Slovakia, e.g. *som* ‘I am’, *somas* ‘I was’, as well as in the Vendic dialects, e.g. *som* ‘I am’, *somahi* ‘I was’. The 3rd person past form (of both numbers) in the NC dialects is *sas* or the aspirated *has* and *ehas* (cf. 2.5.); also the Ct dialect of Prenčov retains the NC form *has* (see also below). The original stem **sin-* in the 3rd singular past exists in the Vendic dialects (*sina*, *sine*, *sin*, *sinahi* etc.), in Čobánka (*sina*), and in “Nógrád” (*siňa*) – in the last two varieties beside more common innovative stems (see below). In Farkašda, Tarnóca, and Šóka, the stem **sin-* is present only in the plural (*sine*, *sinéhi*, or syncopated *snéhi* ‘they were’); rarely, the 3rd plural past is equal to the singular form, e.g. Farkašda *SÁH'ase romňa* ‘there were such women’.

[21]

		$l' > j$	3PL PAL	Σ -	Σ 1-
a. Zohra, Čarad'ica, Čaba, Čobánka	{sl}	+	–	<i>sj</i> -	<i>sl</i> -
b. “Nógrád”	{sl}	+	+	<i>sj</i> -	<i>sj</i> -
c. Budča, Očova, Lieskovca; Prenčov	{sl}	–	–	<i>sl'</i> -	<i>sl</i> -
d. Litava	{sl}	–	+	<i>sl'</i> -	<i>sl'</i> -
e. Hrad'išť'a, Kokava, Klinóca	{st}	0	+	<i>st'</i> -	<i>st'</i> -

Most NSC varieties use innovative copula stems, which are given in [21]. The underlying {st} is present only in the easternmost NSC dialects [e], while the most general innovation is the stem {sl}. Boretzky (this volume) explains the innovative stems as results of a morphological analogy with the preterite forms of other verbs.¹¹⁴ The innovations probably started in the 3rd person copula past form, e.g. *sl'a* ‘s/he was’ as *phuč'l'a* ‘s/he asked’, *sle* ‘they were’ as *phuč'le* ‘they asked’, and then spread to the other Σ -stem forms. Secondly, the 3rd person past forms use the imperfect suffix (in a reduced form *-hi*) in some varieties, in accord with the other past forms of the copula: we have recorded only the short forms in Zohra, Prenčov, and Klinóca, and both the short and the long forms in Litava, and Čarad'ica.

The hypothesis that *sja* may come from **sinja* in NSC does not seem likely. All varieties where the Σ -stem contains the approximant *j* have undergone or are in the process of the delateralization of **l'* (cf. 2.2.); this is hardly a chance. Moreover, the form *sle* in some varieties could not be explained. We think that *sj*- in Zohra, Čarad'ica, Čaba, Čobánka, and “Nógrád” developed from an older **sl'*-. If one abstracts from the phonological process of delateralization (cf. 2.2.) in these dialects and from the innovative 3rd plural preterite palatalization (cf. 3.14.) in other dialects (both developments having occurred in “Nógrád”), two continuous areas with the underlying {sl} appear: a) Zohra Romani in the extreme west, and b) the central NSC area (with Budča, Očova, Lieskovca in the north, Čarad'ica, Litava in the middle, and Čaba, Čobánka, and “Nógrád” in the south) plus the Ct dialect of Prenčov.

The {sl} forms in Prenčov Romani are more likely to be borrowings from the adjacent NSC dialects than results of a shared innovation. The NC past 3rd person variant (i.e. *has*) is attested only in the possessive function in Prenčov, e.g. *čháve len na HAS* ‘they did not have

¹¹⁴ In the cases [abcd], the only conceivable analogy is with the verbs of the **l*-preterite subclass (cf. 3.14.), i.e. those whose stems end in a velar, labial, or č, but not in *s*, which was present in the original copula. The

children’, while the variants of the NSC origin (i.e. *sl’a* ‘s/he, it was’ and *sle* ‘they were’) are only used non-possessively.

Although we have little data, a very interesting situation seems to exist in the Et dialects. In Chyžné, the Σ -stems {sl} and {s} are used variantly, e.g. *sl’amas* / *sjamas* (cf. 2.2.) and *samas* ‘we were’; only the short forms *sja* and *sle*, i.e. the Σ -stem {sl}, are attested in the past 3rd person. Revúca Romani uses *st’a* and *st’e*, i.e. the Σ -stem {st}, in the past 3rd person, but only the stem {s} in the other forms, e.g. *som* ‘I am’. In Roštár, the stem {št} is the most common, e.g. *št’a* ‘s/he was’, *št’e* ‘they were’, or *št’an* ‘you[-PI] are’; however, also the past 3rd singular *ša* is attested. Teplica Romani uses *št’a* / *šča* ‘s/he was’, *št’amaš* ‘we were’, but the {sl} Σ -stem in *šle* ‘they were’.

The original Σ -stem in the transitional dialects surely was {s} (as in the other NC dialects), remnants of which exist here and there. The copula forms of other stems have been borrowed from the neighbouring NSC varieties. The remnant form *šle* in Teplica shows that the {sl} forms a) were borrowed first, and b) have been later covered by the {st} forms. It is likely that the NSC area of Hrad’išťa, Kokava, and Klinóca have had the {sl} forms before the innovative {st} forms: most Et dialects were borrowing the copula forms in both stages, while Chyžné retained just the older forms. The forms of the 3rd person, which are the most frequent, seem to be the first ones to be borrowed (cf. the state in Chyžné and Revúca). They have been borrowed as wholes: first, the palatalized past 3rd plural *st’e* in Revúca and *št’e* in Roštár do not correspond to the non-palatalized 3rd plural preterites of other verbs, and second, the palatal *t’* is often retained in the copula in the dialects of the Štítník valley (cf. **t’* > *č* elsewhere, 2.6.). The NSC copula forms were either borrowed before the change **s* > *š* in the dialects of the Štítník valley, i.e. *st’amas* > *št’amaš*, or the prealveolar sibilant has been phonologically adapted.

Zohra, Šóka, Farkašda, Čobánka, “Nógrád”, Litava, and Klinóca Romani possess two different forms of the 3rd person present copula: *hi* and *si*. (The *si*-form together with the subjunctive particle make up the necessative *site*; see 3.24.). The *si*-form does not seem to exist in Budča and Očova Romani and it is not attested from Kráľova. The *si*-form is extremely rare in Klinóca, even in the possessive function (see below), e.g. Kráľova *téle HI man kher* ‘down there I have a house’, or Klinóca *HI man trin čháve* ‘I have three sons’. There is an instance of *si* in our text from the Et dialect of Revúca, which is likely to be borrowed from NSC: *o Němci jegoder džukela SI* ‘the Germans [nazists] are the worst dogs’.

question remains why with this subclass then? The only source of the stem {st} could be the **t*-preterite verbs (cf. 3.14.), i.e. those whose stems end in *s* or *š*, and in Hrad’išťa and Klinóca also in *č*.

The 3rd person present copula *hi* also exists in WSR and CSR (including the Ct dialect of Prenčov), while in ESR as well as in the Et varieties the extended *hin* is used, e.g. *Teplica dzanelaš hoj maškar o Roma HIN partizána* ‘he knew that there were guerillas among Roms’, or *Revúca oja briga HIN amenge stále* ‘we still feel that sorrow’.

It seems that in Litava, the *si*-forms are used in possessive constructions and the *hi*-forms elsewhere, e.g. *ola spisi, ola papíra, sa sa sa sa sa, so SI man* ‘those documents, those papers, everything I have’ vs. *džanes so HI krumpľi?* ‘do you know what it is “krumpľi”?’¹¹⁵ This functional distinction does not hold true in Šóka, Farkašda, Čobánka, and Zohra: First, although the possessive copula is often *si*, e.g. *Šóka man SI čak pándž iškoli* ‘I have passed just five schools [i.e. classes]’, or *Farkašda jékh kafid’a SI štár pre* ‘one table has four legs’, it may also be *hi*, e.g. *Šóka te valakas valaso butér HI* ‘if someone has something more’. Second, the *si*-form need not be used possessively, e.g. *Šóka t’ando prósti SI kriminalita* ‘also in the non-Roms is criminality’, *Čobánka adi SI paramisi* ‘this is the tale’, or *Zohra čhavóre SI tikne* ‘children are small’. In Šóka, Farkašda, and Čobánka Romani, the non-possessive *si*-form is common in local or existential predicates, e.g. *Šóka SI maškar amende igen erd’ave Roma* ‘there are among us very bad Roms’, *na phiren o mule, de valaso SI ánde* ‘the ghosts do not reappear [literally: walk] but there is something in it’, or *Farkašda taj rédli SI odoj* ‘and there are ovens there’. In the clause-initial position, only the *si*-form can be used, but the reverse implication is not true; the *si*-form may be even clause-final, e.g. *Šóka kana valaso SI* ‘when something exists’. It seems that discourse considerations such as emphasis or concessivity are also important. Cf. also *Šóka SI le čhavóra, štár čhavóra HI le* ‘he has children, four children he has’, or *Čobánka adaj báre láche Roma HI, láche; SI meg Čabate iš láche Roma* ‘here are very good Roms, good; still in Piliscsaba, there are good Roms’.

Elements similar to the Vendic enclitic anaphoric personal pronouns *lo, li, le* are mostly bound to the copular *hi*-form in NSC, e.g. *Farkašda lácho ková HILO, džanel te táven* ‘he is good, he knows how to cook’ (for the expletive, cf. 3.11.), *no dikhes, savi čori HILI* ‘you see how poor she is’, or *Lieskovca ungrike alava HILE ma buter sar amáre alava* ‘there are already more Hungarian words than ours’. The copular suffixes cannot be used with the *si*-form, e.g. *Šóka si dosta čóra, si zlođeja, but HILE* ‘there are lots of thieves, there are thieves, they are many’. The forms *hilo, hili, hile* remind us of the number-and-gender inflected copula forms in the NC dialects of eastern Slovakia (cf. the gender and number unmarked form *hin*), e.g. *Chyžné avka HINO* ‘this is how it is’, *ESR HIŇI čhavoreha* ‘she is pregnant’

¹¹⁵ *Krumpľi / krumpľi* is the most common NSC term for ‘potatoes’. It also exists in Hungarian and Slovak dialects of southern Slovakia (cf. Štolc 1994).

(literally ‘with a child’), or *o čhave HINE khere* ‘the children are at home’. In Šóka, Farkašda, and Tarnóca, however, the copular suffixes also occur with the past copula form *sáhi*, e.g. Šóka *phuro gáddžo SÁHI-LO* ‘he was an old non-Rom’, or Tarnóca *baro barválo sa, at’i lóve le sá, mindeneko le sá, baro barválo SÁHI-LO* ‘he was very rich, so much money he had, he had everything, he was very rich’.

If the copular suffixes are used in NSR, then there is almost never an overt subject in the clause; two exceptions, however, have been recorded: the Lieskovca example (see above) and Šóka *ón čore erd’ave HILE* ‘they are poor and wicked’. The covert subject does not imply the copular suffixes: they are optional, e.g. Klinóca *lól’ila, ta furt HI lólo* (elic.) ‘he has turned red, and still is red’ vs. *lól’ile, ta furt HILE lóle* (elic.) ‘they have turned red, and still are red’. The number-and-gender inflected copula may be a part of an adjectival or adverbial (but usually not of a substantival) predicate, e.g. Farkašda *sikjon a god’avera HILE* ‘they learn and they are wise’, or *áva Roma, phenas, Ned’edatar HILE* ‘other Roms, let us say, are [those who are] from Neded’.

In the NC dialects, the verb *ovel* ‘to become’ (and the source of some suppletive copula forms) was lost, and the verb *avel* ‘to come’ has taken over its functions, e.g. ESR *avel lavutariske* (beside *ačhel lavutariske*) ‘to become a musician’, or *ča kaj te avelas sasto* ‘may he only be healthy’. The verb *ovel* is retained in all NSC dialects. Its forms are used in the future indicative, in the subjunctive and the infinitive, and in the conditional potentialis of the copula, e.g. elicited Klinóca *te odá hasa, OVLA tuke erd’avóne* and Šóka *te le hasa, erd’avóne OVEHA* ‘if you eat it, you will be sick’¹¹⁶, or Farkašda *akkor buter džéne sit’OVEN, ta phenaha ón* ‘well, should there be more people, then we will say “ón” [= they]’. In Farkašda, the forms *ovel* and *oven* may be contracted to *ol* and *on*, respectively (cf. the obligatory contraction in Vendic), e.g. *site tut’OL asso kašt* ‘you must have such wood’.

