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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. 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 ESR, 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 cíkno, 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, románi 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 Lípa 1965, Húbschmannová et al. 1991, and still in Húbschmannová & Bubeník 1997). Boretzky (this volume) uses the Romani equivalent “Ungriko”. We have abandoned this quasi-ethnical 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 Poľáko / Poják 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 Poják 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, poľáko 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 Polják ‘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. heďicka Roma (cf. Hungarian hegy ‘hill’) used by the WSR speakers in Záhorie to refer to their NSC neighbours (see 1.3.), vrchára (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 víxodhára (from Slovak východniah ‘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 báta / bátya (from Hungarian bátja ‘older brother’ / the possessive from bátja) vs. báci (from bácsi ‘uncle’), which are used after the first name of an older respectable man, e.g. Jánošbáta is a Rom, while Jánošbáci is not.
If nationality is to be specified, a Slovak is called Slovákos (female Slovenka or Slovačka, country Slovensko, adjective slovačko or slovensko) in the NC dialects of Slovakia. In NSC, including the Slovak-bilingual varieties and the Ct dialect of Prenčov, the term Servo (female Servička or Servička, 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 Ungrička or Ungrička, 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 gadžikane 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, Vlax 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 Vlax 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 spoken in the southern part of Záhorská nížina (Záhorské nížiny): e.g. in +Zohor (Romani Zohra), Lozorno (Romani Lozorna), Vysoká pri Morave (Romani Hošťena), Borinka (Romani Pajštún), Stupava (with Roms mainly from Borinka), and Devínska Nová Ves (Romani Falíva); in Podunajská nížina and the lower Váh River area: e.g. in +Podunajské Biskupice (Romani Biskupica), Trstie, Neded, +Vlčany (Hungarian Farkasd, Romani Farkašda), Žihárec (Hungarian Zsigárd, Romani Žigárda), Diáky, +Trnovec (Hungarian Tarnóc, Romani Tarnóca), +Selice (Hungarian Sókszélőce, Romani Šóka), and perhaps as far north as in Madunice; in Pohronská pahorkatina: e.g. in +Čaradice (Romani Čarádica) and Rybník; in parts of Krupinská planina and Zvolenská kotlina: e.g. in +Litava (also in Romani), +Kráľová (Romani Kráľova), +Buďa (also in Romani), Môťová, Breziny, +Lieskovec (Romani Lieskovca), Zvolenská Slatina (Romani Slaťina), Vigľaš, +Očová (Romani Očova), Hrochoť (Romani Hroxoštia), Poníka (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 Hnúštka (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 Čóbánka) and +Pilisscaba (Romani Pilisčaba 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, Tmava, Komjatice, Levice, Zvolen, Tisovec, Fiľakovo. Lípa’s (1965: 58) NSC research localities were Trstie, 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 Zoloma or Zvoleňa), and Sliač; and in the valleys of the Muráň River, e.g. in +Revúca (also in Romani) and +Chyžné (Romani Xžna), and of the Štítnik 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 registers 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, 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

---

Vlkany, Rybnik, 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. mesáč ‘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.
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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 only\(^{10}\) 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 Vlax Roms also speak Šőka 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 Šőka 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 remined that a non-NSC feature is present in the example.

Our data on Rošťár Romani are based on a few texts published in the Czech journal of Romani studies *Románo džaniben*, while the facts about Hradšťa 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 (Šőka Romani), Mrs. Weissová, Mrs. Fabiánová, Mrs. Pálková (Farkašda), Mrs. Horváthová and her family, Mr. Humpí (Klinóca), Mrs. Suchá (Ošova), Mr. Berky (Lieškovca), Mrs. Kryštofová (Zohra), Mrs. Šarkéziová (Čaraďica), Mrs. Hakeľová (Kraľova), Mrs. Balogh (Čobánka), Mr. Boris (Čaba), Mr. Abrahám (Buđáč), Mr. Kováč (Litava), Mr. Radič and his wife (Kokava); Mr. Vlačuha (Prenčov), Mr. Tomí (Chyžné), Mr. Cibuľa (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 Hradťšťa 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 Hradťšťa 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 by symbolized by quotation marks, i.e. “Nógrád”).

Comparative notes on the NC dialects are based especially on Lípa’s (1963) and Húbschmannová 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 [angle] ‘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. lačho ‘good’ (see 2.7.), not *lačho. Vocalic length is rendered by an acute, e.g. šukár ‘beautiful’.
The orthography used here\(^\text{14}\) 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 \([\text{ts}^h]\) (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 [ts: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

\(^\text{13}\) We would like to advocate the graphemic symbolization of the palatal consonants by diacritics (i.e. \(t\), \(d\), \(ň\), and \(ľ\), and \(ľ\)) 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 postyotated dentals, e.g. both tuJarel ‘to dry’ (< *tuJarel) and tuJarel ‘to make sour’ (< *tuJarel < *tuJarel) e.g. in Šoka Romani would be spelled as tuJarel.
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 szógál, written as szolgálinel15 (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), soha ‘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. Rácz’ *chhávo as chávo ‘boy’, *otyda as ofóda ‘there’, or tyhil as thil ‘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 ǯ, ǯ', ǹ, the aspirate ȑʰ, and the lateral ɬ. In this section, the development of palatalals 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 assimilation 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 ɨ, 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 ɨ-palatalizations are both grammatical and root-internal. The palatalals in the NC dialects have a wider distribution than in the SC dialects. In the former, the vowel ɨ has had in many cases a palatalizing effect on a preceding dental consonant, i.e. *ti > ǯi, *di > ǯi, *ni > ɲi, and *li > ɬi, 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 ɨ-palatalization of dentals has been most consequently accomplished with ɬ and ɨ, less often with t, and exceptionally with d.

Nearly all sequences of *li, which had been mostly initial, changed to ɬi in NC: cf. ɬikerel ‘to hold’, ɬivinel ‘to shoot’, palɨkerel ‘to thank’ in ESR, ɬɨţi ‘tree’ in Bohemian Romani, and kofin ‘breast’, ɨdžal ‘to carry, bring, lead’, ɨkh ‘nit’, ɨlɨ ‘leaf’, and ɨɨm ‘phlegm’ in both. The word *kliði(n) ‘key’ changed to kliði / kliði in and later to kliɡin ‘padlock’ in some ESR varieties. Puchmajer (1821: 44) also gives mišklo ‘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 ɨnaj, and both Puchmajer and v. Sowa give ɨništino. Some Slovakia varieties have proceeded further in a few cases, losing the initial consonant: *ilijom ‘I took’ > ɨliom (thus in Bohemian Romani and in some NC dialects of Slovakia) > iļom, *lindra ‘sleep’ > iļindra > indra, and *lizdral ‘shiver, flicker’ > ɨlizdral > izdral.

The nasal became palatal, for example, in Bohemian cukɨida ‘nettle’, xaɲig ‘well’, and perəica ‘bed-blanket’, or in ESR ɨnilaj ‘summer’, raɨik ‘rod, twig’, buɾɨik ‘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 ɨne in the NC dialects, e.g. in ɨerno ‘sober’. 
The original *ti changed to tţ, for instance, in patţiv ‘honour’, or in Bohemian postţin ‘fur, pelt’. In other cases, mainly at the beginning of a word, it was either retained (e.g. tţro ‘your’), or assimilated to ci (e.g. cirax ‘shoe’, or keći ‘how many’ in all NC dialects). In the case of assonation, it is possible to assume a development through *tţ, e.g. *tirax > *tţirax > cirax. There is an isogloss within the NC dialects between tikno ‘small’ in Czechia and WSR, and cikno in CSR and ESR. We have found only one root-internal instance of the change *dţ > dţ in NC, namely *dives > dţives ‘day’.

Other cases remained non-palatalized, e.g. dikhel ‘to see’, dikhło ‘kerchief’, dílino / dţílino ‘fool, stupid’, dino ‘given’, and Bohemian dız ‘château, castle’.

Now if one looks at the NC dialects, it is obvious that there was no such a wide palatalization of *li, *dţ, and *ti in roots, cf. e.g. dílino, dive / dţ (< *dives), kolţin, liţ, lim, lindra, livinelo, pativ (unlike pţat’al ‘to believe’ < *patţal), and tikno. An exception may be the variant pajaţerel in “Nógrád” (but Šoka 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 *ikerel, the source of NC tikrel. The noun tţrhaj ‘shoe, high boot’ (< *tţrhaj, cf. NC *tţrax) is another instance of a positive palatalization in NSC. Only apparently palatalized is the masculine dţikeri ‘mirror’ in Farkaşda and “Nógrád” Romani from Hungarian tţkőr: it is likely that the Romani form comes from dialectal *grţkőr, 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 NC varieties (e.g. in Klinócä, “Nógrád”, and Šoka): cf. the feminines in ik or ig, namely burţik ‘palm’, haţig[17] ‘well’ (< *xamig), raţik, “Nógrád” cuţîk ‘whip’ / Farkaşda cuţîk / Klinócä cuţîk (all ultimately from *cuţnik), and also hîlaj ‘summer’. The Serbocroatism perrîca ‘pillow’ has kept the dental in the Hungarian-bilingual varieties, while there is a palatal, e.g., in Klinócä perrîca. 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 *tţkõ is not attested.

[17] The ESR root dţmő: as given in Húbschmannová et al. (1991: 90) may be a hypercorrect representation of an underlying dţindţ (for the assimilation dţ > dţ see 2.6.). Cf. the cognate zinţo ‘high, long’ (possibly from *dţindţo or *dţindţo) in the Romani dialects of Cosenza and Calabria (Soravia & Fochi 1995: 121).

[18] This form is known to exist in the Hungarian dialects of Váhóve (northwest of Vlăcany and Selice) and in some places in the Pest and the Heves districts (Imre 1971: 250). The feminine dikkeri ‘little mirror’ (Húbschmannová et al. 1991: 89) in some varieties of Slovakia Romani may be a contamination of the Hungarian dikkeri etc. and the original verb dikحل ‘to see’.

[19] The non-palatalized hanig exists in Farkaşda Romani. According to a Farkaşda 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. cukάida ‘nettle’ and pernića ‘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 ři) rather than historical palatalization. It is likely that Slovak is the source of the palatalization *li > ři in NC as well as of a few instances of *ni > ři in both the NC and the Slovak-bilingual NSC dialects, while the palatalizations *ti > ři, *di > ři, and most instances of *ni > ři 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 > ři occurred in řišel ‘to buy’, říral ‘curd’, and pořišel ‘to pay’ in most NSC varieties, but not in kirvo ‘godfather’, kiti ‘how many’ etc. Biskupica Romani, quite specifically, has kinel, kirul, but also kirhaj ‘shoe, high boot’ (< kirhaj < *tirxaj, cf. above); the last word shows that the initial velar could be an innovation in Biskupica (i.e. kinel < řišel < *kinel), rather than a simple retention.20 The NC dialects further assimilated the ‘develar’ palatal in most cases, e.g. cinel, ciral, and Bohemian pocinel (vs. ESR pořišel). The change *gi > di occurred in diš ‘rye, corn’ (see also 2.6.) and voši ‘soul’ in both the NC and the NSC dialects, while *gili ‘song’ and its derivatives have been palatalized to diši (etc.) only in NSC. Any root-internal *khi changed to thī in Bohemian Romani, e.g. thīthi ‘tree’, mathin ‘fly’, thīl ‘butter’, and thīlava ‘plum, fruit’. The palatal of this origin also exists in NSC, e.g. mažhi (or mažha), thīl, and thino ‘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. mažhi, čhil, and čhilav. In “ Nógrád” Romani, but not anywhere else in NSC, there was a later depalatalization in thino (< *thino < *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 pāňi ‘water’ (and, due to a morphophonological analogy, also in its diminutive pāňori), in the feminine vocative singular, e.g. romniže (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. Šoka Tarzaňi

20 However, it is more likely that the initial velar in Biskupica kinel (etc.) is old, and that kirhaj 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 kirhaj in analogy to Biskupica kinel – other NSC řišel.

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 ‘peasant’ (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 pǎni ‘water’ (as well as in its diminutive pǎnori); in the singular of all athematic i-masculines (see 3.3.), e.g. sapuň-is ‘soap’, or baciľ-is ‘bacillus’ (from Slovak bacil), including the vocative, e.g. baroňis (of barojis ‘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’, kaľ-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. sastipe ‘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. lavućica ‘little violin’, or Bohemian lurđica ‘female soldier’; before the suffix -in deriving names of fruit trees (see 3.6.), e.g. ambroľin ‘pear-tree’; before the formants -iko and -ikáno (see 3.8.), e.g. džuvlikáno ‘female, woman’s’; before the formant -indos, e.g. pašľindos ‘lying’; etc. The NSC dialects have the non-palatalized romni, kali (for Klinóca and Čaraďica see below), sastipe, lavutica, džuvlko 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 -išagos (see 3.6.) from athematic verbs, e.g. tetišagos (from tetinel ‘to tattoo’), or parančolišagos (from parančolinel ‘to order, command’), while the derivations from thematic verbs get palatalized in the NC dialects, e.g. ESR xišišagos ‘diarrhoea’ (from xin tel ‘to shit’), or ucanišágos (from uxcenel ‘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 ‘cresses’, kabáti ‘coats’, fáči ‘walls’, ESR barati ‘friends’, čudi ‘miracles’, or Bohemian popeli ‘ashes’ (o-masculines), and Farkašda kotti ‘music notes’, iškoli ‘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 heďi (of heďo ‘hill’), or ESR amoňi (of amoňis ‘anvil’).
The yod palatalizes both preceding dentals and velars, in both NSC and NC: *tj and *kj > t̊, *dj and *gj > d̊, *nj > n̊, and *lj > l̊. 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 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 participal 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 terňiljom (for the raising ov > uv see 3.13., for l̊ > 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. čáliljom (< *čáljiljom) ‘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 čálilom and čáljom was *čǎjjom, or *čǎilom, respectively. The dental in the 3rd plural preterite is due to analogy with the other preterite forms, e.g. čájle ‘they ate their fill’, not *čǎjile (< *čǎle < *čǎjile). 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. čáljom ‘I ate my fill’ (and čálo ‘replete’).