The conditional irrealis forms of the copula are based on the preterite stem **úl-*, e.g. elicited Klinóca *tena odá tumári čhaj na háľáhi, n’ÚLÁHI lake erd’avóne* and Šóka *te tumari čhaj le na háľáhi, na ÚJÁHI erd’avóne* ‘if your[-PI] daughter had not eaten it, she would not have been sick’. The same stem is used in the preterite of *ovel* ‘to become’: cf. the first *úja* in Farkašda *adá mro baličho jékhfar khamno ÚJA, taj ÚJA le šó* ‘that pig of mine once became pregnant, and had six [piglins] born’. The second *úja* in the example means ‘to be born’ and

¹¹⁶ In Klinóca, the clause ‘you will be sick’ is impersonal and the noun or pronoun which refers to the experiencer of the sickness is in the dative case, exactly as in Slovak (e.g. *bude ti zle* – literally ‘[it] will be sickly to you’). In Šóka, the experiencer is in the subject position, exactly as in Hungarian (e.g. *rosszul leszél* – literally ‘you will be sickly’).

it is used impersonally: a literal translation is '[it] was born to him six'. Cf. also another suppletive stem in Farkašda *síte ÁČHIJA o bijav* 'there should have been the wedding'.

The present 3rd person negative form is *náne* in the NSC as well as the NC dialects. In most varieties, the 3rd person past forms are the regularly negated positive forms, e.g. Klinóca *nas'ta* and *nas't'e*, Lieskovca *nas'l'a* and *nasle*, Šóka *nasáhi* and *nassine* (cf. 2.7.), ESR *nasas* etc. In Biskupica and Tarnóca, however, the specific past negative *nána* exists (cf. Vendic *nána*), e.g. Biskupica *amen NÁNA sobodna ando muzi* 'it was not free for us [to go] to the cinema', or Tarnóca *NÁNA len te han, NÁNA len gáda, ništa len NÁNA, ni te soven lenge NÁNA* 'they had no food, they had no clothes, they had nothing, not even a place to sleep they had'.

3.18.-3.22. Verbs: derivation

3.18. Adaptation and minor derivations

Borrowed verbs in the NC as well as in the NSC Romani are adapted by the suffix *-in-* and integrated into the subclass of the *C*-verbs (cf. 3.13.). Loans of Hungarian verbs may bring some Hungarian suffixes into Romani, e.g. the iterative *-gat-* in *čavargatinel* (synchronically derived from *čavarginel* 'to stray, wander'), the intransitive *-ít-* in *fordítinel* 'to turn [oneself]' vs. the transitive *-ul-* in *fordulinel* 'to turn [st.]', the desubstantival *-az-* in *falazinel* 'to build in brick' (derived from *falo* 'wall'), etc. in "Nógrád" Romani. (For the causative suffix *-tat-* see 3.20.). The sequence *-áz-in-*, composed of the Hungarian desubstantival suffix plus the Romani adaptational suffix, has become a desubstantival formant in some NSC varieties, e.g. Šóka *paramisázinel* 'to tell stories' (from *paramisi* 'story, fairy-tale'), or Očova *d'ilázinel* / Farkašda *d'ijázinel* 'to sing' (from *d'ili* 'song'); Čaba and "Nógrád" Romani use the older *d'ilavel*, and Lieskovca Romani borrowed the NC *gilavel* (but kept the NSC *d'ili*). The formant *-áz-in-* is very rare and lexically limited.

Only a few verbs with a morphologically simple inflectional stem can be synchronically derived from nouns, e.g. NSC *čhungar-el* 'to spit' from *čhungar* 'spit', *khel-el* 'to play, dance' from *khel* 'play, game', *mutr-el* 'to urinate' from *muter* 'urine', and *ruš-el* 'to be angry' from *ruš* 'anger'. The first components of most of the original compounds of the verb *del* 'to give', e.g. **ci-*, **čumi-*, or **vaz-*, are not autonomous morphological segments, since their occurrence is limited just to the *d*-verbs (and their derivatives), e.g. *cidel* 'to pull, draw', *čumidel* 'to kiss' (and *čumidkerel* 'to kiss intensively [etc.]'), or *vazdel* 'to lift', respectively.

There are only a few verbs derived by the suffix *-an-*, e.g. *lošanel* 'to rejoice' (from *loš* 'joy') in NSC. A yod must be reconstructed in the original form of the verb *sid'anel* 'to hurry'

(derived from *sig* ‘quickly, soon’) in Farkašda, Šóka and “Nógrád” Romani, i.e. **sigjarel*. The corresponding verb in ESR is derived by **-jar-*, i.e. *sid'arel* (< **sigjarel*), while Puchmajer’s Romani has the **-jov-* verb *sid'ol* (< **sigjovel*). The verb *danderel* ‘to bite’ derived by *-er-* (from *dand* ‘tooth’) is common to the NSC and the NC dialects. For the most frequent derivational devices see 3.19. to 3.22.

3.19. Factitives and synthetic passives

Deadjectival **jar-*derivations function as factitives, e.g. *šut'arel* ‘to dry’ (derived from *šuko* ‘dry’), or *terñarel* ‘to make young, rejuvenate’ (derived from *terno* ‘young’), and they are numerous both in the NSC and the NC dialects. Some of them have an idiomatic meaning, e.g. *nand'arel* ‘to bath’ derived from *nango* ‘naked’. Departicipial factitives are rarer. There is also a small number of desubstantival and deverbal **jar-*derivations. The latter have the causative function, e.g. *rovl'arel* ‘to make [so.] weep’ from *rovel* ‘to weep’. In a few cases, the **av-*causatives (see 3.20.) in the NC dialects correspond to the **jar-*causatives in NSC, cf. *ačhavel* vs. *ačharel* ‘to build, stand [st.]’ (from *ačhel* / *áčhel* ‘to stand, stay’), or *uštavel* vs. *uštarel*¹¹⁷ ‘to waken’ (from *uš'el* ‘to awake’). Only some of the few desubstantival **jar-*derivations are common to both dialect groups, e.g. NC *xevl'arel* / NSC *hev'l'arel* ‘to make holes’ (derived from NC *xev* / NSC *hév* ‘hole’), NC *xóljarel* / NSC *hól'arel* ‘to make angry’ (from NC *xóli* / NSC *hóli* ‘anger’), or *pañarel* ‘to moisten, wet’ (from *páni* ‘water’). In ESR, there are also a few **jar-*formations derived from other parts of speech, e.g. *jekhetañarel* ‘to unite’ (from *jekhetane* ‘together’), or the regional *duval'arel*¹¹⁸ (from **duval*; cf. *duvar* ‘twice’); for *sid'arel* ‘to hurry’ see above.

Deadjectival SPs (i.e. **jov-*derivations) are inchoatives, e.g. *šut'ol* ‘to become dry’ (derived from *šuko* ‘dry’), or *terñol* ‘to grow young’ (from *terno* ‘young’). There is a number of them in the NSC and the NC dialects, as well as of departicipial SPs, which may function as the passive counterparts of their basic verbs, e.g. *mard'ol* ‘to be beaten’ from *marel* ‘to beat’. Only a few desubstantival and deverbal SPs exist, and they are often common to both dialect groups, e.g. *rátol* ‘grow dark’ derived from *rat* ‘night’, and *phad'ol* ‘to crack, get broken’ derived from *phagel* ‘to break [st.]’ (the departicipial *phagl'isal'ol* also exists in ESR). The ESR verb *jekhetañol* ‘to get united’ is deadverbial. Moreover, there are a few **jar-* and **jov-*

¹¹⁷ The verb *uštarel* means ‘to tread, step, trample, stamp’ in ESR.

¹¹⁸ The meaning of this verb is ‘to use plural when referring to one addressee, expressing a certain degree of social distance; to speak to an individual as if s/he were two persons; to “double” the addressee’. There are similar verbs in the contact languages, but their derivational motivation is quite different: Slovak *vykat'* and

derivations, often in a pair, whose base words have been lost, e.g. NSC and ESR *bi'arel* 'to melt [st.]' – *bi'l'ol* 'to melt, thaw' (with the base **bil-*), or *sikh'l'arel*¹¹⁹ 'to teach' – *sikh'l'ol* 'to learn' (with the base **sikh-*, which is a participial base of the lost verb **sikhel*).

The yod of the original suffixes **-jar-* and **-jov-* palatalizes both preceding dentals and velars, in both NSC and the NC dialects (see 2.2.). The fact that the verb 'to look [like]' has the form *di'thol* in all NSC varieties, i.e. also in those which retain the palatal lateral phoneme, shows that it has developed from the deverbal **dikhjovel* (from *dikhel* 'to see, look at'), rather than from the participial **dikhjljovel*. The yod following *r*, *m*, and perhaps *v* (see below) has been retained in NSC, e.g. *phurjarel* 'to make old' – *phurjol* 'to grow old' (derived from *phuro* 'old'), but lost in the NC dialects, e.g. *phurarel* and *phurol*.

Some desubstantial and deverbal **-jar-*derivations reflect an extra segment (**-l-*) between the stem and the suffix **-jar-*, e.g. **thuv-l-jar-el* 'to reek, smoke' derived from *thuv* 'smoke', or **sov-l-jar-el* 'to put [so.] to sleep' (only with the prefix *za-* in ESR) from *sov-el* 'to sleep'. Bubeník (1995: 19-20) suggests that the **-l-* in the deverbal derivations **sovljarel* and **rovljarel* is an old (Middle Indic) intrusive consonant. The **-l-* in the desubstantial derivations **thuvljarel* and **xevljarel* can be another instance of an old intrusive between a labial stop and a yod¹²⁰, or, alternatively, the expanded suffix **-l-jar-* could have been only later generalized from the inherited instances to all stems ending in *v*. Nevertheless, without evidence from those NSC varieties which retain the lateral palatal, it is not clear whether *phuvjarel* in "Nógrád" Romani (the verb does not exist in ESR) developed from **phuv'l'arel* < **phuvljarel*, or whether it contains a simple historical yod.

In Humenné Romani (Lípa 1963: 117-119), an **-l-* exists in the verb *šarg'ol* 'to grow yellow', which is derived from the athematic adjective *šargo* 'yellow'; the segment may be due to analogy with *lov'ol* 'to grow red' and *kál'ol* 'to grow black'. Other varieties of ESR have *šargisa'ol* with the formant **-isal-*, which is mostly used (including Humenné Romani) in the SPs derived from athematic adjectives, e.g. *radisa'ol* 'to rejoice, to be glad' from *rado* 'glad'. However, the formant also occurs in a few derivations from thematic adjectives, e.g. *zabarva'isa'ol* 'to grow rich' (from *barvalo* 'rich'), where the Slovak prefix may be the

Hungarian *magáz* are derived from the second person plural or formal pronoun *vy*, and from the reflexive or 2nd person civil and intimate pronoun *maga*, respectively.

¹¹⁹ The NSC forms have lost the aspiration, cf. Šóka *sikjarel* – *sikjol*. The verb *sikh'l'arel* does not exist in all ESR varieties.

¹²⁰ Intrusion of this sort has a parallel in East Slavic, Slovenian, and Serbocroatian, cf. **zemja* > **zemlja* > *zeml'a* 'earth' etc.

reason for the athematic morphology to apply.¹²¹ The formant **-isal-* does not usually trigger palatalization, but variants such as *rad'isa'ol* (cf. *radisa'ol* above) can also be found. Derivations from a few thematic verbs contain the variant **-sal-* of the formant, e.g. *phagersa'ol* ‘to crack, get broken’ (derived from *phagerel* ‘to break [st.]’), or *phutersa'ol* ‘to get open, unbound’ (from *phuterel* ‘to open [st.], to unbind’). It is also present in *xol'asa'ol* ‘to get angry’ (from the athematic participle *xol'amen* ‘angry’).

The formant **-isal-* seems to be extremely rare in NSC, and perhaps in some varieties it does not exist at all. The only example we have recorded is the verb *stavisal'ol* ‘to happen’ in Klinóca Romani; the verb may have been borrowed from Serbocroatian *staviti se* ‘place oneself, to take a stand’. Inchoatives derived from borrowed adjectives are formed in the same way in NSC as those derived from the original adjectives, cf. *kikñol* ‘to grow blue’ (from *kikno* ‘blue’), or *žut'ol* ‘to grow yellow’ (from *žuto* ‘yellow’). In NSC, the absence of the athematic morphology in inchoatives correlates with the absence of the athematic morphology in adjectives themselves. On the other hand, there are *-isaj-* and *-osaj-* inchoatives derived from original adjectives in Roman, e.g. *čorisajol* (< **čorisaljol*) and *čorosajol* (Halwachs 1996: 63), although the dialect has the fully integrated Slavic and Hungarian adjectives; the formants ceased to convey thematicity in Roman.

There are further irregularities in the form of the **jar-* and **jov-* derivations in NSC. The factitives and inchoatives of the adjectives *kóro* ‘blind’, *polóko* ‘slow’, and *kuč* ‘expensive, dear’ in “Nógrád” Romani are: *korovjarel* (cf. the extension *-ov-*)¹²² – *korojol* (**-ol-*), *polókajarel* (**-al-*) – *polókijol* (**-il-*), and *kučajarel* (**-al-*) ‘raise the price’¹²³ – *kučajol* (**-al-*) ‘to become expensive’, respectively. The adjective *pháro* ‘heavy, difficult’ derives the factitive *pharajarel* (**-al-*). It is difficult to say what is the origin of the extra segments; it is likely that the extension **-al-* expanded from verbs derived from the *al-*adjectives (cf. 3.8.), e.g. *bokhajarel* ‘to make [so.] hungry, starve out’ (< **bokh-al-jar-el*; derived from *bokhálo* ‘hungry’). The inchoative of *koro* is most dialectally diverse: cf. *korojol* in “Nógrád”, *koral'ol* in Humenné Romani, *korisa'ol* in most ESR varieties, and *korisajol* / *korosajol* in Roman (cf. above).

¹²¹ There appears to be great dialectal diversity within ESR, both formal and semantic, which may be seen in the following example: the athematic *zazoralisa'ol* means ‘to become powerful’, while the thematic *zazora'ol* means ‘to get hard, firm, stiff’; the latter meaning can be also expressed by the desubstantial *zazorisa'ol*; both *zora'ol* and *zorisa'ol* possess both meanings (without the perfective nuance rendered by the prefix *za-*).

¹²² Cf. the regular ESR *korarel* ‘to blind, dazzle’.

¹²³ Beside the formally regular “Nógrád” factitive *kučarel* ‘to consider [st.] to be dear or expensive’. The formally identical *kučarel* means ‘raise the price’ in ESR.

The Farkašda and Šóka factitive and inchoative of the adjective *báro* ‘big’ is *bard’arel* – *bárd’ol* (cf. Vendic *bárd’ol*, developed into *barčol* in Roman), while Klinóca has the regular *barjarel* – *bárjol* (cf. also the regular *bararel* ‘to bring up, raise, grow [so.]’ – *barol* ‘to grow’ in ESR). It is possible to consider *bard’arel* and *bárd’ol* to be participial rather than deadjectival formations, and to reconstruct the verb **barel*. More likely, however, the verb never existed, and the above mentioned forms as well as the Šóka, Farkašda, and “Nógrád” inchoative *phárd’ol* (from *pháro* ‘heavy, difficult’) are formed analogically to the derivations from the **d*-participles (cf. 3.14.).

Finally, the pair of verbs **pašljarel* ‘to lay’ – **pašljol* ‘to lie’ developed into *pašjarel* – *pašjol* in “Nógrád” Romani and further to *paššarel* – *paššol* in Farkašda (see 2.7.), while Čaba and Klinóca Romani have *pašt’arel* – *pašt’ol*. Klinóca Romani also possesses *našt’ol* ‘to get lost, disappear’ as against *naš’ol* in most NSC varieties and in the NC dialects. This morphological innovation is in accord with the specific extension of the **t*-preterites to the stems in *č* in Klinóca and Hradišťa Romani (see 3.14.).

3.20. Causatives

The suffix **-av-* may derive deverbal causatives, and it does more often in NSC than in ESR. Many NSC causatives simply do not have equivalent formations in ESR, e.g. Farkašda *anavel* ‘to order, make [so.] bring’ (derived from *anel* ‘to bring’), *bešavel* ‘to seat, make [so.] sit’ (from *bešel* ‘to sit, live’), *khelavel* ‘to make [so.] dance’ (from *khelel* ‘to dance’), *ledžavel* ‘to make [so.] carry’ (from *ledžel* ‘to carry’), *pindžaravel* ‘to make [so.] acquainted’ (from *pindžarel* ‘to know, be acquainted’), or *peravel* ‘to drop; to fell trees’ (from *perel* ‘to fall’).

In other cases, an **av*-derivation which functions as a causative in NSC has an iterative meaning in ESR, e.g. *bikenavel* (derived from *bikenel* ‘to sell’) means ‘to make [so.] sell [st.]’ in NSC, but ‘to sell frequently’ in ESR. Other examples of non-causative **av*-derivations in ESR are *arakhavel* ‘to discover, look up, search for’ (from *arakhel* ‘to find’), *cinavel* ‘to buy frequently’ (from *cinel* ‘to buy’), *demavel* ‘to hammer, pound, beat’ (from *demel* ‘to pounce, bang’), or *pekavel* ‘to bake frequently; to bang frequently’ (from *pekel* ‘to bake; to bang’). Only few ESR **av*-derivations are causatives: a couple of them are derived from intransitive verbs, e.g. *daravel* ‘to frighten’ (from *daral* ‘to be frightened’), *dukhavel* ‘to hurt, injure’ (from *dukhal* ‘it hurts’), and even a lower number from transitive verbs, e.g. *pijavel* ‘to give [so.] to drink, to water’ (from *pijel* ‘to drink’).

As could be observed, causatives in NSC may be derived both from intransitive and transitive verbs. Moreover, in some instances, causatives may be derived from causative verbs

themselves to yield so-called second causatives [23:a], e.g. *asavavel* ‘to make [so.] make [so.] laugh’ in *o cirkušmajsteri asavavlahi ole nípen ole románe čháveha* ‘the circus manager let the people be set in a roar by the Romani guy’. The second causatives do not exist in ESR at all, and in NSC they are based only on (some) intransitives: no transitive verb can have a second causative, i.e. a two step **-av-av-* derivation meaning ‘to make [so.] make [so.] ---’, where ‘---’ is the meaning of the basic verb. In some cases, however, the SP of a transitive basic verb may be considered to be its anticausative [b], since the semanto-syntactic relation between the SP and the basic verb is analogous to that between the basic verb and its (first) causative.

[23]

	INTRANSITIVE	TRANSITIVE	
a.	<u>BASIC VERB</u>	I. CAUSATIVE	II. CAUSATIVE
	<i>daral</i>	<i>daravel</i>	<i>daravavel</i>
	‘to be frightened’	‘to frighten [so.]’	‘to make [so.] frighten [so.]’
b.	ANTICAUSATIVE	<u>BASIC VERB</u>	I. CAUSATIVE
	<i>tád’ol</i> ‘to boil’	<i>tável</i> ‘to boil [st.]’	<i>távavel</i> ‘to have [st.] boiled’

The final consonant of the suffix **-av-* gets usually lost in the participial / preterite stem as in most *v*-final verbs (see 3.14.), e.g. *kerad-* (< **ker-av-d-*) of *keravel* ‘to have [st.] done’ as *garud-* (< **garuv-d-*) of *garuvel* ‘to hide, cover’. In Šóka and Farkašda Romani, it is mostly possible to make (the *v* of) the causative suffix expressive by formal reduplication in the participial / preterite stem, e.g. both *anađom* (*-a-*) and *anavađom* (*-ava-*) ‘I ordered, had [st.] brought’ of *anavel* (*-av-*). The formal reduplication is progressive and in some verbs obligatory, e.g. in *genavađom tuha* ‘I had it read by you’ (i.e. not **genad’om*) of *genavel* ‘to have [st.] read’.

It is clear that the retention and the productivity of causatives in NSC is due to Hungarian influence. A series of causatives which contain the Hungarian causative suffix *-tat-* is attested from an idiolect of Klinóca Romani. First it must have been borrowed in Hungarian verbs, in most of which it probably had the shape *-tat-* (beside the less common *-tet-*, *-at-* / *-et-* etc.). The causative suffix in the borrowed Hungarian causatives was adapted by *-in-* in a regular way. In the second stage, the whole sequence *-tat-in-* was extended to pre-Hungarian athematic verbs, e.g. *vič-in-tat-in-el* (beside *vič-in-av-el*) ‘to have [st.] called’ from *vičinel* ‘to call’.

Finally, the sequence was extended to the thematic verbs, too. Most instances contain both the original and the Hungarian causative suffix, e.g. *an-av-tat-in-el* (beside *an-av-el*) ‘to have [st.] brought’ from *anel* ‘to bring’, or *ker-av-tat-in-el* (beside *ker-av-el*) ‘to have [st.] done, made’ from *kerel* ‘to do, make’. In one instance, only the Hungarian causative suffix is present, namely in *bičhav-tat-in-el* (beside *bičhav-av-el*) ‘to have [st.] sent’ of *bičhavel* ‘to send’ (the segment *av* is a part of the stem here).

3.21. Iteratives

The suffix **-ker-* derives iterative verbs from other verbs. It expresses frequent action, multiplicity of agents or objects, or intensity (cf. Lípa 1963: 120-123). Especially in the extreme east of Slovakia, it is fully productive and almost lexically general. In the NC dialects, the suffix **-ker-* is the last one before the inflectional formant, while in NSC it may be followed by the causative **-av-* (cf. Hübschmannová & Bubeník 1997: 142-143), e.g. Farkašda *t'inkeravel* ‘to have often [st.] bought [by so.]’, or *dikhingeravel* ‘to make frequently [so.] look [at st.]’ in *dikhingeraváhi man mre čháveha* ‘I used to make my son [a doctor] examine me frequently’. In the only iterative causative given by Rácz, however, the iterative suffix precedes the causative one, as in the NC dialects: *daravkerel* ‘to frighten frequently’. If the suffix **-av-* does not have the causative function, then the iterative suffix follows in all dialects, e.g. NSC *d'ilavkerel* ‘to litl, sing all the time’ (from *d'ilavel* ‘to sing’; cf. also 3.18.), or *pharavkerel* ‘to split often etc.’ (from *pharavel* ‘to split, slit, open’). In both dialect groups, the suffix **-ker-* follows the adaptational suffix, e.g. *recitujinkerel* ‘to recite frequently etc.’ from *recitujinel* ‘to recite’. In the extreme east of Slovakia (Lípa 1963: 123), the iterative suffix is often doubled, e.g. *phučkerkerel* from *phučkerel* from *phučel* ‘to ask’.

Disregarding two exceptions (see below), the iterative suffix in ESR is always *-ker-*, and its initial velar is never assimilated in sonority to a preceding *n* or any other consonant, e.g. *cinkernel* ‘to buy frequently’ (from *cinel* ‘to buy’); this contrasts with the phonologically conditioned alternation *k ~ g* in nominal morphology, e.g. *la-ke* ‘to her’ vs. *man-ge* ‘to me’. On the contrary, sonority is neutralized in the preceding consonant, e.g. *ispidkerel* [ispitkerel] ‘to push all the time’ (from *ispidel* ‘to push’). At least in Lípa’s variety, if the stem ends in a consonant cluster, the final consonant is elided before the suffix *-ker-*, e.g. *phurkerel* ‘to blow intensively etc.’ (from *phurdel* ‘to blow’); such an elision does not occur in NSC, e.g. *phandkerel* ‘to bind up, fetter’ (from *phandel* ‘to bind’). The verb *čhinel* ‘to cut’ derives *čhingerel* (*-ger-*) ‘to tear’, and the verb *phagel* ‘to break’ derives the iterative *phagerel* (*-er-*).

The development from the original forms **čhinkerel* and **phagkerel* must be old, since both the SC and the NC dialects share the outcomes.

Iteratives of most verbs with a stem ending in a velar contain an extra segment between the stem and the suffix **-ker-*: *-el-* in some ESR varieties, *-er-* in others (e.g. Humenné), and *-in-* in NSC, e.g. *dikhelkerel*, *dikherkerel*, and *dikhinkerel* / *dikhingerel* respectively, all derived from *dikhel* ‘to see, look at’. The forms of the type *dikhinkerel* (i.e. without the sonority assimilation) exist in Klinóca and “Nógrád” Romani, while Šóka, Farkašda, and Čobánka possess the forms of the type *dikhingerel* (i.e. with the sonority assimilation). However, the sonority assimilation in the latter subgroup is not triggered by *n*-final verb roots, cf. Farkašda *tinkerel* ‘to buy frequently’ (from *tinel* ‘to buy’). In both NSC subgroups, the sequence *-in-ker-* / *-in-ger-* have spread to a few other verbs, e.g. Klinóca *geninkerel* and Šóka *géningerel* ‘to read through etc.’ (both from *genel* ‘to read’). The segment *-in-* in the iteratives of the inherited verbs may have originated in the adaptational suffix *-in-*, e.g. Klinóca *dikhinkerel*, *geninkerel* in analogy to *livinkerel*.

Iteratives of the *a*-verbs contain an extra segment between the stem and the suffix *-ker-*: *-l-*, *-r-*, or *-v-*, e.g. *asalkerel*, *asarkerel*, or *asavkerel*, all derived from *asal* ‘to laugh’. The last suffix is the most common among the ESR varieties, and it is also the one used in NSC. Causative iteratives and simple iteratives of the *a*-verbs may look alike in some varieties, cf. Rácz’ *daravkerel* from *daravel* ‘to frighten’, but *asavkerel* from *asal* ‘to laugh’ (i.e. not from the causative *asavel* ‘to make [so.] laugh’). Iteratives of the SPs contain the suffix *-uv-* in ESR, e.g. *sikhluvkerel* ‘to learn intensively etc.’.