The transitional dialects share the NC palatalizations, e.g. Prenčov dīve ‘day’, kijarāti ‘evening’, romnī ‘wife’, Teplica bùči ‘work’, kajī ‘black [feminine]’, puranī ‘old [feminine]’, Chyžné bùti ‘work’, těrnī ‘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 soma’i tiktī ‘I was small’, asi običajní bùti ‘such an ordinary work’, or Klinóca oja manušni ‘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 rātik ‘at night’ (an adverb with no inflectional paradigm). In Klinóca
Romani, the nominative feminine palatalization may affect only the original nasal dental (in accordance with the forms of the type *pheň ‘sister’; see 3.2.), e.g. *romňiš (beside *romniš ‘wife’), but only *nasvališ ‘ill [feminine]’, *budžándiš ‘clever [feminine]’ etc.

There is no yotation or palatalization in the feminine diminutives in NSC, e.g. Čaba čirklórí (from čirklí ‘bird’), melórí (from mel ‘dirt’), čerhenórí (from čerhen ‘star’), Čobánka phenórí (from phen ‘sister’), or Farkašda and Klinóca tiknórí (from tikni ‘small, little [feminine]’). At least in Farkašda, the oblique forms are not palatalized either, e.g. the accusative singular feminine tiknórä (vs. the non-diminutive tiknä). In the NC dialects, the feminine diminutives are palatalized as if they were inflectional forms of the base noun or adjective, e.g. rakňórí (from rakňi ‘non-Romani girl’), pheňórí (from *phen ‘sister’), or terňórí (from terňi ‘young [feminine]’); this type of palatalization is due to a morphophonological analogy, i.e. there was no historical yod (e.g. no *phenjôri).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. *ľ > l), or it was delateralized into the palatal approximant (i.e. *ľ > 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 Šaštin, but not in Čachtice, or Trenčianske Teplice, while the deleralatization occurred in the NSC varieties of Zohra, Biskupica, Farkašda, Šôka, Čaraďica, and “Nôgrád”, 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 deleralatization is just in process, e.g. clear géľom 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. *pheňójóri, *kangľóri (from kangľi ‘comb, crest’), but non-palatalized *džukľóri (from *džukľi ‘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’), *matňóri (from matňín ‘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 *ř > l, and in Biskupice, Vlčany, and Selice, where both Romani and Hungarian *ř > j. Third, both languages in contact lack the palatal lateral without sharing the outcome of its change, e.g. in Zohor, Čachtice, Teplica, and Roštár, where Romani *ř > j, but Slovak *ř > 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 *ř > l, and Pilis, where Hungarian *ř > 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. The first type of negative correlation could be interpreted as follows: the speakers of Romani have not used the ľ-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 years in the ľ-less Slovak environment. And finally, the negative correlation of the second type either assumes a recent movement of the ľ-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 ľ-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’, *xaljovel > haľol / hajol ‘to understand’, *xandžol > handžol ‘to itch’, *xanig > hanić / hanig ‘well’, *xarno > harno ‘low, short’, *xev > hēv ‘hole, jail’, *xoli > hōli ‘anger’, *xolov > “Nógrád” holóv or *xolev > Farkaša holév ‘trousers’, *xudel > “Nógrád” hudel ‘to get’, *xuxur > huhur ‘mushroom’, *xulaj > hulaj ‘housekeeper, farmer’, *xumer > humer ‘dough’, *xurdo > hurdo ‘minute, small’, *solxarel (cf. NC solaxarel) > soľharel / sojharel ‘to swear, get married’, *tirxaj (cf. NC *tirax) > tīrhaj ‘shoe, high boot’ etc. The verb

23 The depalatalization in Western Slovak occurred in the 14th or 15th century. If the change *ř > 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 Farkaša.

The change of the uvular into the laryngeal also occurred in the Vendic 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 *postan(o) > postan(o) ‘linen, cloth’.25 Since the original laryngeal also changed to the sibilant before t, e.g. Farkaša pisti (< *pihti) ‘jelly, liver-wurst’, or plasta26 (< *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 *oxtos ‘eight’ resulted in osto 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)xalol, xandžel / xandžol, xaňig, xarno, xev, xőfi, xőlov, xudel, xuxar (in some varieties), xulaj, xumer, xurdo, solaxarel, cirax (< *tirax), xoxavel; baxt, moxt, poxtan, and oxt. All NC dialects, moreover, possess a few words with a uvular which has arisen from the laryngeal, e.g. baxlo ‘wide’ (< *buhlo). ESR, in addition, has kaxňi ‘hen’ (vs. Bohemian kahňi, both from *kahni), xarľas ‘smith’ (vs. Bohemian Romani, WSR, and CSR harľas), 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 Farkaša and Šoka kaňhi27, harľa, and hasna, respectively. The h in “Nógrád” hušnel ‘to knead’ is prothetic, cf. ušnel in Farkaša (and in Arli; Boretzky & Igla 1994: 294), and ESR ušanel.

The impetus for the loss of the phoneme s 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 Farkaša Romani. Cf. also v. Sowa (1887: 26).
26 The noun plasta ‘canvas’ in Budča Romani is borrowed from Slovak. Kráľova Romani uses both plasta (< *plahta) and plaxta.
27 Both the noun kanhi and its adjective kaňhalo in “Nógrád” Romani arose through metathesis, cf. the older *kahňi and *kaňhalo (< *kohnjalo). At the same time it is clear that the metathesis took place after the palatalization. In Farkaša and Šoka, the noun has been probably palatalized by an analogy with the adjective.
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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 űszos ‘smell’ (from Serbocroatian njūh). 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 all)29 Hungarianisms 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. hados (beside vados) ‘bed’, or husinel ‘to swim’ from Hungarian ágy and úszik (stem úsz-), respectively.

The laryngealization *x > h and the assimilation *h > s → x in the NC dialects affected the Asian, Greek (cf. hóli ‘anger’, or pisti31 ‘jelly’), and South Slavic loanwords (cf. older holov / holév ‘trousers’, or planta > *plahta ‘bed-sheet’ from Serbocroatian plaha ‘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 Prenčov, 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

---

29 There is no connection between the change in NSC and a similar one (cf. *mucha > maha ‘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 hasna ‘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 hazel 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 → *vazdel < vazdel (in some ESR varieties as well as in NSC) < *vast del ‘to give a hand’.

31 The cognate forms pectija or pxtija ‘jellied meat’ exist in Serbian Kalderas (Boretzky & Igla 1994: 212), pesteća ‘brawn in jelly’ < pxtija (Gjerdman & Ljungberg 1963: 310) in Swedish Kalderas, pehče ‘jellied meat’ in Bosnian Gurbet, and pxti ‘jelly’ in some varieties of ESR. The Kalderas forms must be borrowed from Serbian phtije ‘a kind of jellied meat’ which in turn comes from Turkish ptkia ‘clot, coagulum’ (cf. Boretzky & Igla 1994: 212), a loanword from Greek or Persian. The ESR pxti (< *phtiti) and NSC pisti (< *pisti) are likely to be direct Graecisms (cf. Modern Greek ptxi ‘jelly’, derived from pxtos ‘thick’, which can be traced back to the Old Greek pktos ‘fixed, joined’).
singular of the athematic masculine nouns, e.g. *fóro ‘town’, *lavutári ‘musician’, *papu ‘grandfather’, or *harta ‘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. *romíne ‘in Romani’; and e) the 3rd person singular preterite form, e.g. *kerďa ‘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 > ø (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. Garbet *va ‘hand’ and *gra ‘horse’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th>c.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>e.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>many NC (incl. Spiš and Šariš ESR)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many ESR</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(±)</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct Prenčov</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et Teplica</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et Roštár</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et Čhýžné and Revúca</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 d’ive (< *d’ive) ‘day’ is attested. The dialects of Čhýžné and Revúca are almost totally s-less (with the NSC exception of kas ‘whom’ etc.); however, Čhýžné retains the sibilant in d’ive. 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 skončíť sa ‘to finish’). The s-lessness of the accusative singular of masculines is only variant in the neighbouring Roštár dialect, e.g.

Roštár o chave amen šte but, maj na šakoneš dešupác ‘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 -or is much less dialectally restricted than the (unstressed) -is: Bugurđiş, 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 vičinёlov? ‘what is his name?’ vs. palek pes talinđa 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. lăče ‘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 that 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’adi čhib IGE, važdár mer IGE šiči 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 ratimen áčihloš ‘I stayed wounded’, Revúca manušíben ‘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 *dżahahi
'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 formants: 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} {s}, 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 Vendic dialects. In NSC, however, the imperfect forms contain the sibilant, e.g. džasahi ‘you/we went’, not džahahi as in the Vendic 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 Vendic 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 Šôka and Farkašda Romani, the future forms of the type džasa can be used along with džaha, e.g. Šôka te laha levinesa, furt trafinesa ‘if you will shoot with it [a gun], you will always hit the mark’ vs. vakereha téle, kana ònde rukkolindal 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 Šôka and Farkašda, but supposedly in all NSC dialects (attested also from Klinôca) as well as in Vendic: 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 dissimulate, 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 l or ň, e.g. bešla (< *bešla) ‘s/he sat’ vs. bešle ‘they sat’. Second, *št > *šč > *š < š, e.g. *uštav > ušav ‘I get up’ (Lípa 1965: 14). The cluster *št has also changed to šč in some WSR varieties (v. Sowa 1887: 27), in accord with the absence of šť in local Slovak dialects, but the change does not produce a new phoneme there.
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. 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 d has been assimilated to dz, e.g. ESR dzivo ‘wild’ from dzivy (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 zen ‘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 /č/, which is used only in the ‘post-nasal’ instrumental suffix -ça, e.g. mança ‘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 /č/ was a distributional allophone of the phoneme s in the 19th century Czechia Romani, i.e. that it had not merged with the affricate č 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 Štítník River valley, whence the label Štítník Romani used here. Two stages are apparent in the development of affricates in Štítník 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. dzanel > dzanel ‘to know’, gádžo > gádzo ‘non-Rom’), and *čh > ch (e.g. čhibálo > chibálo ‘boss, head of a community’, ačhel > ačel ‘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 čh, 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 *búči from bűči (< bűči) ‘work’. The development in fricatives took the reverse direction: prealveolar fricatives have been ultimately postalveolarized, i.e. *s > š (e.g. so > soš ‘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 > č (Vážný 1934: 291); the change in Romani must be later. Both the prealveolarization and the postalveolarization affect all Hungarisms and some Slovakisms, e.g. karácsony ‘Christmas’ (from Hungarian karácsony), ci ‘whether’ (from Slovak či), koncínel ‘to finnish, cease’ (from Slovak končíť); mušaj ‘must’ (from Hungarian muszáj), blíško ‘near, close’ (from Slovak blízky), škamarátinel peš ‘to make friends’ (from Slovak skamarátíť sa), smutno ‘sad’ (from Slovak smutný); žapojinel peš ‘join in’ (from Slovak zapojíť sa), or žaxrátninel ‘to save, rescue’ (from Slovak zachráňtiť). Later and ad hoc loanwords from Slovak retain their č, dž, s, and z, e.g. čas37 ‘times’, gardista ‘guardist

---

37 This form is borrowed from standard Slovak, i.e. not from the dialectal lasí.
[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 roztrhat ‘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 assimilated into postalveolar affricates, i.e. *ť > č (e.g. búťi > búcťi ‘work’) and *ď > dž (e.g. phendeom > phendžom ‘I said’). No NSC variety has participated in this change. The assimilation may be connected to the absence of the palatals ľ and ť in local Slovak dialects: they have changed to prealveolar affricates (so-called dzekanie, e.g. *ďeťi > dzejči ‘children’) in most Eastern Slovak dialects, or to dental stops in the relevant parts of the Štítnik River valley (e.g. *ďeťi > 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 assimilated form in ESR, e.g. dživ ‘rye’ (< *dživ < *giv), or džombra ‘stomach’ (from Hungarian gyomor, perhaps through a Slovak dialectal form). The Romani dialect of Svidník has changed the oral palatal stops into postyotated velars, e.g. *búťi > bučji.

Finally, there was a reverse change in Zohra NSC: *ď > d (e.g. *ďănél > dánél ‘to know’, *ďungáló > díngáló ‘dirty’, *ďuviľi > důviľi ‘woman’, or *gáďo > gáďo ‘non-Rom’), but not *č > č. The new voiced palatal stop merged with the old one (cf. heďíčko ‘of hills’); thus, both unvoiced but neither of the original voiced affricates now exist in Zohra. A similar de-assimilation occurred in the adjacent NC dialects, but only medially, cf. gáďo, but džánél.