3.22. Verb prefixation and verbal coparticles

Prefixation in NSC is by far not as important as in the NC dialects. It seems that a relatively long lasting contact is needed for the Slavic aspectual and aktionsart prefixes to be borrowed into Romani. It is possible to distinguish at least two stages (cf. also LIPA 1963: 123-124): First, the prefixes occur only in loans from the contact language. Second, the prefixes become autonomous in the sense that they can also apply to thematic verbs or to verbs borrowed from an earlier contact language; nevertheless, their distribution in Romani still corresponds to that in the contact language, so the whole word is a semicalque (cf. ESR *cirdel* – Slovak *tiahnuť* ‘to pull’ and *vicirdel* – *vytiahnuť* ‘to pull out’).

The second stage is well documented in the NC varieties spoken in Slovakia. In the Slovak-bilingual NSC dialects¹²⁴, Slovak prefixed verbs are freely borrowed, e.g. Budča *othar man prihlásind'om Handlovu* 'from there I enlisted to Handlová' (cf. Slovak *pri-hlásit' sa* 'to apply for, report'), or Litava *prvikrát mange potpisind'a* 'the first time he signed [it] to me' (cf. Slovak *pod-písať* 'to sign'). It is important that the only common prefixed pre-Slovak verb in NSC is *pobisterel* / Farkašda *pobiskerel* 'to forget', which is also the only one included in Puchmajer's (1821: 46) dictionary. The non-prefixed *bisterel*, which is the common ESR form, does not exist in NSC, and it is not given by Puchmajer. It is likely that the South Slavic prefix in the verb is an old feature shared by NSC and the western NC dialects (cf. also 4.1.).¹²⁵ Sporadic second stage use of Slovak prefixes in NSC cannot be excluded, but surely it is not a frequent phenomenon: no such a verb is attested in our NSC material. Nevertheless, we have recorded *téle man domárde* 'they thrashed me down' (cf. Romani *márel* – Slovak *biť* 'to beat' and *domárel* – *dobit'* 'to thrash, to beat hardly') in the Ct dialect of Prenčöv.

The functional equivalents in the NSC dialects of the NC prefixes are often the verbal coparticles, which express aktionsart, local and other modifications of the verb meaning. Most verbal coparticles are local and other adverbs, e.g. *ánde* 'inside', *ángle* 'in front', *ári* (Farkašda also *ár*) 'outside', *eketháne* / *kethán* / *khetáne* 'together', *kija* 'to it', *pále* 'back, backwards', *páše* 'to, at, towards, close', *téle* / *télo* 'down', *préko* 'trough', or *upre* / *uppe* 'up'. The syntagmas of a verb plus a verbal coparticle possess differing degrees of idiomaticity, cf. Farkašda *so phenes KIJA?* 'what do you say to this?' ('say + to it'), *ÁRI ňuminlahi ole čhavóren andar o than* 's/he pushed the children out of the place' ('press + out'), *sar šaj ÁRI siklíja doktoriske?* 'how could he finish his studies to become a doctor?' ('learn + out'), *ma alakh ÁRI pre mande ništ* 'do not fabricate anything on me' ('find + out'), *TÉLE thod'a i vížga* 'he passed the exam' ('put + down'), *me na gondoliná PÁLE* 'I will not recollect' ('think + back'), Šóka *KETHÁN pumen vakerde* 'they agreed upon it' ('speak + together'), Klinóca *kňiški st'e sa PRÉKO gende* 'all the books were read through', or *odoj ko Roma ále – UPRE kedime civil'a – ke lende* 'they came there to the Roms – dressed in mufti – to them' ('take + up').

The verbal coparticles also exist in the NC dialects, but they are much less developed because of the functionally competing Slovak prefixes. On the other hand, the full

¹²⁴ Less often also in the Hungarian-bilingual ones in Slovakia: for instance, the verb *otrávinel* 'to poison' (an *ad hoc* borrowing of Slovak *o-tráviť*) was employed by a Šóka Romani speaker in order to make sure that we understand the verb *mírgezinel* (from Hungarian *mérgez*), which was used in the preceding sentence.

development of the verbal coparticles in NSC is clearly due to the influence of Hungarian. The Hungarian aktionsart and local prefixes are treated differently from the Slovak ones:¹²⁶ in most cases the former are translated, i.e. not borrowed in their material form. Nearly all syntagmas of a verb plus a verbal coparticle in Rác's dictionary are based on the Hungarian model;¹²⁷ sometimes two or more Hungarian prefixes correspond to one Romani coparticle.¹²⁸ Three types of structural congruence may be distinguished: First, the verb is borrowed, while the coparticle is translated (a semicalque), e.g. *ánde čukinel ~ becsuk* 'to close, lock up'. Second, both the verb and the coparticle are translated (a calque), e.g. *ánde sikjarel ~ betanít* 'to train' (cf. *sikjarel ~ tanít* 'to teach'). Third, the verbs are semantically different, but the Romani verbal coparticle corresponds to the Hungarian prefix, e.g. *ánde čhinel ~ becsap* 'deceive, dupe' (but *čhinel* 'to cut, tear off' vs. *csap* 'to hit, throw').

Only exceptionally, the Hungarian prefix is borrowed into Romani. We have found only *sít* (cf. standard *szét-*) and *sija* (cf. standard *széjjel-*), both of which express a motion apart, spreading, dispersion etc., e.g. *Hrad'išťa o Rudko cidiňa SÍT pro kabáto* 'Rudko unbuttoned, undid his coat' ('draw + apart'), *SÍT našna pal o rito* 'it will be straggled in the meadow' ('run + apart'), or *Farkašda tel'odí fedóva šukáre tuke SÍJA džal odá járo* 'under that lid the flour dissolves nicely' ('go + apart', cf. ESR *rozdzal* 'to melt, dissolve' with the Slovak prefix *roz-*).

In a clause with the establishing word order (cf. Matras 1995), the verbal coparticle often immediately precedes the finite verb, e.g. *Šóka me ÁNDE pindžarav čak ole ungrike Romen* 'I acknowledge only the Hungarian Roms', *ÁNDE géja* 's/he went in', or the participle, e.g. *me som PRÉKO kerdo* 'I am persuaded'. If the preverbal position is occupied by further complements, then the coparticle follows the verb, e.g. *adá sa lóvend'avel ÁNDE* 'all this costs money [literally: goes into money]'. If the word order is connective, the coparticle follows the postverbal subject, e.g. *Šóka avka keverinen te o Vixodňári ÁNDE i serviki čhib* 'so also the Easterners mix in the Slovak language', and when there is no overt subject then the coparticle immediately follows the verb itself, e.g. *Šóka avka keverinas ÁNDE i ungriki čhib* 'so we mix in the Hungarian language'. The last point seems to be a rule with

¹²⁵ The prefixed verb *pobistrel* (beside simple *bistrel*) also exists in Hungarian Vlach (Vekardi 1983: 29).

¹²⁶ Different treatment of the Hungarian and the Slovak prefixes in Romani reflects their differing structural character in the respective source languages (e.g., the former may be separated from the stem, while the latter may not).

¹²⁷ Cf. Romani *ángle ~ Hungarian elő-, ári ~ ki-, kija ~ hozzá-, páše ~ mellé-*, and the instances in the next footnote.

¹²⁸ Cf. Romani *ánde ~ Hungarian be- or bele-; eketháne / kethán ~ egy-, egybe-, or össze-; pále ~ vissza- or hátra-; téle ~ le- or alá-; and upre / uppe ~ fel- or rá-*.

imperatives, e.g. Šóka *štoppolinas TÉLO* ‘let us stop down’. The general word order variability also concerns the position of the verbal coparticles, e.g. Šóka *kamav t’i káveja taj ÁNDE štamperňi rumo jóke* ‘I also like coffee and a jigger of rum in it’ vs. *me kamav i káveja taj štamperňi rumo ÁNDE* ‘I like coffee and a jigger of rum in it’.

3.23. Prepositions

In the NC as well as in the NSC dialects, there are three pairs of essive vs. ablative prepositions (cf. 3.12.): in- (inside an object), super- (on the surface of an object), and apud- (near an object). The NSC prepositions in question are: inessive *ande*, superessive **upre*, apudessive *ke*, inablative *andar*, superablative **upral*, and apudablative *kathar*. The stem of the apudessive preposition is *ke* in NSC, *kije* in WSR and Bohemian Romani, and both in ESR. The original liquid in the stem of the inessive preposition (**andre*) is lost in the NSC dialects as well as in the NC dialects of western, central, and northern Slovakia (including the Ct dialect of Prenčov), while Puchmajer’s Romani as well as most ESR varieties plus the Et dialects of Chyžné and Teplica retain the liquid. The variant *ane* (< *ande*) is quite frequent in Klinóca and Litava Romani as well as in Spiš. The inablative preposition is *andar* in NSC and Teplica, while ESR, Chyžné and variantly Šóka Romani have *andal*. Unlike in NSC, the aspiration of the apudablative preposition in most NC dialects of Slovakia is initial (i.e. *khatar*). Puchmajer’s Romani agrees with NSC, while v. Sowa (1887: 96) gives the unaspirated *katar*.

The greatest shape variation is shown by the superessive preposition. The original stem **upre* is preserved in Zohra and by some speakers of Šóka Romani. In Čaradice, Klinóca, “Nógrád”, Farkašda, and in some idiolects of Šóka Romani, the liquid of the stem has been assimilated to the preceding stop to yield a geminate, which in some varieties (optionally or obligatorily) further changed into a simple stop. Independently of this development, the ininitial vowel of the original stem has been lost in the preposition by all NC dialects including the Et dialects of Chyžné and Teplica (it has been retained in the corresponding adverb: *upre* or *opre* ‘above’), and also by Čaba, Čobánka, Čaradica, Budča, Očova, Lieskovca, Klinóca, and variantly by Farkašda and Šóka. It seems that the assimilation is a recent process (cf. 2.7.), as may be seen from the synchronic variation in Šóka Romani, and also from the variant forms of the superablative preposition *upral* ~ *uppal* in “Nógrád” Romani. The initial vowel loss must be old in the NC dialects, but later in NSC. The developments of the superessive preposition are summarized in [25].

	<i>pr</i> > <i>pp</i>	<i>pp</i> > <i>p</i>	<i>u</i> > <i>ø</i>	
Zohra, Šóka (var.)	–	0	–	<i>upre</i>
“Nógrád”, Farkašda (var.)	+	–	–	<i>uppe</i>
Šóka (var.), Farkašda (var.)	+	+	–	<i>upe</i>
NC, Chyžné, Teplica; Čaba, Čobánka, Budča, Lieskovca, Očova, Šóka (var.)	–	0	+	<i>pre</i>
Čaradica, Klinóca, Farkašda (var.)	+	+	+	<i>pe</i>

Further NSC prepositions are¹²⁹, for example, *angle* ‘in front of, before’, *bi* ‘without’, *maškar* ‘among, between’, *pal* ‘behind’, *paš* ‘by, beside’, *téle* ‘under’, *vaš* ‘for’, or Farkašda and Šóka *perdal* ‘through, according to’, e.g. Farkašda *me džanav PERDAL mande* ‘I know [it] according to myself’. The prepositions borrowed from Serbocroatian are *préko* ‘through, over’, Rác’ *mišto* ‘without’ (from Ikavic *misto* ‘instead of’)¹³⁰, and Zohra and Farkašda *uz*-¹³¹ ‘by, near’, e.g. Zohra *UZI Hodoňina* ‘near Hodonín’, or Farkašda *UZO páňi* ‘close by water’. The last preposition was contaminated with *ke* in Čobánka to yield the apudessive *kus*, e.g. *adaj KUS amende, adaj ande Ungriko* ‘here at our place, here in Hungary’, or *me khére resá, KUS mre čhavóra* ‘I will get home, to my children’. The origin of *mere* ‘towards’ in “Nógrád” Romani is obscure; cf. *mére* in Vekerdi’s (1983: 109) Romungro and *mero* ‘at, near’ in Roman (Halwachs 1996: 88).

Slovak prepositions may be borrowed into the Slovak-bilingual varieties, e.g. Budča *PROŤI o Němci* ‘against the Germans’, or Čaradica *savora slehi odoj OKREM dú džéne* ‘everyone was there except for two people’. The Slovak case government may be kept in Romani, e.g. the dative in Budča *československi armáda PO BOKU le Němcenge* ‘the Czechoslovak army by the side of the Germans’ (cf. Slovak *po boku Nemcom*). Although the Slovak preposition *okrem* ‘except for’ governs the genitive, the Lieskovca example *OKREM man* ‘except for me’ has the accusative: the explanation must be sought a) in the genitive – accusative homonymy of the respective personal pronoun in Slovak, b) in the non-preferability of the genitive government in Romani, and c) in the lack of the regular genitive form of the Romani pronoun (cf. **okrem míro*).

¹²⁹ Only basic, primary meanings are given.

¹³⁰ The preposition has undergone a different semantic change in “Nógrád” Romani than in the Vendic dialects, cf. *misto* ‘because of’ in Vend (Vekerdi 1983: 110) and Roman (Halwachs 1996: 88). The specific meaning and the deviant form (cf. the postalveolar affricate) of the “Nógrád” preposition make its etymology less evident.

The prepositions ending in *e* as well as the preposition *préko* delete the final vowel (cf. 2.11.) in constructions with the definite article, e.g. *ando* (< **ande* + *o*) and *andi* (< **ande* + *i*). If there is no article (e.g., if the noun is determined by a possessive pronoun, a numeral etc.), the basic form of the preposition is used, e.g. *ande mro kher* ‘in my house’ vs. *ando kher* ‘in the house’. Sporadic and non-obligatory instances of double determination can be found in Klinóca, e.g. *ando mro kher* ‘in [the] my house’. The shape of the article in the singular agrees with the (nominative) adjectival inflectional suffixes, and a construction of the preposition plus the article looks like an *o*-adjective¹³², e.g. the masculine singular *ando* ‘in’ as *budžando* ‘clever’, and the feminine singular *andi* as *budžandi*. One more step is needed for the preposition to become an adjectival, namely to assimilate the plural form of the type *ando* (< **ande* + *o*) to the plural form of the adjective, e.g. *budžande*.

According to the data given in Rácz’ (1994: 131-133) grammatical survey, the last step did take place with many prepositions in “Nógrád” Romani, cf. *angle manuša* ‘in front of THE people’ beside *anglo kher* ‘in front of the house’, and *angli kafidi* ‘in front of the table’. The prepositions-adjectivals in “Nógrád” Romani are *ando*, *anglo*, *mero*, *palo*, *pašo*, *télo*, and *vašo*. On the other hand, the consonant-final and some *e*-final prepositions retain the original article forms, e.g. *andar o manuša* ‘out of people’, or *uppo manuša* ‘over the people’ (< **uppe* + *o*). It is interesting that the apocope of the final *e* in *uppe* before the article is not obligatory in “Nógrád” (unlike most NSC varieties), e.g. also *uppe o manuša* ‘over the people’. A similar phenomenon exists in some idiolects of Klinóca Romani.

3.24. Conjunctions and particles

The coordinating conjunction *taj* / *ta* ‘and’ connects clauses (e.g. *Šóka me phírav andi khangeri TAJ furt rovindú* ‘I go to church, and [I go] always weeping’), nominal phrases (e.g. *Lieskovca Rinaldoskero dad TAJ mro dad: odá slehi bare primáša* ‘Rinaldo’s father and my father: they were great first fiddlers’), or nominals (e.g. *Šóka báre TAJ báre laččo Rom* ‘very very good man’). The form *ta* is used in Klinóca, Chyžné, and variantly in Očova¹³³, e.g. *Klinóca amen phírasahi trin phrala khetáne: dú saksafóni, brúgova TA vijola* ‘we, the three brothers, were going together: two saxophones, a contrabass, and a viola’. The most common NC equivalents are *the* or *he*. The Slovak *a* may be used in some varieties, especially NC,

¹³¹ There is no basic form of the preposition *uz-* in our data: it may be **uzo*, **uze*, or even **uz*.

¹³² The lack of palatalization in the feminine nominative singular in the NSC dialects contributes to the similarity.

¹³³ The coordinating *ta* is homonymous with *ta* ‘so, well’ in these varieties, e.g. *Klinóca na kamlahi te hádinen, no TA bičhavlahi le het* ‘she did not want to quarrel, so she sent him away’.

while *éš* from Hungarian is rare in NSC. The conjunction connecting verb phrases is *u* (also in the NC dialects) or *o*, e.g. Lieskovca *avka sikl'arlahi mro dad le čháven prima U man kontra* 'so my father taught the children the first fiddle and [he taught] me the second fiddle', or Šóka *me phírav O phírd'om o világo dosta* 'I travel and have travelled [walk the world] enough'.

The original NSC *te* and NC *the / he / hi* 'also, too' is supplemented by borrowed elements of a similar function: *tieš* (in Budča, Lieskovca, and Očova), *tíš* (in Klinóca), *téš* (e.g. in Zohra), or *tiš* (in ESR and Teplica) from Slovak dialects, or *iš* (in the Hungarian-bilingual varieties of NSC and in Klinóca) from Hungarian. The original particles precede the focused element, e.g. ESR *THE jov džanel romanes* 'he, too, knows Romani' vs. *jov džanel THE romanes* 'he also knows Romani', while the position of the borrowed ones is less restricted: the particle *iš* often follows the focused element, e.g. Farkašda *odoj IŠ sah mo dad ikerdo lenca and'odá kávéházo* 'there, too, my father was held with them in that café', or Klinóca *ta vaš odá IŠ me kamáhi bare kňiški* 'and also for this reason I liked books so much'. Pairs or chains of the original particles function as conjunctions, e.g. Klinóca *TE tu, TE oj, TE me* 'both you and him/her and me'. The last particle in a chain may be used together with a coordinating conjunction, e.g. Farkašda *k'amende sáhi TE pojácke Roma, TAJ TE ungrike Roma* 'in our village, there were both the Vlax Roms and the Hungarian Roms'.

In negative clauses, the borrowed particles 'also, too' are used, e.g. ESR *jov TIŠ na džanel romanes* 'neither he knows Romani' (i.e. not **TE jov na džanel romanes*), or Lieskovca *ta odola phuredera ĤIEŠ na slahi zájem* 'neither the older one [a sister] was interested'. The Hungarian-bilingual varieties use the Serbocroatian negative scalar focus particle *ni* 'nor, not even', while the Slovak-bilingual ones (including Klinóca) have borrowed Slovak *aňi*. Both Slavic particles precede the focused element and require the negated verb, e.g. Tarnóca *NI te soven NA džanav* 'I even cannot sleep', or Čaraďica *NA sjahi hart'a AŇI jekh* 'not a single person was a smith'. Pairs of the particles function as conjunctions, e.g. Budča *Ňemci na kamnahi AŇI Romen, AŇI Slovákou*¹³⁴ 'Germans liked neither Roms nor Slovaks'.

The Hungarian-bilingual NSC varieties as well as Čaraďica Romani use the conjunction *vad* 'or' (from Hungarian *vagy*), e.g. Farkašda *trinmasekengeri VAD dúj* 'three- or two-month old'. It is likely that the similar form *vaj*, which exists in Roman (Halwachs 1996: 90), many NC dialects, as well as in Zohra, Lieskovca, and variantly in Čobánka, is pre-Hungarian: cf. *vaj* in Gurbet (Boretzky & Igla 1994: 296). (For a formally parallel pair of conjunction forms, namely *hod'* – *hoj*, see below). Most interesting is the obscure *maj* in Klinóca Romani, e.g. *jék*

¹³⁴ The Slovak accusative plural form of the noun *Slovák* 'Slovak', due to an intraclausal code-switch.

čhon MAJ dúj čhona ‘one month or two months’, *tra dake, MAJ tre meštreske?* ‘to your mother, or to your teacher?’; it can be also used in the meaning ‘otherwise’, e.g. *no čak, phenla, MAJ dikheha* ‘just [do it], he says, or you will see [there’s going to be trouble]’. Finally, Slovak *abo* / *a’lebo* is used in some NC varieties. The alternative conjunctions may be employed disjunctively. In a pair, they render ‘either – or’, e.g. *Klinóca t’ovlah’amen MAJ čhajóri MAJ čhávo* ‘if we only had a daughter or a son’, which is in accord with Hungarian *vagy – vagy* and Slovak *alebo – alebo*.¹³⁵

There is no inherited adversative conjunction in the Central dialects of Slovakia¹³⁶: the Hungarian-bilingual varieties use Hungarian *de* ‘but’, and most of the Slovak-bilingual ones Slovak *a’le* / *ale*, e.g. *Farkašda sake khereste sáhi d’ujtó, DE sake khereste na sa lampa* ‘in every house, there was a candle, but not every house had a lamp’, or *Čaraďica ALE na murdarde aňi jékhe Rome* ‘but they did not kill a single Rom’. The Hungarian *de* still used in *Klinóca* indicates a later contact of the *Klinóca* Romani speakers with Slovak.

The causal conjunction *mer* ‘because, since, as’ (borrowed from Hungarian *mert*) is probably used in all NSC varieties, e.g. *Šóka le čháveske na tecillahi, MER igen phúri sáhi* ‘the boy did not like it [a violin] as it was very old’. *Lieskovca* and *Klinóca* Romani employ both *mer* and Slovak dialectal *bo*. The Slovak conjunction (*bo, lebo, lebo* etc.) is used in all NC dialects of Slovakia. The syntagma *vaš odá* ‘for that; for that reason, that is why, therefore’ has developed into *važdár* in *Šóka*, *Farkašda*, and *Čaraďica*, e.g. *Šóka odá VAŽDÁR phenav, hod’ naštig phiras sabadun* ‘I say that for the reason that we cannot move freely’. Both versions may be used variantly, e.g. *Čaraďica VAŽDÁR mre dade na line* vs. *na line VAŠ ODA mre dade* ‘that is why they did not take my father’. Not rarely, two causal conjunctions are used together, e.g. *Šóka tecinel mang’adí čhib ige, VAŽDÁR MER ige súži hi* ‘I like this language very much because it is very pure’.

The concessive conjunction in the NSC as well as in some NC dialects is *hjabá* ‘although, even though’ (borrowed from Hungarian *hiába* ‘in vain’), e.g. *Farkašda na džanes ništa, HJABA sal phureder sar me* ‘you do not know anything, although you are older than me’. Some NC varieties borrow Slovak elements (e.g. *darmo*, or *xoc*).

The factual complementizer was borrowed from Hungarian *hogy* ‘that’ (both factual and non-factual) into all NSC dialects. The form *hod’* is retained in *Farkašda*, *Šóka*, *Tarnóca*, *Čába*, *Čaraďica*, and some time ago, it also existed in *Klinóca* Romani; the contemporary

¹³⁵ In Slovak beside *bud’ – alebo*, and *bud’ – bud’*.

¹³⁶ Puchmajer’s Bohemian Romani used *uva* ‘yes’ in this function.

Klinóca as well as Chyžné or v. Sowa's form is *hoj*¹³⁷, while Lieskovca and Očova depalatalized the final consonant to yield *hod*, e.g. *Očova pre late na phenela, HOD Romni, me HOD Servičkiňa hi* 'one would not say about her that she is Romani, I [thought] that she was Slovak'. The Slovak and/or Czech factual *že* has been borrowed into some NC varieties, but *kaj* (of relative origin) is still the most common NC device.

A non-factual complement is introduced by the subjunctive particle *te*, e.g. *Farkašda ánde thovav dij sekviségi, ságošno T'ovel* 'I put in two cloves so that it were fragrant'. The subjunctive particle is usually supplemented by another function word: In the NC dialects and variantly in Farkašda, it is the conjunction *kaj* (of relative origin), irrespective of whether it functions as the factual complementizer in the variety in question, e.g. *Farkašda kethán le čavarinasah'odá rond'o, KAJ T'ol asso sar kana hed'o* 'we coiled it up, the rag, so that it were such as if a hill'. In Farkašda, the subjunctive particle may be also supplemented by the optative particle *nek*, e.g. *Farkašda ánde thovav rántáši, NEK širendereske T'ovel* 'I put in roux so that it [a soup] should become thicker', or by both *kaj* and *nek*, e.g. *Farkašda čino čiken thoves upro plého, KAJ NEK TE na thábol* 'you put a little fat on the baking tin in order that it [a meal] should not singe', or *sako čaládo kamlahi, KAJ NEK báro T'ovel – sako dad kamlahi, KAJ NEK T'ovel le but murša* 'every family wanted to be big – every father wanted to have many sons'. The non-factual complementizer in Klinóca Romani consists of the factual one plus the subjunctive particle, e.g. *mangnahi ole gule Dève, HOJ TE na del brišind, HOJ TE ovel papalek šukár díve* 'they implored the sweet God lest it should rain, so that it may be a beautiful day again'.

The subordinate conjunction 'whether, if' in Farkašda Romani is the enclitic *-i* (borrowed from Hungarian *-e*), e.g. *phen mange, šaj-I džas od'da* 'tell me whether we can go there'. It may be used together with *hod*, e.g. *phen čak mange, HOĎ kames-I man* 'please tell me whether you like me'.

There is a number of Hungarian particles which have been borrowed into Romani dialects of Slovakia (and Czechia). The loan of Hungarian *csak* 'only, just' has reduced to *ča* in ESR (for the analogical reduction *mik* > *mi* see below), while the other NC dialects (including the Et variety of Chyžné) as well as NSC have kept the form *čak*.¹³⁸ The particle *már* 'already' has reduced its form to *má* in most NSC dialects (but cf. the extended *imar* in ESR). Hungarian *még* 'still, yet' has been borrowed as *még* / *meg* / *mek*. Further Hungarisms which

¹³⁷ Contamination with *kaj*? Phonetic development?