2.7. Geminates

Gemination or consonant length 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 Lípa (1963: 15) offers a specific explanation for the assimilation in Prešov Romani.
39 Húbschmannová et al. (1991: 248) give only slugadžis ‘soldier’ (< *slugadžis), but cf. Lípa’s (1963: 151) slugadžis and Teplica Romani slugadži (< *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 Romani\textsuperscript{42}, 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’, čoro ‘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 čoro ‘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.\textsuperscript{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 cillapitinél ‘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” frissítinel ‘to refresh’ (from frissit). Exceptionally, a geminate may arise through derivation: e.g., “Nógrád” bajnoko ‘male champion’ borrowed from Hungarian plus the suffix -ki- (cf. 3.6.) result in bajnokkiña ‘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 intervocically and there seem to be other limitations, e.g. upe < uppe ‘on’ (< *upre; cf. 3.23.); cilla ‘once, in those days’ (< *čírla\textsuperscript{44}), or kello ‘throat’ (< *kerlo), but usually kerla ‘s/he will do’.\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{46} (< *tecilnahi); cf. the non-assimilated phirnahi.


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

\textsuperscript{44} Čaba Romani retains čírla, while Klimóca possesses the specifically assimilated čílna.

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{46} The grammatical subject of the Romani verb is the thing liked, while the experiencer is in the dative, e.g. Šóka tecineln mang’adí čih či liki this language, literally ‘likes to me this language’. Analogical constructions exist both in Hungarian (cf. tetzik nekem ez nyelv) and Slovak (cf. pácí sa mi teno jazyk).
‘you[AB]/they were walking’. Geminates may also arise through the vowel syncope in some verb forms (see 3.13.), e.g. *džanahí ‘you[PL]/they knew’ (< džanahí), tecinnahí ‘you[PL]/they were liked’ (< tecinnahí), or khelelahí ‘s/he danced’ (< *khelelahí).

Another consonant may be assimilated (in accord with Hungarian morphophonology) is the palatal approximant j: *sj > šš, *ňj > ňě, *ťj > tť and perhaps after the other palatals or postalveolars in Farkašáda, e.g. bacílaša ‘bacilli’ (< *bacílaša), or lakatoša ‘locksmiths’ (< *lakatoša). The form paššol ‘to lie’ (< *pašjol < *pašľol) 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 vagóňňa ‘railway carriages, wagons’ (< vagóňja), but the non-assimilated Čobánka vónťťja ‘trains’, or Šóka cimbalmošťja ‘cymbal players’. The change does not occur in Čaráďica, e.g. biťošťa ‘workers’, and in the other Slovak-bilingual varieties. The assimilation *ňď > dď in Farkašáda and “Nógrád” Romani must be recent, too, since Šóka retains the non-assimilated cluster, e.g. Šóka oňđa vs. Farkašáda odđa ‘there [direction]’.

The old cluster in *gundo ‘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 děl ‘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 (< *devľoro) vs. NC devľoro. Klinóca Romani as well as the NC dialects retain the original cluster in khabin / khabí ‘pregnant’, while Farkašáda Romani possesses the assimilated khaměni.

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 dži 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, Farkašáda enňa (< eňa) ‘nine’, keťť (< keťi) i kiti (< kiťi) ‘how many, how much’, aťť (< 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’, gădžo ‘farmer, non-Romani person’, and gădži ‘female farmer, non-Romani woman’ have the variants laččho, gaddžo, and gaddži, respectively, in Šóka, Farkašáda, and Biskupica: the gemination is usually compensated by the vocalic shortening, but we have also recorded găddžo in Šóka. It may be important that the voiced affricates are always geminated intervocally in Hungarian. (For čučča ‘tits’ and kafuđča ‘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, hoď Roma ssan ‘they are ashamed of being Roms’, lačchi gödi le ssaj ‘he had good brains’, Šóka meg akkor nassa ništta ‘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. romesker ‘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. vakerasah ‘we were talking’), both non-initial and initial (e.g. vakerasah), or only initial (e.g. vakerasah). The non-initial stress is mostly penultimate, and less often antepenultimate or final. The antepenultimate stress occurs in the genitive, e.g. bratrancoesker ‘of a male cousin’, and in the non-contracted imperfect forms (see 3.13.), e.g. mangasa ‘we were begging’, vakerah ‘they were talking’, or bojuih ‘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. čôrih ‘theft’, or mlátinasah ‘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. kuro ‘week’, čačpe ‘truth’, čavore ‘children’, or duvjen ‘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 (Štole 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. *ďungalo* 'dirty'.

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 preterite\(^5\), e.g. *ďanav* ‘I know’, *phageres* ‘you break’, or *sikďa* ‘s/he showed’.

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.

\(^5\) 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 ă [æ]. It appears especially in a stressed syllable in Hungarian loanwords, e.g. tástviro ‘brother’ (from the dialectal testvő ‘sibling’), kázdinel ‘to start’ (from kezdį), dă or even [da] ‘but’ (from de), and also in the superlative prefix (see 3.7.), e.g. lăksüzeder ‘the purest’. It may also occur in unstressed syllables, e.g. tebniąra ‘mostly’ (cf. többnyire), părșă ‘sure, of course’ (cf. persze), or kăvärinel ‘to mix’ (cf. kever). The noun ‘teacher’ may be pronounced both taniò and tănitő in Šóka Romani (cf. standard Hungarian tanító). If the low front ā occurs in inherited words, then it usually comes from a stressed mid front e, often before a liquid, e.g. khär ‘house’, khálen ‘to dance’, băršiko ‘-year old’, or dăš ‘ten’. In Farkašda, the low front ā originates in the unstressed low middle a in zijän ‘damage’ (vs. Šóka zijan). The phonological status of the vowel ā 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 ā [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 ā is labial, e.g. kapál ‘to dig’ is pronounced [kʰpa:l] in the standard language, but [kɑpʰl] in the dialect. Similarly, akán ‘now’ is pronounced [akɑ:n] in Šóka and Farkašda Romani. In some idiolects of Šóka Romani, the long ā sounds like [æː], and it cannot be excluded that in some varieties it has merged with the old ō phonologically.

Hungarian front labialized vowels are phonologically adapted by delabialization in all NSC varieties, e.g. Klinóca tándékiňa ‘nymph, fay’ (cf. Hungarian tündér, see 3.6.), Lieskovca tirinél ‘to suffer’ (from túr), Zohra sîkinel ‘to heat’ (from fűt), Šóka sîkerîlen ‘thrive, be successful’ (from sikerül), tebniре ‘mostly’ (from többnyire), Farkašda irga ‘pouched marmot, gopher’ (from ürge), or “Nógrád” gedra ‘hole’ (from gödör). In some cases, the long word-final labialized ō is de-unlauted, e.g. Farkašda felmony (< *felhóvo, see 3.3.) and “Nógrád” fejhóvo (from felhó and the dialectal fej’hő, respectively), or “Nógrád” tiđöko ‘lungs’ (from tiđő). 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 *görény* (cf. Imre 1971: 189). Exceptionally, but not only in *ad hoc* borrowings, labialized vowels are retained in Šóka and Farkašda Romani, e.g. *göndőro* ‘curly’ (from Hungarian *göndőr*), *sületišnapo* ‘birthday’ (from Hungarian dialectal *sületišnap*), or *üzleto* ‘shop, store’ (from *üzlet*).

Many Hungarianisms in various Romani dialects contain an *i* (or *i*) in place of a standard Hungarian *é*, e.g. *dilos* ‘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*), *vigzinel* ‘to bring to an end, complete, finish’ (cf. *végz*), Farkašda *somsído* ‘neighbour’ (cf. *szomséd*), *zenísi* ‘musician’ (cf. *zenész*), “Nógrád” *giga* (cf. *gége* ‘larynx’), or *üzleto* ‘shop, store’ (from *üzlet*).

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 Húbschmannová 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, Lípa (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 found them in a few monosyllaba: *bár* ‘garden’, *bár* ‘stone’, *dúr* ‘far’, *há* / *hát* ‘yes’ (from Hungarian), *ič* ‘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[-Pl]’ 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 Serbocroatisms 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 mlin), 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 túr).

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 rythmical law into Romani: a limitation on neighbouring lengths exists in most Central Slovak dialects as well as in standard Slovak, e.g. pečný ‘nice’ vs. krásny ‘beautiful’, not *krásny.

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 áčel ‘to stay’, ánde ‘inside’, ármin ‘cabbage’, áver ‘other’, hálo ‘pig’, bőri ‘daughter-in-law’, jilo / ilo ‘heart’, káci ‘cup’, lólo ‘red’, lóve ‘money’, márió (etc., cf. 3.2.) ‘fly’, náne ‘is not’, phába ‘apple’, šéro ‘head’, táha ‘tomorrow’, tável ‘to cook’, the trisyllabic amáro ‘our’, angáli ‘arms’, endáňi ‘relative’, korkóri ‘church’, pirán ‘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” pháro ‘heavy, difficult’ (vs. phare šéreskeró ‘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’ (vs. tumari čhaj ‘your 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 lačho 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, *olv, *uvl, *avl, and *avr), causing a lengthening of the preceding vowel. The following instances are common to all NSC dialects: dél ‘God’ (< *devl < *devel), kölo ‘soft’ (< *kovlo), šálo ‘swollen’ (< *šálo), álom / ájom ‘I came’ (< *avlom) plus the other preterite forms of this verb, and ári ‘out’ (< *avri). In Biskupica, one also finds džuli ‘woman’ (< *džulī). In the past participle suffix -d- (see 3.14.), the preceding vowel is not lengthened, e.g. garudo ‘hid’en’ (< *garuvdo), or sikáda ‘s/he showed’ (< *sikavdja). In Šóka, Farkášda, and Biskupica, an original word-final v has been elided after a labial vowel, with a lengthening effect upon the latter, e.g. šo ‘six’ (< *šov), phú ‘earth’ (< *phuv), or sú ‘needle’ (< *suv). We have also recorded phú in Budča. Ráce’ 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 dýr ‘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’ (vs. kájol ‘to grow black’ from kálo ‘black’), čačipe ‘truth’ from čáčo ‘right’ (vs. párnipe ‘whiteness’ from párno ‘white’55), or šušarel ‘to dry [st.]’ from šúko ‘dry’ (vs. hőšarel / hőjarel ‘to make [so.] angry’).

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 averbs (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 džabe ‘gait, walking’ (from džal ‘to go’), hábe ‘food’ (from hal ‘to eat’), or paťabe ‘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 -őr- (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 čhávo ‘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. šužőne ‘in a clean manner’ (from šűzo ‘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 andro56 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’ (<*ändé); 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 intersentencial 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’odi kvalita ‘it is not of that quality’; the imperfect forms in -ahi, e.g. Čaraďica sar odá len akharnah’úžár ‘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’aše sar amen ‘also these Roms [are] such as we [are]’ (<*Roma), Litava o gád’odá na šund’e ‘did not the farmers hear it?’ (<*gáđe), Chyźné štár džen’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’a ti géja ... ‘the Rom went with the horse for so long ...’ (<*grasteha); the 3rd singular preterite forms, e.g. o rašaj podajind’amen le Ņemce ‘the priest gave us away to the Germans’ (<*podajindafa); etc.

The length of the apocopated vowel is irrelevant, e.g. Šóka od’anđe mro šéro áčhol ‘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 and’ro), 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 men
deneko ári genav ándal ‘I read everything out of it’ (i.e. not *míndenek'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 nípale ‘people’, prícalen ‘princes’, and királalen ‘kings’. The last vocative
also appears in the dissimilated form királalen. 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 karácsonykor ‘at Christmas’ from
karácsony (cf. karácsonya ‘Christmas’ from karácsony), hušvítkor ‘at Easter’ from hušvítkor
(cf. hušvito ‘Easter’ from dialectal husvit), 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. Hradšta 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,
Farkaša, 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 kípo
‘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 *nro, 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. oj 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 diňos vs. ESR diňos nasvafi ‘you[-Sg, female] look ill’, Tarnóca Beťáriske l’akarnahi vs. ESR vičímenas 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 bešelas jekh famifija ‘each house was inhabited by one family’, Farkašda harneder dromeste āja vs. ESR xarharda peske o drom ‘s/he cut the way short’, or Šóka mukjom man dromeste vs. ESR mukhľom 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 ďives ‘two days’, šiar čhon ‘four months’, keci berš ‘how many years’, but duj ori ‘two

57The ablative after the preposition andar exists in Vekerdi’s (1983: 15) Romungro.
58But cf. the accusative in Čáradľa odola ... sar oda len akharnahi? ‘those ... how did they call them?’.
hours’ (an athematic noun), dīvesa ‘days’ (no numeral), and duy bare dīvesa ‘two long days’ (an attribute). The neutralized forms may alternate with the plurals in some NSC varieties, e.g. Farkašda both keši berš and keši berša ‘how many years’, trin berš and trin berša ‘three years’. Other nouns are usually not neutralized, e.g. Šóka s̱ 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]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>NSC</th>
<th>Roman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM SG</td>
<td>čačipen</td>
<td>čačipe</td>
<td>čači-p-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM Pl.</td>
<td>čačipen-a</td>
<td>čačipe-n-a</td>
<td>čači-p-ča</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL SG</td>
<td>čačipn-as-</td>
<td>čači-p-n-as-</td>
<td>čači-p-es-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In many nouns, there is a segmental or non-segmental modification (e.g. yotation, palatalization, -i-) 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 RODINA odoj bešel még ‘four families still live there’ (i.e. not the plural rođini). 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 the non-base forms, e.g. roman-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’ ~ džav-a-. The yod caused palatalization of preceding dentals61 (cf. 2.2.) in both dialect groups of Central Romani, e.g. *romnja- ~ *romnja- 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 phuva- (of the soft zero-feminine phuv ‘earth’), but NC píra- and phuva-. Both dialect groups have lost the yod after sibilants, e.g. *kućja- ~ kuča- (of the i-feminine kući ‘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 angrusta ‘rings’, thardā ‘brandies’, lubna ‘whores’, džavla ‘women’, and of the zero-feminines raľa ‘nights’, phuva ‘bridges’, phěna ‘sisters’, or mola ‘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. rakľa / rakľija in the nominative plural (of rakľi ‘non-Romani girl’), rakľen- / rakľilen- in the oblique plural, but only rakľa- 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. Farkašดา zărja ‘hair [plural] of body’; čhamja ‘faces’, but lima ‘phlegms’, puruma ‘onions’, pušuma ‘fleas’; hěvja ‘holes’, holēvja ‘trousers’, phuva ‘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. chiba ‘tongues, languages’, not *chibja.