¹³⁸ When the particle follows an imperative form, it enfeebles the command; when it precedes, the command is stricter, e.g. *phen ČAK mange* 'please tell me' vs. *ČAK phen* 'tell, right now'.

are not limited to Hungarian-bilingual varieties are, for example, *bizo* ‘really, in fact, well’ (from *bizony*), *ipen* ‘just, right, the very’ (from *éppen*), *hát*¹³⁹ ‘well, so, then’ (from *hát*), *perse* ‘sure, of course’ (mostly in NSC, from *persze*), or *talán* / *talám* (from *talán* ‘perhaps’).

The particle **dži* ‘as far as, until, as much as etc.’ is mostly used with adverbs, e.g. Litava *ži akának* ‘up to now’, or together with the preposition *ke*, e.g. Budča *dži ko Lublino* ‘all the way to Lublin’. Nevertheless, it may also precede the nominative, the locative, the ablative, or the directive, e.g. Čobánka *me mek čak DŽI Piliščabu pindžarav le Romen, džanes* ‘I still know Roms only as far as Piliscsaba, you know’. The particle has undergone regular phonological changes in Zohra and Teplica (i.e. *d’i* and *dzi*, respectively, cf. 2.6.), but the eastern part of NSC (i.e. “Nógrád”, Klinóca, Litava, and variantly Budča) possesses the irregularly developed *ži* (< **dži*).

The optative particle is *mi* (< *mik*) in ESR, *me* (< **mek*) in the Et dialect of Roštár, *nek* in Biskupica, Šóka, and Farkašda, and *mek* in Klinóca as well as in v. Sowa’s (1887: 94) WSR dialect, e.g. Biskupica *maškar amende NEK ovel jednota* ‘may there be unity between us’. The optative particles in the NC dialects arose from the imperatives of certain variants of the verb *mukel* / *mukhel* ‘to let’ (cf. Boretzky & Igla 1994: 187): **mekel* and *mikel* (cf. Puchmajer 1821: 44). The form *nek* is either a loan of Serbocroatian *neka* or, more likely, a contamination of an older **mek* by it. The Klinóca particle may be a retention of this original form.¹⁴⁰ In addition, the subjunctive particle *te* may be used optatively.

A few particles, e.g. the postconsonantal *óke* / the postvocalic *jóke* (of demonstrative origin), *ókejó*, or the unstressed *-ja* / *-jo*, signal the end of an utterance, e.g. Šóka *kamav t’i káveja taj ánde štamperňi rumo JÓKE* ‘I also like coffee and a jigger of rum in it’, *si adla skíni vad’ sar lenge phenen ÓKE* ‘there are these skinheads or how they are called’, or Farkašda *pe me čhavóreskero va meg asso baro fótáči-JA* ‘on my child’s hand still such a big stain’.

The agreement particles *ova*, *uva* (e.g. in Čachtice or Bohemia), or *oja* (in “Nógrád”) are old. The other NSC dialects use *hát* (or the reduced *há*), which is borrowed from Hungarian *hát* ‘well, and, sure’; *hat* and *ha* also exists in ESR. Further *h*-forms exist in some NC dialects, e.g. *he*, *hi* (e.g. Levoča), or *ehe* (e.g. Jablonica). In the Hungarian-bilingual NSC varieties, Hungarian *igen* ‘yes’ (also *ige*, cf. 2.4.) may be employed. The particle of disagreement is usually identical with the negative *na*, but it may be bisyllabic in some varieties, e.g. Čaradica *na’a* with a glottal stop. The prohibitive particle is *ma*.

¹³⁹ The particle *hát* often accompanies the conjunction *hod’* in Šóka Romani, e.g. *avka le kamav te phenen, HOĎ HÁT gođavera nipi dživen and’adí čhib* ‘I want to say it in this way, namely that wise people live in this language’.

The modal particle *šaj* ‘to be able, allowed to, can, to be possible’ and its negation NSC *naštig* / NC *našti* are commonly used in all Central dialects in Slovakia (cf. also 3.13.). A similar modality may be rendered by the verb *džanel* ‘to know’. The other modal devices are more dialectally diverse (see also Boretzky, this volume).

The particle *musaj* ‘to have to, must’ (borrowed from Hungarian) is common in Klinóca, Čobánka, and the transitional dialects of Prenčov and Chyžné. It requires the subjunctive particle *te*, e.g. Čobánka *hát MUSAJ TE thovlahi košáro pro va, na* ‘so she had to put the basket on her hand, didn’t she’, Klinóca *MUSAJ TE gé’la* ‘s/he had to go’, *MUSAJ TE dela* ‘s/he will have to give [it to you]’, but both particles may be separated, e.g. Klinóca *tena*¹⁴¹ *áver berš na sik’li’omahi románe, adádive MUSAJ má tumenca TE vakerd’omahi servika* (elic.) ‘had I not learned Romani last year, today I would have had to speak Slovak with you[-PI]’. The negative *na musaj* means ‘need not, not to have to’, e.g. Klinóca *NA MUSAJ te géj’áhi andi árešta* ‘s/he would not have had to go to jail’.

The particle *site* is the most common necessative particle in Šóka, Farkašda, Tarnóca, or Zohra, but it also exists in Klinóca and the Ct dialect of Prenčov, e.g. Farkašda *ole muleske SITE des odá utóšono, odí pativ* ‘you have to render the last thing, the respect, to the dead’, Tarnóca *SITE ári liňa ole tiknóre* ‘s/he had to take out the little one’, or Zohra *o mas SITE t’ines* ‘you have to buy meat’. The necessative *site* is compounded of the copula *si* (cf. 3.17.) and the subjunctive particle, but it also exists in some varieties which otherwise possess only the *hi*-copula (e.g. in Prenčov). Both components tend towards inseparability¹⁴²; two counterexamples have been recorded, though: Farkašda *andar kaštestar SI tut T’ol jag* ‘you must have fire from the wood’, and Klinóca *SI len TE delahi lóve* ‘s/he had to give them money’. The particle *site* may be separated by personal pronouns from the verb, e.g. Šóka *SITE man mukjom ra’aha dromeste* ‘I had to set out for a journey in the evening’.

The negative *na site* means ‘need not, not to have to’, e.g. Zohra *t’odala man NA SIT’úléhi* ‘if I had not have to have those [born]’, or Prenčov *NA SITE džas dúr* ‘you/we need not go far’. In Šóka Romani, a negated *site* is used if the finite verb is the copula, e.g. *te odá odona čhavóra na háléhi, NA SITE úléhi adádi erd’avóne* (elic.) ‘if those children had not eaten that, they would not have had to be sick today’. Otherwise, a negated *musaj* is employed (this seems to be the only use of this Hungarian element in Šóka), with a specific construction of the copula subjunctive (without the particle *te*!) plus the infinitive of the autosemantic verb,

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Vekardi (1983: 116) on *nek* in Hungarian Romungro: “not generally used”.

¹⁴¹ The double negation (i.e. *tena ... na*) is not used in Šóka, cf. *te me tavval na sik’lijomahi románe, adádi me tumenca site vakerd’omahi servika* (elic.).

e.g. *te mri phen tavval siklijáhi románe, adádí tumenca NA MUSAJ ovlahi*¹⁴³ *te vakeren servika* (elic.) ‘had my sister learned Romani last year, she would not have had to speak Slovak with you[-PI] today’. A similar construction (with a positive *mušaj*, though) exists in the Et dialect of Teplica, e.g. *préki rat mušaj šle te denašel Lehotate* ‘during the night they had to flee to Lehota’.

The particle *kampe*¹⁴⁴ ‘it is necessary, there is need for’ is attested from Zohra, Farkašda, and Biskupica, e.g. Zohra *ezero koruni KAMPE ko kurko* ‘one needs one thousand crowns per week’, while the impersonal form in Šóka Romani is *kampol*, and *kampel* in ESR. The fully inflected verb *kampel* ‘to be necessary, need’ is common in Klinóca and Šóka as well as in some ESR varieties (including the Et dialects of Revúca and Teplica). The preterite stem is *kamp-l-* in NSC, e.g. the elicited Šóka *nassine odoj kaj KAMPLE te oven*, and Klinóca *nast’e odoj kaj KAMPLE te oven* ‘they were not there where they should have been’, but *kamp-il-* in ESR (as if based on **kampol*).

4. Remarks on contact history and dialect classification

4.1. Lexicon and contact history

Apart from the Asian, Greek, and South Slavic words common to all or many dialects of Romani, the lexicon of all NSC varieties contains Serbocroatian and Hungarian elements. The NSC varieties of Slovakia, especially the Slovak-bilingual ones, also borrow from Slovak. The Germanisms are only indirect, mediated by Serbocroatian, Hungarian, or Slovak. There seem to be no loans from Rumanian,¹⁴⁵ except for those borrowed from Hungarian Lovári by the NSC dialect of “Nógrád”, e.g. *muca* ‘cat’ (Rácz 1994: 38, cf. Vekerdi 1983: 112). The older athematic elements in the NC dialects are borrowed from the same languages as those in NSC, but the individual words are often different. Common Serbocroatisms, Hungarisms etc. may be explained by cultural factors or similar lexical gaps.

The differences between the NSC and the NC dialects in the Asian lexicon are due to old variances, or, more often, differing lexical losses. For example: the SC noun *kopal* ‘stick’ does not exist in NC; the initial *a-* is present in the NSC nouns *anav* ‘name’ and *alav* ‘word’ (but not in *bijav* ‘wedding’, or *šunel* ‘to hear’), while all NC dialects have *nav* and *lav*; the

¹⁴² Which is reflected in native speakers’ spelling as well as in the orthographic convention accepted here.

¹⁴³ A form of the conditional potentialis was used instead of the irrealis in this example.

¹⁴⁴ For its genesis see Boretzky, this volume.

¹⁴⁵ Taking into account the absence of any other Rumanian loans in NSC, the nouns *lavuta* ‘violin’ and *lavutári* ‘violin player, musician’ may be of a different origin.

nouns *ambrol* ‘pear’ and *bov* ‘oven’ have been replaced by Serbocroatian *kruška* and *pé’a*¹⁴⁶ in NSC, but retained in the NC dialects; etc.

The NC dialects seem to be much more differentiated by old lexicophonetic and lexical isoglosses than the NSC dialects¹⁴⁷, e.g. eastern NC *pindro* vs. western NC *pro* ‘foot’, eastern *pindrango* vs. western *pernango* ‘barefooted’ (the latter means ‘with naked belly’ in ESR, cf. *per* ‘belly’), eastern *jandro* vs. western *járo* ‘egg’, eastern *graj* (but the adjective *grastano*) vs. western *grast* ‘horse’, or the eastern *rikono* / *rukono* ‘dog’ unknown in the western dialects (only *džukel* / *džuklo* is used there). In the cases given above, NSC goes with the western part of the NC dialects, cf. *pro*, *pernango*, *járo*, *gra* (< **grast*, see 2.4.) ~ *grast*-, and *džukel*. (For *verda* vs. *verdan* ‘cart’ see 3.2.; cf. also 3.22. for the prefixed *pobisterel* / *pobiskerel* ‘to forget’). On the other hand, there are some innovations which are shared by NSC and the eastern NC dialects. An example may be the metathetical change **sast(e)r*- > *trast* ‘iron’, which took place both in ESR and NSC (as well as in Vekerdi’s Romungro), but not in Bohemian Romani and WSR.¹⁴⁸

The NSC and the NC dialects share a great number of Greek loanwords. There are also differences, though: The NSC varieties use *táha*, while the NC dialects borrowed *tajsa* ‘tomorrow’.¹⁴⁹ The Greacism *karfin* ‘nail’ has been replaced by Serbocroatian *klinco* in NSC. The meaning ‘chair’ is rendered by *(i)skami* in NSC; its formal counterpart *skamin(d)* in the NC dialects means ‘table’. In NSC, the latter meaning is expressed by the specific Greek loanword *kafidi*. The numeral ‘thirty’ has the shape *trijanda* in NSC and the western NC dialects, while ESR uses *tranda*. The Greacism *buka* ‘little, small’, which exists in some NSC varieties, e.g. in Šóka and “Nógrád”, is not attested from the NC dialects.

The oldest Slavic elements in NSC are *vodro* ‘bed’ (also in the Northern Romani dialects, but not in the NC ones), *holóv* / *holév* ‘trousers’ (cf. Northern and NC *xolov* etc.), and perhaps *trupo* ‘body, trunk’ (possibly also from Serbocroatian *trúp* ‘trunk’). There are dozens of Serbocroatian loanwords in NSC, perhaps more than in the NC dialects. Only a part of

¹⁴⁶ Although Vekerdi (1983: 30) gives *bov* for Romungro, the word does not exist in the NSC dialects of Slovakia, nor it is contained in the Rácz’ dictionary of “Nógrád” Romani.