The yod of the NSC i-feminines is usually missing after sibilants, e.g. čuća ‘its’, gadža ‘non-Romani women, female farmers’, or paramisa ‘tales’. Nevertheless, we have also recorded čućča and gaddža in Farkašda, which may a) come from the historical yotated form *čućja 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 kafiďa (the nominative plural of the i-feminine kafidi ‘table’), in the stead of the expected simple palatal – i.e. *kafidja as góđa (of gódi ‘brain, mind’), is likely to be connected to the expansion of the yod in the thematic masculines (see 3.3.) in the same variety, especially in the type somsiďa (the plural of somsiido ‘neighbour’).

The feminine jakh ‘eye’ is unmodified in Farkašda and Šőka (i.e. jakha etc.), but it has the palatalized plural forms in Klinóca, “Nógrád”, Čaba, and Zohra: the nominative ařha ‘eyes’ (< *akhja), and the oblique ařhen- (< *akhjen-) etc. The adjective is palatalized, too, e.g. Klinóca bijařhálo ‘unscrupulous, ruthless’ (cf. Slovak bezočívý ‘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 Hradišťa Romani, e.g. pheň ‘sister’, meň ‘neck’, arniň ‘cabbage’, asviň ‘tear’, mărţiň ‘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 *angušť* (or *angušto*) ‘finger’ is usually *angušt rá*. In NSC, both *anguš* 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 *pāni* ‘water’, ESR *vodi* ‘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 *buršišik* ‘palm’, Klinóca *čuššik* / Farkašda *čušnik* ‘whip’, *dōrišik* ‘tie, string’, *račnik* ‘rod, twig’, or Klinóca *porik* ‘tail’, while *dori* and *pori* is *k*-less in the NC dialects. Puchmajer gives both *čupší* ‘whip’ and *čupšič* ‘cat-o’-nine-tails’ (an untrustworthy semantic opposition); only the latter is common in ESR. On the other hand, *raži*, *račnik*, or even *ražig* exist in ESR, while Puchmajer had only the *k*-less *raži*. 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. *čušňiška* ‘whips’, or *čušňikjenca* ‘with whips’, while the situation in the oblique singular is not clear, cf. yotated *dōriškaha* ‘with a string’, but hard *čušňiška* ‘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’, *kharmin* ‘millet, groats’, *pajrin* ‘leaf’ in Bohemia and some Slovakia varieties / metathetized *pračtin* 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 *ljiggin* ‘padlock’ is a simple i-feminine: *klidi* ‘lock’ or ‘key’. The *in*-feminines in NSC include, for example, *armin*, *papin*, *patri* ‘leaf’, and the rare *atičin* ‘honey’, *klicin* ‘padlock’, and *kharmin* (Vekerdi 1983: 17, 88, 91); the noun *‘soup’* is *zumin* in “Nóigrád”, but the *n*-less *zumi* in Zohra and Farkašda, and variantly *zumi* / *zumin* in Klinóca. Moreover, Klinóca Romani has spread the final -*n* to *mášišti* ‘fly’, and variantly to *ásvi* ‘tear’ (beside *ásvi* and *ásva*). Most *in*-nouns inflect like the zero-feminines, e.g. *papíšna* ‘goose’. In the NC dialects, however, the noun *pajrin* / *pračtin* behaves like an i-feminine (**pajri* / *pračti*). The plural form being *pajtra*, *pračta*, or *pračta*, -*in* must be considered a nominative singular suffix; similarly in *karfin* with the plural *karfa*. In Klinóca Romani, on the other hand, *patri* 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 *a* in ESR, i.e. *svirind* and *skamind*.
plural form asviņa serves for all three Klinóca singulars. The n-less Zohra and Farkašda źumi
’soup’ forms the regular nominative plural zümja.

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’, bībast ‘bad luck’, and trast ‘iron’ (cf. 2.4.). The plural of the noun dive / di
‘day’ is divesa. In Klinóca Romani, the masculines with the oblique singular stem in š 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- (angušta) ~ angušt- (angušteha).

The Šóka, Farkašda, Biskupica, and Budča feminines phuv ‘earth’ and sū ‘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 ásví and the extended ásviņ),
Klinóca čeņa ‘earring’ (originally čeņi), “Nógrád” čhora ‘moustache’ (originally the
masculine čhor), drákha ‘grape’ (originally drákhi), gój65 ‘sausage’ (beside gój ‘intestine’),
máťha ‘fly’ (originally máťhi), or mirikla ‘pearl’ (originally mirikli). After the singularization
of the old plurals, new athematic plurals are regularly formed, e.g. phábi, or čeņi.

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 mozi) 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 kokalo; 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 gójha is plural and means ‘entrails’.
sirim), but not in ESR (sirimox) 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. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MASCULINE</th>
<th>FEMININE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o-masc.</td>
<td>i-masc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>-o(-s)</td>
<td>-i(-s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL.</td>
<td>-o-s-</td>
<td>-i-s-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

[7] MASCULINE FEMININE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>o-masc.</th>
<th>i-masc.</th>
<th>a-masc.</th>
<th>u-masc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>-o(-s)</td>
<td>-i(-s)</td>
<td>-a(-s)</td>
<td>-u(-s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL.</td>
<td>-o-s-</td>
<td>-i-s-</td>
<td>-a-s-</td>
<td>-u-s-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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’, inspite 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 lulud67 ‘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 e68 in Hungarian become feminines in NSC Romani, e.g. bráča ‘viola’ (from brácza), 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 aproximant 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 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 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 bánás, or gazda(s) ‘farmer, house-keeper, lord’ from Slovak gazda. Cf. also the Farkasháda 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, or nebespečo ‘danger’ in Zohra Romani from the Slovak dialectal nebespeči (cf. standard nebešpeče). For the integration of Hungarian nouns in ô, 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. Farkasháda nipo ‘people’ (from Hungarian dialectal níp), majmo ‘monkey’ (from Hungarian majom, majm-), kabátó ‘coat’ (from Hungarian kabát), hango ‘voice’ (from Hungarian häng), heđo ‘hill’ (from Hungarian hegy), or klinco ‘nail’ (from Serbocroatian klinac, klin-). Most nouns in š, č, or the palatal ń become the i-masculines, e.g. Farkasháda álmacsi ‘station’ (from Hungarian állomás), Čobánka kováči ‘smith’ (from Serbocroatian or Slovak kováč), or Budča větčeli ‘commander’ (from Slovak veliteľ). Hungarian nouns ending in a consonant preceded by an elidable vowel (e.g. ľ, or, on, ok, or og, sometimes om) are integrated as feminines, e.g. “Nógrád” epra ‘mulberry’ (from eper, epr-), ćomra ‘stomach’ (from gyomor, gyomr-), gedra ‘hollow’ (from gödör, gödr-), močka ‘bago’ (from mocsok, mocsk-), horga ‘rod and line, hook’ (from horog, horg-), or cimbálna ‘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), andćala ‘angel’ (from angyal), bajá ‘calamity, evil, trouble’ (from baj), or hivaja ‘buffalo’ (from hivaly). 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 kraľ and Hungarian dialectal kráľ, 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. dǐkeri ‘mirror’ (from Hungarian dialectal gyákör), 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 bánász), or vítízi / vitízi ‘hero’ (from Hungarian vitéz or dialectal vitéz), while shorter and some longer nouns are integrated into the subclass of the o-masculines, e.g. žiro ‘fat’ (from Hungarian zsír), falo ‘wall’ (from Hungarian fal), plino ‘gas’ in Budča (from Slovak plyn), méso ‘lime’ (from Hungarian mész), or blizzo ‘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 testvíro ‘brother’ (from Hungarian dialectal testvír ‘sibling’, cf. test ‘body’ and vír ‘blood’) and onokateštvíro ‘male cousin’ (cf. standard Hungarian unuktatestvér ‘cousin’) are o-masculines, since Hungarian vír is monosyllabic and would be integrated as *viro.

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 Hungarianisms, 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 napasťa ‘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 fattyúvo ‘boy’ (from fattyú ‘bastard, boy’), Klinóca boršovo ‘pea’ (from borsó), háborúvo ‘war’ (from háború), brágóvo ‘contrabass’ (cf. the standard bőgő), Čobánka bűcúvo ‘feast, banquet’ (from bűcű ‘bastard, boy’), Klinóca boršóvo ‘pea’ (from borsó), háborúvo ‘war’ (from háború), or leketóva ‘apron’ (cf. the standard lekötő- ‘to be bound’). In Šóka and Farkašda Romani, such Hungarian nouns are usually not morphologically adapted in their base forms, e.g. the feminines bégóvo ‘contra bass’, or leketóva, and the masculines háborúvo, tanítóvo ‘teacher’, tó ‘pond, pool, lake’, vonóvo ‘bow of a music instrument’, or Židóvo ‘Jew’.

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 borňuko in “Nógrád” (from standard borjú and dialectal bornyú, respectively), and tidóko ‘lungs’ (from tűdő) in “Nógrád”. The same element appears in tiviško (cf. standard Hungarian tővis or tűske ‘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, kline-), 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 tetejó ‘roof, top’ (from tető, poss. tetej-), or Farkašda vejó ‘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 NC dialects, e.g. Farkašda görőddüni (of görőddűnna ‘melon’, cf. standard Hungarian görögdinnye), Šóka fantázjii (of fantázija ‘fantasy’), Čobánka patkovi (of patkova ‘horseshoe’), Klinóca phābi (of phāba ‘apple’), sobi

71 Instances of the lack of adaptation in Čobánka Romani are perhaps rather code-switches: no less modern unadapted nouns than bista-shi ‘insurance company’, or televišji ‘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 batu ‘rucksack’ from Hungarian bátyu. “Nógrád” and Pilis form would be *batuvo.

73 Including the old a-masculine xarras ‘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’); Šóka komuništi (of komuništa ‘communist’), Čaráfica 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 Hungarianisms binos ‘sin’ and šogoris ‘brother-in-law’. Only a few loans of Greek neuters retained their plural in -a, e.g. supaños ‘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 ar⁷⁵ implying the suffix -a); both suffixes are often used variably.

The athematic -i-masculines in NSC reflect the nominative plural suffix *-ja in Šóka, Farkašda, Čaráfica, Čóbanka, and “Nógrád”. The yod palatalizes preceding dentals, e.g. Farkašda borbija (of borbili ‘barber’); it has been retained after ř and m, e.g. lavutára (of lavutári ‘musician’), papirja (of papíri ‘paper’), or “Nógrád” iskámja (of iskámi ‘chair’), and lost after some sibilants, e.g. Farkašda zenísa (of zenísi ‘musician’), vitíza (of vitízi ‘hero’), or Čóbanka kováća (of kováči ‘smith’). After palatals and ľ, the yod is either kept, or assimilated to the preceding consonant: the plural forms of the -i-masculines baciluši ‘bacillus’, bútosi ‘worker’, lakatoši ‘locksmith’, rokoši ‘relative’, and vagoši ‘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’), vitíza (of vitízi ‘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. lavutárija as bárja ‘gardens’, or with the nominative singular -i, i.e. *lavutári- (lavutárra). It is not likely that the yod once existed and has been lost in Klinóca, i.e. *lavutárija > lavutára, since it is retained in the original yotated feminines there, e.g. bárja. The plural királa (of királ ‘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. bugelaris ‘purse’.
need not presuppose a historical form *kir álja, since the palatalization may be a synchronic morphophonological rule copied from the feminines etc. Budéa Romani even has the non-palatalized tunel (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’), Caraďica partizáni (of partizáno ‘guerilla, partisan’), Budéa gestapáki (of gestapáko ‘member of Gestapo’), Klinóca fali (of fálo ‘wall’), heďi (of heđo ‘hill’), herci (of herco ‘actor’), or “Nógrád” gombi (of gombo ‘button’). It is also retained in many athematic o-masculines in Šóka, Farkašda, and Čobάnka, 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 sínszig).

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. barált'a (of baráto ‘friend’), somsiđđa (of somsido ‘neighbour’), čaláđđa (of čaládo ‘family’), or duhańa (of duhano ‘tobacco’). There may be a yod after a velar, e.g. onokja (of onoko ‘grandson’, cf. standard Hungarian unoka ‘grandchild’). In Čobάnka, the yod, which caused the gemination in Farkašda, is retained after the palatals (cf. 2.7.), e.g. vónatja (of vónato ‘train’). 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 *rokoňha (later barált'a as rokońha). The innovations do not affect pre-Hungarian and some Hungarian words (cf. Čobάnka 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 üzlett'a.

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. báťvi ‘rucksacks’, or bégóvi ‘contrabasses’, but it may also occur in some feminine forms, e.g. fedővaha ‘with a lid’. In the oblique cases of masculine nouns, the inflectional formant immediately follows the vocalic stem, e.g. vonóha ‘with a bow’, Židóške ‘to a Jew’, or tanítóange ‘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'a 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 > čhá in some varieties), connects Šóka and Farkašda Romani to the Vendic dialects (cf. Vekerdi 1984: 68, Halwachs 1996: 11; in Vend moreover *hordóvi ### hordój).

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

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. batú-v-i of batú ‘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, Čaraťica, Budča, Lieskovca, and Očova NSC varieties as well as in many WSR and CSR dialects, e.g. in Saštín, 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
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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). 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’ (Puchmayer 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 “Nôgrád”) 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. On the other hand, the Slovak origin of the innovation is logical on geographical grounds (cf. the Slovak minority in Čobánka).

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’: beš as he cites it (1916: 207), which he thought to be the source of the Romani noun. In fact, Beča or Bečis (borrowed from Hungarian Bécz, beside Váňa 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 Lieskovec-), Hradišťa from the Slovak neuter Hradište, or Poška, Štiža, or Nováka from the Slovak pluralia tantum Poníky, Šmižany, 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 Zoloma ‘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), Sliací, or Košo (in Budča Romani) from Slovak Poltář, Sliací, 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; desubstantival, 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 thulo ‘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 dukhal ‘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 čóríbe vs. “Nógrád” čórípe ‘theft’ (from čórel ‘to steal’). Also all desubstantival 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 hamisság ‘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/ -šig in the NSC dialects is restricted to loans of whole Hungarian words, e.g. Šóka fogšágo ‘captivity’ (from fogšág), or ketelessíg ‘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 Hungarian 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-cf-is] in masculine nouns (-V- is the vocalic exponent of subclassification), e.g. hangocis from hangos ‘voice’, lavutarics from lavutaris ‘musician’, xarćacis from xarlas ‘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 *kedvesno* ‘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*), *hangóri* 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’), *mačkića* (from *mačka* ‘cat’), or *vodróro* (from *vodro* ‘bed’). In Klinóca and Hradšiča Romani, a special suffix *-ať* (with the athematic *i*-masculine inflection) may derive diminutives from both athematic and thematic masculines, e.g. Klinóca *táńcri* (from *táńci* ‘plate’), Hradšiča *petalati* (from *petalo* ‘hoof, horseshoe’), *nebaťi* (from *nebo* ‘heaven, sky’), or *kerekati* (from *kereko* ‘wheel’), and also Klinóca *lovata* (from *lovó* ‘coin, money’), Hradšiča *gonaťi* (from *góno* ‘sack’), or *šeraťi* (from *šero* ‘head’). There is an uncertain form *fótatci* (from *fóto* ‘stain’) in Farkasda Romani; the affricate may be a result of a different adaptation of the original palatalized consonant. Hradšiča 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 Hradšiča, e.g. *verdaťi*/*verdoři*/*verdaro* (of *verda* ‘cart’). Exceptionally, the thematic and a new diminutive suffix may be combined in some varieties, e.g. Očova *chajorička* (cf. *chaj* ‘Romani girl, daughter’, its regular diminutive *chajóri*, and the Slovak feminine diminutive suffix *-ič*).

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’), or the suffix *-ni* (e.g. *manušt* ‘male human being’ – *manušni* ‘female human being’). New suffixes which form names of female persons have been borrowed from Serbo-Croatian: *-kiń* and *-šin-. In the NC dialects, they have been mostly retained as part of a few borrowed ethnic terms, e.g. *Rusos* ‘Russian’ – *Rusšiha* (borrowed from Serbo-Croatian *Rus* – *Ruskinja*), or *Vlaxos* ‘Vlax Rom’ – *Vlakšiha* (borrowed from Serbo-Croatian *Vlak* – *Vlakšniha*).

---

79 We were first inclined to see the origin of this diminutive suffix in a contamination of the Serbo-Croatian suffixes *-ić* and *-ak* (i.e. *-ač*). More likely, however, the whole formant *-ači* comes from the Greek diminutive formant *-ak’i* (Victor Friedman, personal communication): cf. the masculine *xerak’i* derived from the neuter *seri* ‘hand’. The diminutive *petalati* could be then a direct Graecism.
Vlášína (from Vlah – Vlahinja),\textsuperscript{81} and they do not seem to be productive.\textsuperscript{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 učiteľský ‘teacher’ – učiteľka (from Slovak učitel – učitelka).

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 -kiš-, which has become productive: any personal noun borrowed from a sex-indifferent\textsuperscript{83} Hungarian noun can derive a female counterpart by it, e.g. Šóka tanító ‘teacher, male teacher’ – tanítókiša ‘female teacher’, “Nőgrád” bajnoko ‘male champion’ – bajnokkiša ‘female champion’ (cf. Hungarian bajnok ‘champion’), Farkašda teštíro ‘brother’ – teštírkiša ‘sister’ (cf. Hungarian dialectal testvir ‘sibling’), or katolikus ‘Catholic man’ – katolikuskiša ‘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 tindérikiša into Klinóca Romani, i.e. adapted as if derived from a non-existent masculine *tindéri.

There are only few kiš-derivations derived from Serbocroatian stems, e.g. Klinóca mešterkiša ‘female teacher’ (cf. meštra ‘male teacher’), or Šóka próštiša ‘non-Romani woman, female farmer’ (from prósto, cf. 1.2.; only the syntagma próštiki džuviš is used in Farkašda). The suffix -kiš- in NSC is limited to a few ethnic terms such as Rumungriša, Ungriša, or Serviša (derived from Rumungro, Ungro, and Servo, respectively; cf. 1.2.). The last two terms are less common in the Slovak-bilingual NSC varieties than Ungriška and Serviška, which contain the complex formant compounded of Slovak -ičk- and Serbocroatian -kiš-.

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

\textsuperscript{80} In Farkašda, only the syntagma džuviški džukel ‘female dog’ can be used for džukli ‘bitch’, a word common in most Romani varieties.

\textsuperscript{81} The pair Česko ‘Czech’ – Česína in ESR was rather borrowed from Eastern Slovak Češ – Češka than from Serbocroatian Čeh – Čehinja.

\textsuperscript{82} But cf. ESR gilóšiša ‘female singer’ derived from gilős ‘male singer’ (for the suffix -őš- see below).

\textsuperscript{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 *vejkiša has replaced the original bőri ‘daughter-in-law’.
would not differentiate sex, contrary to the pre-Hungarian ones) activated the latest borrowed devices which could fulfil the gap. 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 *ambrelărís* ‘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 *bögös*), or ESR *kujdaisíš* ‘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 Serbo-Croatian *praho* ‘dust, ash’), or ESR *ciralošís* ‘person who likes floury meals’ (from the thematic *cirál* ‘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 “Nőgrád” Romani use periphrasis of the type *ákhoriko kaš* ‘walnut tree’, which may be a structural borrowing from Hungarian (cf. *diőfa* ‘walnut-tree’, a compound of *diő* ‘walnut’ and *fa* ‘tree’). There are also semicalques such as *čeriko kaš* from Hungarian *csérfa* ‘cherry-tree’, *akáciko kaš* from *akáčfa* ‘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 beetween *járo* ‘egg’ and ‘flour’. The homonymy is retained in Klinóca and “Nőgrád” 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

---

64 In Serbocroatian, the suffix -*aj* is limited to stems ending in a velar, while -*kiń* 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. ŏn dikhľě dăjān ěhávěn ‘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 utóšoní zlāka ‘the last gilder’, Buđča žádní bútí ‘no work’, postalske lukeste ‘insurgent soldiers’, lóve vojnove ‘war money’, Očova mri daj sľahi asi sľabi ‘my mother was such infirm’, Lieskovca pravi romantí čhib ‘true Romani language’, smutočne dǐla ‘mourning songs’, or Klinóca ruske bāšnǐčki ‘Russian poems’.

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-, or -ast--; see 3.8.), e.g. ESR xartiško bušti ‘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 dǐla ‘non-Romani songs’, or Klinóca servike bāšnǐčki ‘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. ŏnečke šlugadža ‘German soldiers’, cele dēteša ‘the whole days’, while the feminine nominative singular forms are fully integrated only if they are predicative, e.g. i daj āchija šmutni ‘mother was sad’. Otherwise the feminine

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

⁸⁵
nominative singular forms of borrowed as well as of the athematically derived adjectives are only athematically integrated, e.g. presila ňemecko ‘German numerical superiority’, i áver világiko vojna ‘the second world war’, and also harčikuno buči ‘smith’s work, product’. A fully integrated oblique plural form has been recorded in Chyňé: řeško zbraňenca ‘with heavy arms’, but only československo brigáda ‘Czechoslovak brigade’ is attested from the Ct dialect of Prenčov.

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 idioclects: cf. ano ěcko nemocnica ‘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’, goďaver ‘wise’, kuć ‘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 manušskero ‘of the bigger man’ (Puchmajer 1821: 24), or ESR dikhav la šakara 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 goďaverá nípi ‘wise people’, ávera 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 COREDERA sinéhi sar ávera, but Klinóca valasave Roma sté valamikor COREDER 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. dikjom JEKE86 čháve (elic.) ‘I saw one boy’, dikla čak JEKA čha (elic.) ‘s/he saw just one girl’; Čaba Romani has anda JÈKHA džinja ‘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 JÈKHÉ čhávöre (elic.) ‘I saw one kid’, but dikja čak JÈKH čha (elic.) ‘s/he saw just one girl’, on dikle DÙJ čhávören (elic.) ‘they saw two kids’, and ánde akharda pre TRÌN čhajen ‘he [the king] called in his three daughters’. Cf. also Teplica amen bešahaš andre JÈKEHE kherôrešte ‘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. godaveder (of godavé ‘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 jēkh ‘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 Chýžné 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, e.g. Zohra legfeder [lekfeder].

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’, kašuno ‘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

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. dug ‘long’, erďavo ‘bad’, červén ‘red’, or vojnovo ‘war, martial’ in Budča Romani from Serbocroatian dug, rďav ‘rusty, bad’, and Slovak červéný and vojný, 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 utósóno ‘last’ (from dialectal utósó; cf. standard utolsó), “Nógrád” dóršino ‘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 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. jegostatneder ‘the last, the least important’ (Lípa 1963: 80); cf. also Šóka loginieligermeder ‘the most intelligent’.

87 Used in the term Červeno krížo ‘Red Cross’ (cf. Slovak Červený kríž); the regular word meaning ‘red’ is lólo.
derived from kečka ‘goat’ (from Hungarian kecske), irgáno derived from írga ‘pouched marmot, gopher’ (from Hungarian írge), and, in a few cases, in ESR as well, e.g. cipano 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’ (< *papinjalo). Not all stems in a dental, however, belonged to the yotated subclass, cf. Farkašda thudálo ‘milk, milky’, i.e. not *thuďálo < *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. bárjálo ‘stone’ (derived from bár ‘stone’), čárjálo ‘grassy’ (from čár ‘grass’), hevjálo ‘holey, leaky’ (from hév ‘hole’), sirjálo ‘garlic’ (from sir ‘garlic’), thuvjálo ‘smoke, smoky’ (from thuv ‘smoke’), zarjálo ‘hairy’ (from zár ‘hair’), or the substantivized štárjálo ‘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 jíválo ‘snow’ (from jív ‘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. bárjálo or thuvjálo.

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’), česiko (from Česos ‘Czech’), or xartiko (from xarías ‘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 čhajőrliko (from čhajőri ‘little girl’), manušiko (from manuš ‘man, human being’), “Nógrád” akkoriko (from akkor ‘nut, walnut’), biboldiko (from biboldo ‘Jew’), bršindiko (from bršind ‘rain’), diviko (from dive ‘day’), džuliko (from džulj ‘woman’), gaviko (from gav ‘village’), kerkiko (from kerkö ‘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’.
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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- -n-, which consist of the Hungarian derivational suffix plus the Romani adaptational suffix, derive adjectives from non-Hungarian nouns, e.g. Farkašda *tiralšno* (from the thematic *tiral* ‘curd’), ESR *kotorošno* ‘patched, spotted’ (from the thematic *kotor* ‘piece, part, patch’), *dzekošno* ‘tasteful’ (from the dialectal Slovakism *dzeka* ‘taste, mood’), or *buterošno* ‘superfluous’ (from the thematic comparative *bute* ‘more’). The oš-n-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 Hungarian *šargo* ‘yellow’ (cf. Slovak dialectal *žltastý* from *žlty*), or gulasto ‘sweetish’ from the thematic *gulo* ‘sweet’ (cf. Slovak *sladkástý* from *sladký*). The desubstantival 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. erdavóně ‘badly’ (see 4.1.), or Zohra veselóně ‘marrily’ (cf. Slovak *veselý* ‘marry’). Later, the suffix has spread to adverbs derived from some thematic adjectives, too, e.g. tátóne ‘hotly’, or šiczáne ‘cleanly’ (vs. NC *tátes* and *žážes*). 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. bistrošno ‘sure’ (from *bistos*) together with bistrošan ‘surely’ (from *bistosan*). 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* ‘sweaty’.
A Hungarian deadjectival adverb may be borrowed without its adjective, e.g. *nadon* ‘very, greatly’ (from *nagyon*) beside the common *báre*, but only *báro* ‘big, great’. The Slovak *inášti* ‘in other way, otherwise’ has been borrowed as the comparative *inášedér* into the Slovak-bilingual varieties.