¹⁴⁷ There seem to be quite a few isoglosses (cf. also 1.1.) between Czechia Romani and WSR on the one hand (“western NC”), and the areas to the east on the other hand (“eastern NC”). Some old isoglosses within the NC area concern even smaller regions.

¹⁴⁸ It is possible that the first step of the change was **sast(e)r*- > *srast*- (i.e. a metathesis of the liquid), the outcome of which can be seen in Vend *srasti* (Vekerdi 1983: 148). The second step could be *srast*- > *strast*- (i.e. an intrusion of a dental), which occurred in the dialect of Šaštín (cf. *strast*), and also in the deadjectival noun *strastuni* ‘pan’ in Bohemian Romani (the ordinary adjective being *sastruno*, though; cf. Puchmajer 1821: 47-48). The third step consisted in dropping the initial sibilant. Puchmajer’s Bohemian as well as v. Sowa’s (1887: 191) and Kalina’s (1882: 110) WSR dialects retained the original *saster*.

¹⁴⁹ In some NC varieties, e.g. in Čachtice, *tajsa* also means ‘yesterday’.

them is common to both Romani dialect groups, e.g. *avka* / Bohemian *avoka* ‘so, in this way’ (cf. *ovako*), *caklo* NSC ‘glass’ / NC *caklos* ‘bottle’ (from Serbian dialectal *caklo*¹⁵⁰), *dosta* ‘enough’ (from *dosta*), *dugo*¹⁵¹ ‘long’ (from *dug*), *mačka* ‘cat’ (from *mačka*; cf. also Slovak *mačka*), *naranča* ‘orange’ (from *naránča*), *pernica* ‘pillow’ / *pernica* ‘feather bed-blanket’ (from *pérnica* ‘feather bed-blanket’), *pisinel* ‘to write’ (from *písati*; in NC possibly from Slovak *písať*), the prefix *po-* (cf. 3.22.), *préko* ‘through’ (from *preko*), *vičinel* ‘to call’ (cf. *vikati* ‘call, scream’), NSC *Vlaho* / NC *Vlaxos* ‘Vlax Rom’ (from *Vlah*), and originally also the indefinite prefix *ni-*, the pronoun *ništa* ‘nothing’ (cf. 3.12.), or the particle *ni* ‘nor, not even’ (cf. 3.24.), etc. For the noun *pisti* / *pexti* ‘jelly’ cf. 2.3.

The specifically NSC Serbocroatisms are, for example, the nouns *bob* ‘bean’ (from *bob*), *bríga* ‘grief’ (from *briga* ‘care, worry’), *duhna* / *dunha* ‘bed-blanket’ (from *duhnja*), *gizda* ‘pride’ (from *gízda* ‘decoration, luxury, grace’; also in Levoča ESR), *klinco* ‘nail’ (from *klinac*), *kruška* ‘pear’ (from *kruška*), Klinóca *meštra* / “Nógrád” *mrešta* ‘teacher’ (cf. *meštar*), *mlino* ‘mill’ (from *mlín*), *nebo* ‘heaven, sky’ (from *nebo*), *péťa* / “Nógrád” *píti* ‘oven’ (from *péc*), *plasta* ‘bed-sheet’ (cf. 2.3.), *praho* ‘ashes, dust’ (from *práh* ‘dust’; *praxos* in ESR more likely from Slovak), *prósto* / “Nógrád” *prosto* (from *prost* ‘simple, common, gross’, cf. 1.2.), Čobánka *sveto* / “Nógrád” *sveco* ‘feast’ (cf. *svét* ‘saint’), *šliva* ‘plum’ (from *šljiva*), *vól’a* / *vója* ‘good mood’ (from *vólja* ‘will, taste’), and perhaps “Nógrád” *pekenuca* ‘pouched marmot, gopher’;¹⁵² the adjectives *brížiko*¹⁵³ ‘sorrowful’ (cf. *brižan* or *brižljiv* ‘careful, solicitous’), *drágo* ‘dear’ (from *drág*; cf. also Hungarian *drága*), *erd’avo* ‘evil, bad’ (from *rdav*), *gizdavo* ‘proud’ (from *gizdav* ‘elegant, vain’), *zeleno* ‘green’ (from *zelen*; *zeleno* / *želeno* in NC more likely from Slovak), or *žuto* ‘yellow’ (from *žut*); the verbs *molinel* ‘to pray’ (from *moliti* ‘to ask, beg, pray’), *prósinel* ‘to excuse, forgive’ (cf. *oprostiti*), or “Nógrád” *šlúžinel* ‘to serve’ (cf. *slúžiti*; *slúžinel* in NC from Slovak *slúžiť*); the adverb *zalog* ‘little’; some prepositions (cf. 3.23.); etc.

An interesting piece of evidence concerning the time of migration of the NC and the SC Romani speakers could be the noun *duhano* ‘tobacco’ in Farkašda, “Nógrád”, and Vend

¹⁵⁰ The Vedic dialects possess the form *staklo* (Halwachs 1996 et al.: 83, Vekerdi 1983: 153), which must have been borrowed from a different Serbocroatian dialect.

¹⁵¹ Attested only in some NC dialects, e.g. in Šaštín or Košice. Most ESR varieties use *d’indardo* ‘long [spatially]’ and *baro* ‘big, long [temporally, abstractly], etc.’.

¹⁵² Kostić (1994: 47) explains the noun *pekenuca* in Hungarian Lovári as a metathetized form of Serbocroatian *tekunica*. If the metathetized form does not exist in a Serbocroatian dialect, then it is likely that either “Nógrád” Romani borrowed from Lovári, or vice versa. Speakers of Farkašda Romani use *irga* (from Hungarian *úrge*; also in ESR), but one of them knew the form *pekeñuca*, not being sure about its meaning.

(Vekerdi 1983: 53), *dohano* in Šóka, or *dohanos* / *duhanos* in ESR. It is a loan of Serbocroatian *duhán* (more common in Croatian, cf. Serbian *duván*), which comes from Turkish *duhan* ‘smoke’. Taking into account the American origin of tobacco, the noun could not be borrowed into Romani before the 16th century. Thus it is likely that at least the NSC speakers (possibly also the ESR speakers) still had a contact with the Serbocroatian linguistic area in that century.¹⁵⁴ Another instance of borrowing a Serbocroatian Turkism may be the noun *hasna* in NSC / *xasna* in ESR ‘use, profit, benefit’ (cf. 2.3.).¹⁵⁵

Some facts point to a stay of the NSC speakers in the western part of the Serbocroatian linguistic area, perhaps in western Bosnia and Hercegovina. There are a few words which must have been borrowed from an Ikavic dialect: *svito* ‘world’ (from *svit*), *cilo* ‘whole’ (from *cio*, *cil-*), and *Nimco* / *Ninco* ‘German’ (from *Nimac*, *Nimc-*). The form *svito* is attested from Klinóca, Hradíšť’a, Drienovo (Miklosich 1978: 10), “Nógrád”, and Vekerdi’s (1983) Romungro, while Šóka and Farkašda Romani now use only *világo*, a loan of Hungarian *világ*. We have recorded *Ninco* in Šóka and Farkašda, *Ňinco* in Čaraďica Romani, *Nimco* in Biskupica and Čaba (the same form exists in “Nógrád”), and the adjective *ninsko* or *ňinsko* in Zohra; Budča Romani has already borrowed the Slovak noun: *Ňemco* (from *Nemec*, *Nemc-*).

The form *cilo* exists in the Vendic dialects, Šóka, and Čaraďica Romani, and as *cilo* in Farkašda Romani and in Veľký Meder (cf. Miklosich 1972: 7). On the other hand, Zohra, “Nógrád”, Klinóca, and Lieskovca NSC, varieties of Hungarian Romungro (Vekerdi 1984: 74), as well as the NC dialects of western and central Slovakia and of parts of eastern Slovakia (e.g. Podskalka near Humenné), including the Et dialect of Teplica, possess the form *celo*. Except for “Nógrád”, Hungarian Romungro, and Podskalka Romani it is impossible to say whether this is a retained loanword from Serbocroatian or a new borrowing of Slovak *celý*, and, providing the latter is true, whether the individual varieties used to have *celo*, or *cilo* before their speakers reached the Slovak territory. The form *calo* in most varieties of ESR is borrowed from local Slovak (cf. Štolc 1994: 26).

¹⁵³ The adjective is derived by the suffix *-ik-* (cf. 3.8.) plus the alternation *g ~ ž* (cf. the noun *bríga* above). The alternation was borrowed together with the Serbocroatian adjective; only later the suffix *-ik-* displaced the Serbocroatian one (*-av-* or *-lživ-*).

¹⁵⁴ Perhaps the noun only later diffused from NSC to ESR, or it is borrowed in some of the Romani dialects in question from a hypothetical Hungarian dialectal **dohan* / **duhan* (cf. standard Hungarian *dohány* with a final palatal).

¹⁵⁵ According to Škaljić (1985: 317) as well as to Boretzky & Igla (1994: 11), the Serbocroatian (*h*)*asna* ‘use, profit, advantage’ comes from Turkish *hasna* ‘wellfare, lot’, while Hadrovics (1985: 258-260) claims that it is a result of contamination of *hasan* / *hasen* (borrowed from Hungarian *haszon* ‘use, profit’) by the Turkism *hazna* ‘treasure, aerarium’.

In all NC dialects, there is a number of Hungarian loanwords, e.g. *bugaris* ‘spider’, *dombos* ‘hill’, *dilos* ‘midday’, *garašis* ‘penny, Groschen’, *hand’a* ‘ant’, *harangos* ‘bell’, *helos* ‘place’, *igen* ‘very’, *kapuvi* ‘gate’, *kareka* / *kereka* ‘wheel’, *kepeňegos* ‘cloak’, *kerestos* ‘cross’, *kestuva* ‘glove’, *lancos* ‘chain’, *leketova* ‘apron’, *meg* ‘still’, *mind’ar* ‘at once’, *mogos* ‘stone [of a fruit]’, *šoha* ‘never’, *talam* ‘perhaps’ etc. in Puchmajer’s Bohemian Romani. Out of the NC dialects, the highest number of Hungarisms seems to be present in ESR. There are instances of Hungarian loans in ESR corresponding to pre-Hungarian words in NSC, e.g. ESR *šargo* (from Hungarian *sarga*) vs. NSC *žuto* (from Serbocroatian *žut*) ‘yellow’. Out of the NSC dialects, it is Šóka and especially Farkašda Romani which contain the highest number of Hungarisms. In some instances, even the fully integrated Asian words, mostly nouns, are being replaced: although they are understood or rarely used, the Hungarism is more common, e.g. Farkašda *teštviro* (beside *pral*) ‘brother’, *teštvirkiňa* (beside *phen*) ‘sister’, *bečelato* (beside *pativ*) ‘honour, respect’, or *ileto* (beside *dživibe*) ‘life’.

4.2. Classification of the NSC dialects, and the transitional NC dialects

An important general feature of NSC (as well as of the other SC dialects) is a prospective blurring of the thematicity dichotomy: it may be observed especially in the adjectival inflection (cf. 3.7.) and derivation (cf. 3.8.), in the derivation of the diminutives and the abstract nouns (cf. 3.6.), in the inchoatives (cf. 3.19.), or in the stress patterns (cf. 2.8.).

We have chosen the innovation of the type **kerahahi* > *kerasahi* (cf. 2.5.) as the feature delimiting the NSC subgroup against the other SC dialects. For a number of specifically Vedic features see Vekerdi’s (1984) comparative notes, and Boretzky (this volume). The Vedic dialects are closer to the western varieties of NSC than to the eastern ones (the common phenomena are presented roughly in the order of declining importance for a genetic relationship): the Vedic dialects share the copula form *nána* (cf. 3.17.) with Biskupica and Tarnóca; the copula Σ -stem *s-* (cf. 3.17.) with Biskupica, Farkašda, and Šóka; the irregular inchoative form *bárd’ol* (cf. 3.19.) with Farkašda and Šóka; the formant *-in-ger-* (cf. 3.21.) with Farkašda, Šóka, and Čobánka; the Ikavic *cilo* / *cílo* (cf. 4.1.) with Farkašda, Šóka, and Čarad’ica; the pronoun *sogúdi* / *sogodi* (cf. 3.12.) with Farkašda and Šóka; the preposition **uz-* (cf. 3.23.) with Zohra, Farkašda, and Čobánka; the contractions of the type **hordóvo* > *hordó*, and **dive* > *dí* (cf. 3.3.) with Farkašda and Šóka; the form *akán* (cf. 3.12.) with Farkašda, Šóka, and Čobánka; some points in the stress pattern and the adverb *ód’a* with Zohra Romani (cf. 2.8. and 3.12., respectively); or the forms *ár* (< **ári*) and *ól* (< **ovel*) etc. with Farkašda (cf. 3.17. and 3.22., respectively). On the other hand, the demonstrative forms

oja in the Vendic dialects and Klinóca Romani have probably arisen independently of one another (cf. 3.11.).