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* / *míro* ‘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 Prenčov), 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. Lipa 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 Šôka, Čaba, Čobáňka and elsewhere, an elision of the liquid occurred in the syncopated forms: *mV > mV* and *tV > tV*, e.g. Biskupica *mo pra*91 ‘my brother’, *odá man kamlaj, taj me rome, taj me čáve* ‘that one liked me, and my husband, and my son’. Farkašá 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 Ladomirová, 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 Čarádfica 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 *drahó* ‘expensively’). The form *inaššie* is quasi-comparative since it is synonymous with *inaš*. Romani both calqued the quasi-comparative form (cf. *-eder*), and borrowed the Slovak comparative suffix within the stem *inaš*-.

91 The noun *phral* ‘brother’ has lost its initial aspiration in Biskupica and Farkašá 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 variably in the pronoun meaning ‘alone, oneself’. The original feminine form has been generalized for both genders, so oj now means both ‘she’ and ‘he’ (but cf. leske ‘to him’ vs. lake ‘to her’ etc.), and korköri may render both ‘she herself, alone’ and ‘he himself, alone’, e.g. Šóka ŌJ KORKÓRI andar leskeri göði ‘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 oj is present not only in the Hungarian-bilingual Šóka, Farkaša, and “Nógrád” Romani, but also in the Slovak-bilingual Hradšťa, Kokava, and Klinóca Romani. On the other hand, Čaba Romani in Hungary retains the masculine ov ‘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 Farkaša Romani (ō < *ov, cf. 2.10.), and it has been either reintroduced or confirmed in Čaraďica 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 Hradšťa, 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 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.
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 Őn. The nominative forms in both languages are now structurally and phonetically similar: Romani őj – Hungarian ő ‘he’ and Romani Őnk (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]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2ND PERSON</th>
<th>3RD PERSON (MASCULINE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERS SG</td>
<td>pe-t</td>
<td>tu-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS SG</td>
<td>p-iro etc.</td>
<td>t-iro etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERS PL</td>
<td>p-umen</td>
<td>t-umen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS PL</td>
<td>p-umáro</td>
<td>t-umáro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-[Pl]’), the singular possessive *píro (as tiro ‘your’),
and the plural possessive *pumáro (as *tumáro ‘your[-Pl]’).

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 Chyžně, 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, 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-.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>OBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SG MASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The NSC syncope in the singular possessive reflexive (i.e. *píro > *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.

4. 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.
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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-.\footnote{For the origin of the stems see Boretzky, this volume.} 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-a- (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-demonstrative\footnote{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).} in the Central dialects. There are two sets of long forms, with the -o- and the -a- augments, respectively, and the form odija.\footnote{The e-extended form odela exists in Klinóca.} 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 Sóka Romani, e.g. te odá ODONA ˇchavora na hˇalˇehi, na site uˇlehí adadí erTavone (elic.) ‘if those children had not eaten that, they would not have had to be sick today’.}

\footnote{The e-extended form odela exists in Klinóca.}
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 Prievidza 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 sľomahi ďieš and ODJAVA vojna ‘I was in that war, too’. The short form oda is attested from Lieskovca Romani, oja is mostly used in Klinóca (as well as in the Vendic dialects), and odi in Šóka, Farkašda, Čobáňka, 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 gáda ‘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. Klinóća i Zuza sťa něna ODOLE kováčiske, so sťamahiičedoj ‘Zuza was the aunt of that smith whom we visited yesterday’ and no sar háľa, minďár khabni pěľa – OLE trine boršóvendur ‘so as she ate [it], she immediately became pregnant – from those three peas’. In Klinóća, 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 Klinóća Romani, the Et dialect of Chyžně, and the NC dialects to the north.

In Šóka, Farkašda, and Biskupica, the nominative singular forms of the neutral demonstrative (i.e. odá and odi) 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 Klinóća Romani, the neutral demonstrative must be employed. Cf. the elicited Klinóća te ODÁ tri čhaj hala, ovla lake erďavóne and Šóka te tri čhaj LE hala, erďavóne 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 kamarašć ‘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 gějom KOVU Štubňa ‘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.
Štubíňa. Excluding the nominative forms, the pronoun declines as a thematic noun of the intended gender, e.g. Čaraďica má sjomah po biťa Kovate Pohorelice ‘I was already working in … Pohorelice’, or otrávinda 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 odola KOVI jőke ‘but there are those …’, or Očova o Paľačovci, valaniškor, so sléhi odola háre 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. kasaša. 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.

The plural forms do not exist in Slovakia NSC dialects, not even in the Hungarian-bilingual ones, e.g. Šóka odna murša, KASKE me dikjom andy jakha ‘those men into whose eyes I looked’, i.e. not *kange.

The quantitative pronominal adverbs in NSC are atť / atťi ‘so much, so many’ (vs. NC ajci, adecí) and the interrogative kiti / kiti / keri / keši ‘how much, how many’ (vs. NC keci). They may take the ordinal or the multiplicative suffix, e.g. “Nógrád” kitišo ‘what, at what numerical position’, or kitišvar ‘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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROMANI</th>
<th>HUNGARIAN</th>
<th>ROMANI</th>
<th>HUNGARIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>ki-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>ka-s</td>
<td>ki-t</td>
<td>ka-n</td>
<td>ki-k-etu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>ka-s-ke</td>
<td>ki-nek</td>
<td>ka-n-ge</td>
<td>ki-k-nek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).
asavo ‘such’ (vs. ESR ajso) is used in “Nógrád”, and rarely in Farkashá, e.g. Farkashá k’amende na sah ‘SAVE Roma ‘there were no such Roms at our locality’; in most NSC varieties, including Šóka and Farkashá, the reduced aso (for geminated asso cf. 2.7.) is common. We have also recorded the k-stems kaso (< *kasavo) in Čobánka, and kac(c)avo (< *kadsavo) in Farkashá 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, Farkashá, Šóka, and Čobánka akán (cf. Vend akán), “Nógrád” akán, Budča akánik, Chyžné akána, and NC akana, akenak, akenake, akenakak, akána, or akindik. Rácz’ dictionary contains sokana ‘always’ (cf. so dúj ‘both’, so trin ‘all three’), while in the other NSC varieties, the adverbs mindig (from Hungarian mindig) and fur / 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, odiua (od-), kodoj, koden (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, 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 othar ‘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 / tâ). Beside adaj, the specific ôde ‘here’ is used in Klinóca, e.g. hát, bešasahi ÔDE angle biš beršenda (elic.) ‘yes, we lived here twenty years ago’, or me pametinav kana ōle o Rusi ÔDE ‘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, Farkashá, and “Nógrád” Romani are specifically locational, and the movement to or towards an object is expressed by kija ‘where’, aňda / adda ‘here’, and oňda / oňda / oňa ‘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. *őj ONĎA sálinďa tèle ‘she sat down there [to that place]’. The Farkašda and “Nógrád” variants with the geminate come from oňďa and aňďa, which are retained in Šóka; the Zohra form oďa is old (cf. Vend oďa and Roman oća < *odţa < *óďa).

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’), akiši, akišito, and akišivar.

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 dikhjom ando ātha ‘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 absolutive relative construction is common in Slovak (cf. znáš toho hudobníka, ČO tak pekne hraje?, and ten muž, ČO som MU pozrel do očí101), 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 soha (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 / *nišo does not exist. The Hungarian-bilingual varieties use the Serbocroatian ništă (facultatively reduced to niš in Šóka), while the situation in the Slovak-bilingual dialects is more diverse: Čaraďica and Budča Romani have ňić or ňiš, 101 Beside znáš toho hudobníka, ktorý tak pekne hraje?, and ten muž, ktorému som pozrel do očí.
Prenčov ňišt or ňiš, Klinóca and Chyžné ňič, Zohra ňišt, ňišt, ňiš, or ňiš etc.; ESR varieties use ňič, while Puchmajer’s Bohemian and v. Sowa’s WSR variety had ňišt and ňišt, respectively. Slovak dialects themselves exhibit great diversity: ňič (also standard), ňic, ňišt, ňiš, 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 ňič), 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 ňi- 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 Čaraďca 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 Čaraďca Romani, we have recorded a loan of Hungarian valami ‘something’, which has been specialized into an estimative word, e.g. keťi 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 ňekeró ‘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 ňišt / 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 ništ but ňiš-

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 (vala-), and Romani.
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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 mindenféliko 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, Čaraďica, 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 S4 lövend’avel ánde ‘canvas, frame, glass, the latex, you mix everything: all that costs money’, or Šóka taj so mange tecinel, hát od’andre mro šéro áchol, 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 dżéne géle ‘they all left, all people left’ (vs. savóre dżéne). The pronoun contains the Serbocroatian suffix -god (cf. Boretzky & Igla 1994: 262), and it represents another specific correspondence between Fakrašda 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 NC\textsuperscript{105}, 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.\textsuperscript{106} The apocopated variant of the suffix {ahi} is -ahˈ (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. đza-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.

\begin{verbatim}
[13]  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1Sg</th>
<th>2Sg</th>
<th>3Sg</th>
<th>1Pl</th>
<th>2/3Pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-</td>
<td>{v}</td>
<td>{s}</td>
<td>{l}</td>
<td>{s}</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>{a}</td>
<td>{v}</td>
<td>{e}</td>
<td>{s}</td>
<td>{l}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{verbatim}

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. *kerel > 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 Vedic dialects, most NSC varieties, and

\textsuperscript{105} The future form phenla ‘s/he will say’ may be used as praesens historicum in the NSC dialects. The irregular variant phunla (< 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. Lípa 1963: 105-106). On the other hand, both the vowel syncope and the contraction are obligatory in the SC dialects. The only\(^{107}\) 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[-Pl]/they will know’, dógozinnahi / dógozinenahti ‘you[-Pl]/they worked’, but only kernahi, not *kerenahi ‘you[-Pl]/they did, made’. The NSC future and imperfect forms of the C-verbs, both the underlying and the surface ones, are shown in [14].

\[\begin{array}{cccccc}
  & 1\text{SG} & 2\text{SG} & 3\text{SG} & 1\text{PL} & 2/3\text{PL} \\
  \text{FUT} & -\acute{a} & -\text{eha} & -\text{la} & -\text{aha} & -(e)\text{na} \\
  & {a}{\text{v}} & {e}\{s\} & {e}\{\text{l}\} & {a}\{s\} & {e}\{n\} \\
  \text{IMP} & -\text{ahi} & -\text{ehahi} & -\text{lahi} & -\text{asahi} & -(e)\text{nahi} \\
\end{array}\]

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].

\[\begin{array}{cccccc}
  & 1\text{SG} & 2\text{SG} & 3\text{SG} & 1\text{PL} & 2/3\text{PL} \\
  \text{C-} & -\text{av} & -\text{es} & -\text{el} & -\text{as} & -\text{en} \\
  \text{SP} & *-\text{ov-av} & *-\text{ov-es} & *-\text{ov-el} & *-\text{ov-as} & *-\text{ov-en} \\
\end{array}\]

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 (*\text{ove} > *\text{oe} > \text{a} [\text{a}] \text{ 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,}}\]

\[\begin{array}{cccccc}
  & 1\text{SG} & 2\text{SG} & 3\text{SG} & 1\text{PL} & 2/3\text{PL} \\
  \text{C-} & -\text{av} & -\text{es} & -\text{el} & -\text{as} & -\text{en} \\
  \text{SP} & *-\text{ov-av} & *-\text{ov-es} & *-\text{ov-el} & *-\text{ov-as} & *-\text{ov-en} \\
\end{array}\]

\(^{106}\) 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. The uncontracted forms are rare in NSC, cf. Farkašda *hajoves* ‘you understand’ (beside the more common *hajos*), or Klinóca *lôľoven* ‘you-[PL]/they grow red’ (beside *lôľon*). Unlike the Vendic dialects, the NSC / NC contraction *ove > o* did not affect other verbs than the SPs, cf. Vendic *sol* ‘s/he sleeps’ (vs. *sovel* elsewhere).

108

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 *terňola* ‘s/he will grow young’ and *terňona* ‘you-[PL]/they will grow young’ originate in *terňovla* (< *ternjovela*) and *terňovna* (< *ternjovena*), respectively, i.e. there was an elision of the preconsonantal *v* [b] in NSC. This elision has not occurred in Vendic (cf. *terňovla*). An alternative explanation, the development

109

Several facts point to the mutual independence of the Vendic and the NSC / NC contraction, respectively: a) the Vendic contraction is more general (cf. *sol* < *sovel* ‘s/he sleeps’), b) there is a whole set of similar contractions in the Vendic 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 Vendic.

---

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

109 According to v. Sova’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. *xeľol* ‘s/he understands’ (*xeľola* ‘s/he will understand’ etc.), *xeľon* ‘you-[PL]/they understand’ (*xeľona* ‘you-[PL]/they will understand’ etc.), but *xeľoves* ‘you understand’ (*xeľoveha* ‘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’ > *terňol* and *terňoven* ‘you-[PL]/they grow young’ > *terňon*, 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’ > *terňojeha* (i.e. not *terňoha*), and the present form in -*ojs assumes the development *ternjoves* ‘you grow young’ > *terňojes* > *terňojs* (cf. Boretzky, this volume). Generally, the forms of the least marked 3rd person tend to be shorter.
of the type *ternjovala > *terňoela > 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 Lieskovača, 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 antihiatus yod, which occurred in Roman (e.g. *terdvovav > terćovav ‘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 terč-ov-a-v / terč-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 > ů see 2.10.), e.g. terňov / terňuv / terňů ‘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!’.

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. podme ‘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 / terňovol ‘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 garavel ‘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 Hradešťa, 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 ašč-il- (of aščel ‘to get up’) in Farkašda and Hradešťa 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 lîna, e.g. sikliňa ‘s/he learned’ instead of the original siklija; the palatal dissimilation (cf. 2.2.) has been retained (i.e. no *sikliňa).

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 trádinde, Farkašda aštidindom ‘I got, obtained’, Klinóca kedinde, ispindinda ‘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 $vigzinda$ ‘s/he finnished’ as $pheninda$ ‘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 $sláhi$ podajime ko Ňemci ‘our Slovak government was submitted to the Germans’ (cf. $podajnen$ pe from Slovak $poddat$ sa ‘submit, give in, give up’), Litava-(Zvolen) $slomas$ obetine ‘I was sacrificed’ (cf. $obetinen$ 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 $potiňel$ ‘to pay’ can have both $potiňalo$ and $potiťmen$ 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. $cidinda$ – $livinda$ (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 $me$ $som$ $narođeno$ Revúcate ‘I am born in Revúca’ (cf. Slovak $som$ $narođený$), or Chyžné $amen$ $samas$ $zasadline$ ‘we were planted, seated’ (cf. Slovak $zasadnúť$ ‘to sit, take a seat’), i.e. no *narođimen, 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 $ledž-a$, v. Sowa’s $lidža$-$l$, ESR $lidža$-$l$) 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: $leginda$, $ligend$- and $liged$-, respectively. The other irregular formations of the preterite are common to all Central dialects, e.g. $dža$- $*gěl$- ‘to go’, $mer$- $*mál$- ‘to die’, $per$- $*pěl$- ‘to fall’, $sov$- $...

110 Exceptionally -$men$ in ESR $xolamen$ ‘angry’ (cf. $xolasaľol$ ‘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 Vendic dialects have the participle-like forms not only in the 3rd plural, but also in the 3rd singular, e.g. gélo ‘he went’ and gelí ‘she went’ (beside géja ‘s/he went’ in some Vendic 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 Vendic 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 gádzi géli ‘the non-Romani woman left’.111

[17]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1Sg</th>
<th>2Sg</th>
<th>3Sg</th>
<th>1Pl</th>
<th>2Pl</th>
<th>3Pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*-jom</td>
<td>*-jal</td>
<td>*-ja ~ *-a/-i</td>
<td>*-jam</td>
<td>*-jan</td>
<td>*-e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some eastern NSC varieties, namely Kokava, Klinóca, Litava, Hraďšťa, and “Nógrád” Romani, as well as the NC dialects of the Upper Hron River (Horehróni) 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. kerđe ‘they did’ (with the same stem as in kerđom ‘I did’ etc.) unlike the plural participle kerde ‘done’. Cf. Hraďšťa na stě lače odola petala? ‘were those lasts not good?’ (Banga 1993b: 56), or Litava o gážódá na šundé ‘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.
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. kerdahas 's/he would have done, made', i.e. not *kerd'aas or similar. On the other hand, if NC 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'aahi is the only and well attested form. The situation in the NSC and the NC dialects is summarized in [19].

[19]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preterite</th>
<th>Conditional Irrealis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>{d} {'a} &gt; -d'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{d} {'as}+[ahi] &gt; *d'asahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>{d} {'as} &gt; -d'(as)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{d} {'as}+[as] &gt; *d'asas, *-d'as etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 *kerđenahi* ‘you[-PI]/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. *kerđahas* ‘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. *kerđahas* ‘they would have done’ (cf. *kerđahas* ‘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*, *našťig* / *našrš*, Šóka and Farkašda *nek* or NC *mi* (see 3.24.), e.g. Šóka *šaj* ovel ‘maybe, it can be true’, *našťig gėjom* ‘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 subjunctive\(^{113}\) 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 posses 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. *terňlanas* ‘you[-PI]/they would have grown young’ (cf. *terňlan* ‘you[-PI] 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. *kerđenas* ‘you[-PI]/they would have done’ (cf. *kerđan* ‘you[-PI] did’ and *kerde* ‘they did’).

88 of 122
restricted to non-present tenses, was also based on the 3rd singular form, e.g. the preterite kamľom 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 Vendi subgroup has the l-infinitive, while the area of NC 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, Tarnóc, 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 Hradčišťa, 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. Lipa (1965: 41) gives géja dógozni ‘s/he went to work’ in Farkašda Romani with Hungarian dialectal dógozni (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, dógozni 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 géj- / géj- ‘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’), paślindos ‘lying’ (of paśl ‘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 (Σ1) in some varieties, in the past 3rd person plural. The formant of the past 3rd person singular may be -a or -ahi or both, and that of the past 3rd person plural -e, -éhi or both, according to variety (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>2SG</th>
<th>3SG</th>
<th>1PL</th>
<th>2PL</th>
<th>3PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Σ-om</td>
<td>Σ-al</td>
<td>Σ-am</td>
<td>Σ-an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Σ-om-ahi</td>
<td>Σ-al-ahi</td>
<td>Σ-</td>
<td>Σ-am-ahi</td>
<td>Σ-an-ahi</td>
<td>Σ1-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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” (siha) – 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 SÀH’ase romňa ‘there were such women’.
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. The innovations probably started in the 3rd person copula past form, e.g. \(sľa \) ‘s/he was’ as \(phučľa \) ‘s/he asked’, \(sle \) ‘they were’ as \(phučle \) ‘they asked’, and then spread to the other \(∑\)-stem forms. Secondarily, 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 Čaraďica.

The hypothesis that \(sja \) may come from \(*sinja \) in NSC does not seem likely. All varieties where the \(∑\)-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, Čaraďica, 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, Čaraďica, 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. *sša ‘s/he, it was’ and *sše ‘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 ∑-stems {sl} and {š}s are used variantly, e.g. *sšamas / *sjamas (cf. 2.2.) and *sšamas ‘we were’; only the short forms *sj and *sše, i.e. the ∑-stem {sl}, are attested in the past 3rd person. Revúca Romani uses *sša and *sše, i.e. the ∑-stem {st}, in the past 3rd person, but only the stem {š}s in the other forms, e.g. *som ‘I am’. In Roštář, the stem {št} is the most common, e.g. *šša ‘s/he was’, *šše ‘they were’, or *ššan ‘you[PL] are’; however, also the past 3rd singular *ša is attested. Teplica Romani uses *šša / *šča ‘s/he was’, *ššamaš ‘we were’, but the {sl} ∑-stem in *šše ‘they were’.

The original ∑-stem in the transitional dialects surely was {š}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 *šše 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 Hradšťa, 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 *šše in Revúca and *šše in Roštář do not correspond to the non-palatalized 3rd plural preterites of other verbs, and second, the palatal *št is often retained in the copula in the dialects of the Štítnik valley (cf. *št’> č elsewhere, 2.6.). The NSC copula forms were either borrowed before the change *š > š in the dialects of the Štítnik valley, i.e. *ššamas > *ššamaš, or the prealveolar sibilant has been phonologically adapted.

Zohra, Šóka, Farkašda, Čobínka, “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 *teľe *HI man kher ‘down there I have a house’, or Klinóca *HI man prin ćhāve ‘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 Ņemci jegoder džulela 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 *š-preterite verbs (cf. 3.14.), i.e. those whose stems end in š or š, and in Hradšťa 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 *džanelaš hoj maškar o Roma HIN partizáňa* ‘he knew that there were guerillas among Roms’, or Revúca *oja ojera HIN amenge stâle* ‘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, 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 pândž iškoli* ‘I have passed just five schools [i.e. classes]’, or Farkašda *jêkh kafišta 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 erďave Roma* ‘there are among us very bad Roms’, *na phiren o múle, de valaso SI ânde ‘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 láčhe Roma HI, láčhe; SI meg Čabate iš láčhe Roma* ‘there 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 *lâčho ková HILO, džanel te tâven ‘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 amâre 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 Šőka, Farkašda, and Tarnőca, however, the copular suffixes also occur with the past copula form sáhi, e.g. Šőka phuro gáddzó SÁHI-LO ‘he was an old non-Rom’, or Tarnőca baro barválo sa, attí löve 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 Šőka ón čore erďave HILE ‘they are poor and wicked’. The covert subject does not imply the copular suffixes: they are optional, e.g. Klinóca lóľi a, ta furt HILE lóle (elic.) ‘he has turned red, and still are red’ vs. lóľiľe, 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 goďavera HILE ‘they learn and they are wise’, or ávera Roma, phenas, Neďedatar 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 erďave and Šőka te le hasa, erďavóne OVEHA ‘if you eat it, you will be sick’116, or Farkašda akkor buter džeňe sít’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 kaš ‘you must have such wood’.

The conditional irrealis forms of the copula are based on the preterite stem *úļ-, e.g. elicited Klinóca tena odá tumári čaj na hāľáhi, n’ÚĽÁHI lake erďavóne and Šőka te tumari čaj le na hajáhi, na ÚJÁHI erďavóne ‘if your[-Pl] 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 miro baličho jékhfar khamno ÚJA, taj ÚJA le šó ‘that pig of mine once became pregnant, and had six [piglings] 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 Šőka, the experiencer is in the subject position, exactly as in Hungarian (e.g. rosszul leszel – 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 såte ĀÇHIJA o bijav ‘there should have been the wedding’.

The present 3rd person negative form is náne in the NSC as well as in the NC dialects. In most varieties, the 3rd person past forms are the regularly negated positive forms, e.g. Klinóca nastá and nasté, Lieskošva nasla and nasle, Šóka nasáhi and nasine (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- çavarginel (synchronically derived from çavarginel ‘to stray, wander’), the intransitive -it-in forditinel ‘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 -az-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 dīľázinel / Farkašda dīľázinel ‘to sing’ (from dīli ‘song’); Čaba and “Nógrád” Romani use the older dīľavel, and Lieskošva Romani borrowed the NC giľavel (but kept the NSC dīlī). The formant -az-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. *cit-, *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 sidanel ‘to hurry’
(derived from sig ‘quickly, soon’) in Farkašda, Šóka and “Nógrád” Romani, i.e. *sigjanel. The corresponding verb in ESR is derived by *-jar-, i.e. siďarel (< *sigjare), while Puchmajer’s Romani has the *-jov- verb sidol (< *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. Factivites and synthetic passives

Deadjectival *jar-derivations function as factitives, e.g. šuťarel ‘to dry’ (derived from šuko ‘dry’), or terňarel ‘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. nandarel ‘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. rovľarel ‘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 / ačhel ‘to stand, stay’), or uštavel vs. uššarel117 ‘to waken’ (from uššel ‘to awake’). Only some of the few desubstantival *jar-derivations are common to both dialect groups, e.g. NC xevlarel / NSC hevlarel ‘to make holes’ (derived from NC xev / NSC hév ‘hole’), NC xoljarel / NSC hóľarel ‘to make angry’ (from NC xoli / NSC hóli ‘anger’), or paňarel ‘to moisten, wet’ (from páňi ‘water’). In ESR, there are also a few *jar-formations derived from other parts of speech, e.g. jekhetarel ‘to unite’ (from jekhetane ‘together’), or the regional duvalarel118 (from *duval; cf. duvar ‘twice’); for sidarel ‘to hurry’ see above.

Deadjectival SPs (i.e. *jov-derivations) are inchoatives, e.g. šutol ‘to become dry’ (derived from šuko ‘dry’), or terhol ‘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. mardol ‘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 phadol ‘to crack, get broken’ derived from phagel ‘to break [st.]’ (the departicipial phaglisálol also exists in ESR). The ESR verb jekhetolol ‘to get united’ is deadverbal. Moreover, there are a few *jar- and *jov-

117 The verb uššarel 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 vyka and
derivations, often in a pair, whose base words have been lost, e.g. NSC and ESR bilarel ‘to melt [st.]’ – bi\l\  ‘to melt, thaw’ (with the base *bil-), or sikhlarel\(^{119}\) ‘to teach’ – sikhlol ‘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 *dikhljovel. The yod following r, m, and perhaps v (see below) has been retained in NSC, e.g. phurjarel ‘to make old’ – phurfjol ‘to grow old’ (derived from phuro ‘old’), but lost in the NC dialects, e.g. phurarel and phurol.

Some desubstantival 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 desubstantival derivations *thuvljarel and *xevljarel can be another instance of an old intrusive between a labial stop and a yod\(^{120}\), 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 *phuvfarel < *phuvljarel, or whether it contains a simple historical yod.

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

---

\(^{119}\) The NSC forms have lost the aspiration, cf. Šôka sikjarel – sikjol. The verb sikhlarel does not exist in all ESR varieties.