Some isoglosses within NSC proper have a roughly meridional direction: the positive 3rd plural preterite palatalization (cf. 3.14.), the location vs. direction opposition in some pronominal elements (cf. 3.12.), the {sl} vs. {st} Σ -stem of the copula (cf. 3.17.), the suffix -*ov*- vs. -*uv*- in the SPs (cf. 3.13.), the forms *kaj* and *taj* vs. *ká* and *tá* (cf. 3.12., 3.24.), the *u*-forms of the preposition **upre* (cf. 3.23.), and perhaps the yotation in the *ik*-feminines (cf. 3.2.) and the opposition *bárd'ol* vs. *bárjol* (cf. 3.19.). The *l*-infinitive (cf. 3.16.) delimits the peripheral NSC dialects (Zohra; Budča, Očova, Lieskovca; Čaraďica, Litava) against the core ones. The individual northern peripheral dialects (Budča, Očova, Lieskovca) are almost identical; they may be characterized by the lack of yotation in the thematic feminines (cf. 3.2.). Taking into account the distribution of the plural form *jakha* (cf. 3.2.) as well as of the copula Σ -stem *s*- (cf. 3.17.), a hypothesis may be formulated that the Biskupica, Farkašda, Tarnóca, and Šóka Romani speakers came to their contemporary domiciles somewhat later than the speakers of the surrounding NSC varieties.

A relatively recent lexical innovation is the loss of the opposition *čhon* ‘moon’ vs. *masek* ‘month’ in some NSC varieties: while the opposition exists in Šóka and “Nógrád”, the noun *čhon* has been generalized to express both meanings in some idiolects of Klinóca Romani (perhaps due to an influence of the NC dialects, see below). Some minor lexicophonetic differences between individual NSC varieties can be found, e.g. *vuder* in Biskupica, Šóka, Farkašda, Tarnóca, or “Nógrád” (as well as in Vekerdi’s Romungro) vs. *vudar* in Zohra (as well as in Vend, cf. Vekerdi 1983: 176).

There is a number of features connecting just a few neighbouring NSC varieties, e.g. the syncopated genitive in Biskupica and Čobánka (cf. 3.1. and 3.9.), the article oblique stem *ol*- in Farkašda, Šóka, and Nógrád (cf. 3.11.), the future -*sa* (cf. 2.5.) and the imperative of the type *cid* (cf. 3.13.) in Farkašda and Šóka, the palatal-final feminines of the type *pheň* (cf. 3.2.) in Hradíšťá and Klinóca, etc. Some isoglosses reflect a higher degree of Hungarian influence rather than geographical proximity, e.g. the assimilation **ňd'* > *d'd'* in Farkašda and Nógrád. (The contact-induced generalization of *ój* occurred in most core dialects and in Litava, cf. 3.9.). Finally, some features are characteristic of individual NSC varieties, e.g. the reflexive form *pet* (cf. 3.10.) and the preterite of the type *siklíňa* (cf. 3.14.) in Biskupica, significant remnants of the original stress pattern (cf. 2.8.) and the change **dž* > *d'* (cf. 2.6.) in Zohra, the *ime*-participles of the *d*-verbs (cf. 3.14.) in Klinóca, or the relative prefix *a*- (3.12.), the forms *ónk* (cf. 3.9.), *songe*, and *kange* (cf. 3.12.) in “Nógrád”, etc.

It is clear that both the Ct and Et transitional dialects genetically belong to the NC subgroup of Romani. Since all of them retain the imperfect suffix *-as* (cf. 3.13.), the isogloss between the differing (perceptually prominent) imperfect suffixes exactly corresponds to the boundary between the NC and the SC dialects, respectively. It is significant that there are NC varieties with a number of major features typical for NSC, but not vice versa.

The genetic affiliation of the transitional dialects can be seen, for example, from the retained uvular in many pre-Slovak words (cf. 2.3.), e.g. Prenčov *solaxárel* ‘to promise, get married’, or *oxto* ‘eight’, Chyžné *xudel* ‘to get, hold, begin’, or *bax* ‘luck, happiness’, or Teplica *xañigóri* ‘little well’, or *baxtálo* ‘happy’. A transitional dialect usually contains a number of NC lexicophonetic peculiarities, e.g. *prindžarel* ‘to know, be acquainted’ (vs. NSC *pindžarel*), or *áv’lom* ‘I came’ (vs. *ál’om* / *ájom*, cf. 2.10.) in Prenčov, *žížo* ‘clean’ (vs. *šúžo*), or *avri* ‘outside’ (vs. *ári*, cf. 2.10.) in Revúca, *cikno* ‘small, little’ (vs. *tikno*, cf. 2.2.), or *avri* in Chyžné, *pindro* ‘foot’ (vs. *pro*, cf. 4.1.) and *graja* ‘horses’ (vs. *grasta*, cf. 4.1.) in Roštár, *prindžarel*, or *avri* in Teplica.

On the other hand, many words are borrowed from NSC together with their lexicophonetic peculiarities, e.g. *ha’ol* ‘understand’ (vs. *xa’ol*, cf. 2.3.) in Prenčov, *ájom*, *pindžarel*, *grasta*, or *anav* ‘name’ (vs. *nav*, cf. 4.1.) in Chyžné, *ájom*, *livinel* ‘to shoot’ (vs. *l’ivinel*, cf. 2.2.), or *te* ‘also, too’ (vs. *the*, cf. 3.24.) in Teplica. Specifically NSC lexemes are, for example, *svito* ‘world’ (cf. 4.1.), or *meštra* ‘teacher’ (cf. 4.1.) in Teplica, or the particle *musaj* (cf. 3.24.) in Prenčov, Chyžné, and Teplica.

The most important feature of the transitional dialects is borrowing of some NSC morphological devices as well as morphological and morphophonological patterns, e.g. the final *s*-lessness (to differing degrees in different varieties, cf. 2.4.), the full integration of adjectives (to differing degrees in different varieties, cf. 3.7.), the 2p-form analogy in the reflexives (at least in the Et dialects, cf. 3.10.), the feminine form of the article (in the Et dialects, cf. 3.11.), various NSC copula forms (cf. 3.17.), the 1st singular verb contraction (at least in Teplica, cf. 3.13.), etc. On the other hand, many features are specifically NC, e.g. the nominative singular feminine palatalization (cf. 2.2.), Slovak verbal prefixes with non-Slovak verbs (cf. 3.22., e.g. Revúca *rozgondolinel* ‘to think out’, or Teplica *roschingerel* ‘to tear up’), the absence of the final *n*-lessness (apart from individual lexemes, e.g. *máribе* ‘war’ in Prenčov, but cf. *xáben* ‘food’, or *rañimen* ‘injured, wounded’, cf. 2.4.), non-syncopated vowel in Prenčov *phenela* ‘s/he will say’ (cf. 3.13.), etc.

Borrowing (the most frequent) inflectional forms and their integration into an original inflectional paradigm leads to inflectional variants with the potential of a functional

differentiation, cf. the past 3rd person copula variants in Prenčov Romani (cf. 3.17.). The NC and the NSC features may even mix within a word form or a morphological segment, cf. e.g. the contaminated form of the prefix *vale-* (cf. 3.12.), Prenčov and Revúca *d'ive* containing the NC palatalization plus the NSC *s*-lessness, or Prenčov *hol'isa'ol* 'to get angry' containing the NC derivation (cf. 3.19.) plus the NSC initial laryngeal.

Bibliography

Banga, Dezider (ed.) 1993a. *Genibarica. Doplňkové čítanie pre žiakov ZŠ*. Bratislava: Goldpress Publishers.

Banga, Dezider (ed.) 1993b. *Romano hangoro. Rómsky šlabikár*. Bratislava: Goldpress Publishers.

Boretzky, Norbert (this volume). *Die Gliederung der Zentralen Dialekte und die Beziehungen zwischen Südlichen Zentralen Dialekten (Rumungro) und Südbalkanischen Romani-Dialekten*.

Boretzky, Norbert & Birgit Igla. 1991. Morphologische Entlehnungen in den Romani-Dialekten. *Arbeitspapiere des Projekts 'Prinzipien des Sprachwandels'*. Arbeitspapier Nr. 1. Essen: Fachbereich Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft an der Universität Essen.

Boretzky, Norbert & Birgit Igla. 1994. *Wörterbuch Romani-Deutsch-Englisch für den südosteuropäischen Raum. Mit einer Grammatik der Dialektvarianten*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Benkő, Lóránd (Hrsg.) 1993. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. Bd. 1.

Bubeník, Vít. 1995. On typological changes and structural borrowing in the history of European Romani. In: Matras, Yaron (ed.) *Romani in contact: The history, structure and sociology of a language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1-24.

Československá vlastivěda III: Jazyk. Praha 1934: Sfinx.

Gjerdman, Olof & Erik Ljungberg. 1963. *The language of the Swedish Coppersmith Gipsy Johan Dimitri Taikon*. Falköping: Gummessons.

Hadrovics, László. 1985. *Ungarische Elemente im Serbokroatischen*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Halwachs, Dieter W. 1996. *Morphologie des Roman. Basisgrammatik der Romani-Variante der Burgenland-Roma*. Arbeitsbericht 3 des Projekts "Kodifizierung und Didaktisierung des Roman". Oberwart: Verein Roma.

- Halwachs, Dieter W. & Ursula Glaeser & Katarina Martens & Cornelia Purr. 1996. *Lehrerkommentar zum Lehrbuch 'Amen Roman Siklojas'*. Arbeitsbericht 4 des Projekts "Kodifizierung und Didaktisierung des Roman". Oberwart: Verein Roma.
- Hübschmannová, Milena, Hana Šebková & Anna Žigová. 1991. *Romsko-český a česko-romský kapesní slovník*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Hübschmannová, Milena & Vít Bubeník. 1997. Causatives in Slovak and Hungarian Romani. In: Matras, Yaron, Peter Bakker & Hristo Kyuchukov (eds.) *The typology and dialectology of Romani*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 133-145.
- Imre, Samu. 1971. *A mai magyar nyelvjárások rendszere*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Ješina, Josef. 1886. *Románi čib oder die Zigeuner-Sprache*. Leipzig: List und Francke.
- Kalina, Antoine. 1882. *La langue des Tziganes slovaques*. Posen: Župański.
- Kostić, Svetoslav. 1994. Romani čhib a jazykový kontakt. *Romano džaniben* 1:1, 42-54.
- Lesný, Václav. 1916. Cikáni v Čechách a na Moravě. In: *Národopisný věstník československý* 11, 193-216.
- Lesný, Václav. 1934. Jazyk cikánů v ČSR. In: *Československá* 1934, 605-612.
- Lípa, Jiří. 1963. *Příručka cikánštiny*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Lípa, Jiří. 1965. *Cikánština v jazykovém prostředí slovenském a českém. K otázkám starých a novějších složek v její gramatice a lexiku*. Praha: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd.
- Mann, Stuart E. 1947. Two Moravian Romani folk-tales. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* III:26:1-2, 24-36.
- Matras, Yaron. 1995. Connective (VS) word order in Romani. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 48:1-2, 189-203.
- Miklosich, Franz. 1878. *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Zigeunermundarten* IV. Wien: Karl Gerold's Sohn.
- Miklosich, Franz. 1872. *Über die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europa's* I. Wien: Karl Gerold's Sohn.
- Puchmayer, Anton Jaroslav. 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*. Prag: Fürst-erzbischöflichen Buchdruckerey.
- Romano Rác, Sándor. 1994. *Kárpáti cigány – magyar, magyar – kárpáti cigány szótár és nyelvtan*. Budapest: Balassi Kiadó.
- Seznam obcí ČSSR s cikánským obyvatelstvem k 31. 12. 1968*. Praha: Federální statistický úřad 1969.

- Schwartz, Ernst. 1934. Jazyk německý na území ČSR. In: *Československá* 1934, 524-597.
- Soravia, Giulio & Camillo Fochi. *Vocabolario sinottico delle lingue zingare parlate in Italia*. Roma: Centro Studi Zingari & Istituto di Glottologia, Università di Bologna 1995.
- v. Sowa, Rudolf. 1887. *Die Mundart der slovakischen Zigeuner*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag.
- v. Sowa, Rudolf. 1893. Die mährische Mundart der Romschprache. In: *Jahres-Bericht des ersten deutschen k. k. Gymnasiums in Brünn für das Schuljahr 1892/93*. Brünn. 1-19.
- Škaljić, Abdulah. 1985. *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Štolc, Jozef. 1994. *Slovenská dialektológia*. Bratislava: Veda.
- Vážný, Václav. 1934. Nářečí slovenská. In: *Československá* 1934, 219-310.
- Vekerdi, József. 1983. *A Magyarországi cigány nyelvjárások szótára. Dictionary of Gypsy dialects in Hungary*. Pécs: Janus Pannonius Tudományegyetem Tanárképző Kara.
- Vekerdi, József. 1984. The Vend Gypsy dialect in Hungary. *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 34, 65-86.