\(^{120}\) Intrusion of this sort has a parallel in East Slavic, Slovenian, and Serbo-croatian, cf. *zemja > *zem\jja > zeml’a ‘earth’ etc.
reason for the athematic morphology to apply.\footnote{121} The formant \textit{*-isal-} does not usually trigger palatalization, but variants such as \textit{radisalol} (cf. \textit{radisalol} above) can also be found. Derivations from a few thematic verbs contain the variant \textit{*-sal-} of the formant, e.g. \textit{phagersalol} ‘to crack, get broken’ (derived from \textit{phagerel} ‘to break [st.]’), or \textit{phutersalol} ‘to get open, unbound’ (from \textit{phuterel} ‘to open [st.], to unbind’). It is also present in \textit{xolasalol} ‘to get angry’ (from the athematic participle \textit{xolamen} ‘angry’).

The formant \textit{*-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 \textit{stavisalol} ‘to happen’ in Klinóca Romani; the verb may have been borrowed from Serbocroatian \textit{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. \textit{kikol} ‘to grow blue’ (from \textit{kikno} ‘blue’), or \textit{žutol} ‘to grow yellow’ (from \textit{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 -\textit{isaj-} and -\textit{osaj-} inchoatives derived from original adjectives in Roman, e.g. \textit{čorisajol} \((<\textit{čorisaljol})\) and \textit{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 \textit{*jar-} and \textit{*jov-} derivations in NSC. The factitives and inchoatives of the adjectives \textit{kóro} ‘blind’, \textit{polóko} ‘slow’, and \textit{kuč} ‘expensive, dear’ in “Nógrád” Romani are: \textit{korovjarel} (cf. the extension \textit{-ov-})\footnote{122} – \textit{korojol} (*-\textit{ol-}), \textit{polókajarel} (*-\textit{al-}) – \textit{polókijol} (*-\textit{il-}), and \textit{kučajrel} (*-\textit{al-}) ‘raise the price’\footnote{123} – \textit{kučajol} (*-\textit{al-}) ‘to become expensive’, respectively. The adjective \textit{pháro} ‘heavy, difficult’ derives the factitive \textit{pharajarel} (*-\textit{al-}). It is difficult to say what is the origin of the extra segments; it is likely that the extension \textit{*al-} expanded from verbs derived from the \textit{al-}adjectives (cf. 3.8.), e.g. \textit{bokhajarel} ‘to make [so.] hungry, starve out’ (<\textit{bokh-al-jar-el}; derived from \textit{bokhálo} ‘hungry’). The inchoative of \textit{koro} is most dialectally diverse: cf. \textit{korojol} in “Nógrád”, \textit{koraľol} in Humenné Romani, \textit{korisaľol} in most ESR varieties, and \textit{korisajol} / \textit{korosajol} in Roman (cf. above).

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{121} There appears to be great dialectal diversity within ESR, both formal and semantic, which may be seen in the following example: the athematic \textit{zazorisaľol} means ‘to become powerful’, while the thematic \textit{zoraľol} means ‘to get hard, firm, stiff’; the latter meaning can be also expressed by the desubstantival \textit{zazorisaľol}; both \textit{zoraľol} and \textit{zorisaľol} possess both meanings (without the perfective nuance rendered by the prefix \textit{za-}).
\footnote{122} Cf. the regular ESR \textit{korarel} ‘to blind, dazzle’.
\footnote{123} Beside the formally regular “Nógrád” factitive \textit{kučarel} ‘to consider [st.] to be dear or expensive’. The formally identical \textit{kučarel} means ‘raise the price’ in ESR.
\end{footnotesize}
The Farkasda and Šóka factitive and inchoative of the adjective báro ‘big’ is bardarel – bárدول (cf. Vendic bárdol, developed into barciol 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 bardarel and bárドル to be departicipial 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, Farkasda, and “Nógrád” inchoative phárدول (from pháro ‘heavy, difficult’) are formed analogically to the derivations from the *d-participles (cf. 3.14.).

Finally, the pair of verbs *pašlarel ‘to lay’ – *pašljol ‘to lie’ developed into pašjarel – pašjol in “Nógrád” Romani and further to paššarel – paššol in Farkasda (see 2.7.), while Čaba and Klinóca Romani have paštarel – paštöl. Klinóca Romani also possesses naštol ‘to get lost, disappear’ as against našľol 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. Farkasda 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 pounc, 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 cirkašmajsteri asavavlahi ole nipen ole române čhâveha ‘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-* 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]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRANSITIVE</th>
<th>TRANSITIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>BASIC VERB</strong></td>
<td>I. <strong>CAUSATIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daral</td>
<td>daravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to be frightened’</td>
<td>‘to frighten [so.]’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>ANTICAUSATIVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>BASIC VERB</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tâdol ‘to boil’</td>
<td>tâvel ‘to boil [st.]’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 garad- (< *garuv-d-) of garavel ‘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 anadôm (-a-) and anavađôm (-ava-) ‘I ordered, had [st.] brought’ of anavel (-av-). The formal reduplication is progressive and in some verbs obligatory, e.g. in genavadôm tuha ‘I had it read by you’ (i.e. not *genadôm) 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 Klinôca 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 *bičav-tat-in-el* (beside *bičav-av-el*) ‘to have [st.] sent’ of *bičavel* ‘to send’ (the segment *av* is a part of the stem here).

3.2.1. 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 *tinkeravel* ‘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 *dilavkerel* ‘to litl, sing all the time’ (from *dilavel* ‘to sing’; cf. also 3.18.), or *paravkerel* ‘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. *cinkerel* ‘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. *ispiderkerel* [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. *phukkerel* ‘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 *činel* ‘to cut’ derives *čingerel* (-*ger-*) ‘to tear’, and the verb *phagel* ‘to break’ derives the iterative *phagerel* (-*er-*)
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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 ťinkerel ‘to buy frequently’ (from ťinel ‘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. sikhľuvkerel ‘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 Lípa 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 tiahnut ‘to pull’ and vicirdel – vytiahnut ‘to pull out’).
The second stage is well documented in the NC varieties spoken in Slovakia. In the Slovak-bilingual NSC dialects, Slovak prefixed verbs are freely borrowed, e.g. Budča othar man prihlásinďom Handlovu ‘from there I enlisted to Handlová’ (cf. Slovak pri-hlásiť sa ‘to apply for, report’), or Litava prvikrát mange potpisindá ‘the first time he signed [it] to me’ (cf. Slovak pod-písat’ ‘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.).

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 bit’ ‘to beat’ and domárel – dobit’ ‘to thrash, to beat hardly’) in the Ct dialect of Prenčov.

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. ánđe ‘inside’, ángle ‘in front’, ári (Farkašda also ár) ‘outside’, eketháne / kethán / khetáne ‘together’, kija ‘to it’, päle ‘back, backwards’, pása ‘to, at, towards, close’, téle / télo ‘down’, préko ‘tough, or uppre / uppe ‘up’. The syntagmas of a verb plus a verbal coparticle possess differing degrees of idiomaticity, cf. Farkašda so phenes KIJÁ? ‘what do you say to this?’ (‘say + to it’), ÁRI ári umihlahi ole čhávóre 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 níšt ‘do not fabricate anything on me’ (‘find + out’), TÉLE thoĎa i vįžga ‘he passed the exam’ (‘put + down’), me na gondolíná PÁLE ‘I will not recollect’ (‘think + back’), Šóka KETHÁN pumen vakerde ‘they agreed upon it’ (‘speak + together’), Klinóca khasili še sa PRÉKO gende ‘all the books were read through’, or odoj ko Roma ále – UPRE kedine civiľa – 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 mirgézinel (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 Rácz’ 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 síja (cf. standard széjjel-), both of which express a motion apart, spreading, dispersion etc., e.g. Hraďšťa 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’odi fedőva šákre tuke SÍJA džal odá járo ‘under that lid the flour dissolves nicely’ (‘go + apart’, cf. ESR rozdžal ‘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 ungríke 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 lövend’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 Vixodnári 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 ungríki čhib ‘so we mix in the Hungarian language’. The last point seems to be a rule with
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125 The prefixed verb pobistrel (beside simple bistrel) also exists in Hungarian Vlax (Vekerdő 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 angle ~ Hungarian elő-, ári ~ só-, kija ~ hozzé-, páša ~ mell-, and the instances in the next footnote.
128 Cf. Romani ánde ~ Hungarian be- or bele-; eketháne / kethán ~ egy-, egybe-, or össze-; páša ~ vissza- or hátra-; télé ~ le- or alá-; and upre / uppe ~ fel- or rá-.
imperatives, e.g. Šóka štopolinas 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 štampérni rumo jôke ‘I also like coffee and a jigger of rum in it’ vs. me kamav i káveja taj štampérni 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 initial 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, Čobánska, Čaradica, Buděa, 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].
Further NSC prepositions are\(^{129}\), for example, *angle* ‘in front of, before’, *bi* ‘without’, *maškar* ‘among, between’, *paľ* ‘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’, *Rácz’* *mišto* ‘without’ (from Ikavic *mišto* ‘instead of’)\(^{130}\), and Zohra and Farkašda *uz*\(^{131}\) ‘by, near’, e.g. Zohra *UZI Hodoňina* ‘near Hodonín’, or Farkašda *UZO pani* ‘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 mere čhávóra* ‘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 Ņemci* ‘against the Germans’, or Čaraďica *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 Ņemcenge* ‘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 miro*).

\(^{129}\) Only basic, primary meanings are given.

\(^{130}\) The preposition has undergone a different semantic change in “Nógrád” Romani than in the Vendic dialects, cf. *mišto* ‘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 (< *andi + 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-adjective\textsuperscript{132}, 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 \textit{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. ando mro uša ‘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 \textit{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 \textit{taj} / \textit{ta} ‘and’ connects clauses (e.g. Šóka me phíra\textit{v} 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 laččho Rom ‘very very good man’). The form \textit{ta} is used in Klinóca, Chyžné, and variantly in Očova\textsuperscript{133}, e.g. Klinóca amen phíra\textit{sahi trin phrala khetáne: dú saksafóni, brúgóva TA vijola ‘we, the three brothers, were going together: two saxophones, a contrabass, and a viola’. The most common NC equivalents are \textit{the} or \textit{he}. The Slovak a may be used in some varieties, especially NC,

\textsuperscript{131} There is no basic form of the preposition \textit{uz-} in our data: it may be *umo, *uzo, or even *uz.

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

\textsuperscript{133} The coordinating \textit{ta} is homonymous with \textit{ta} ‘so, well’ in these varieties, e.g. Klinóca na kamla\textit{hi te hádinen, no TA bichavulhí le het ‘she did not want to quarrel, so she sent him away’.}
while őš from Hungarian is rare in NSC. The conjunction connecting verb phrases is u (also in the NC dialects) or o, e.g. Lieskovca avka sikšarlahi 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 phirav O phirčom 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: tšśi (in Budča, Lieskovca, and Očóva), tšš (in Klinóca), tš (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. Farkaša odj 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 kňški ‘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. Farkaša 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 phurredra Tišš na sľahi 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 Čaraďiča NA sľahi harťa AňI jekh ‘not a single person was a smith’. Pairs of the particles function as conjunctions, e.g. Budča Šenći na kamnahi AňI Romen, AňI Slovákov‘ Germans liked neither Roms nor Slovaks’.

The Hungarian-bilingual NSC varieties as well as Čaraďiča Romani use the conjunction vaj ‘or’ (from Hungarian vagy), e.g. Farkaša trinnmasekengeri VAĎ duj ‘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
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134 The Slovak accusative plural form of the noun Slovák ‘Slovak’, due to a intraclausal code-switch.
čon MAJ důj 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 / alebo 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.

There is no inherited adversative conjunction in the Central dialects of Slovakia: the Hungarian-bilingual varieties use Hungarian de ‘but’, and most of the Slovak-bilingual ones Slovak afe / ale, e.g. Farkašda sake khereste sáhi dýjó, DE sake khereste na sa lampa ‘in every house, there was a candle, but not every house had a lamp’, or Čaraďica ALE na mardarde ahi 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 čháveskes na tecillahi, MER igen phái 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, lēbo 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 VAŽDÁŘ phenav, hoď naštig phiras sabadun ‘I say that for the reason that we cannot move freely’. Both versions may be used variantly, e.g. Čaraďica VAŽDÁŘ mre dade na line vs. na line VAŠ ODÁ 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, VAŽDÁŘ MER ige šičí 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 hjaba ‘although, even though’ (borrowed from Hungarian hiába ‘in vain’), e.g. Farkašda na đanes ništa, HJABA sal phurader 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 hoď is retained in Farkašda, Šóka, Tarnóca, Čaba, Čaraďica, and some time ago, it also existed in Klinóca Romani; the contemporary

---

135 In Slovak beside buď – alebo, and buď – buď.
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 Lieskovea 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 dúj sekviségi, ságšño 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 čavorinash’odá rundó, KAJ T’ol asso sar kana hedó ‘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 širenedereske T’ovel ‘I put in roux so that it [a soup] should become thicker’, or by both kaj and nek, e.g. Farkašda číno cíken 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 čárádo kamlahi, KAJ NEK báro T’ovel – sako dad kamlahi, KAJ NEK T’ovel le but muršá ‘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 Dévle, HOJ TE na del brišánd, HOJ TE ovel papalek šukár dive ‘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 oddá ‘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 mä in most NSC dialects (but cf. the extended imar in ESR). Hungarian még ‘still, yet’ has been borrowed as még / meg / mek. Further Hungarianisms 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, for example, *hizo ‘really, in fact, well’
(from *bízony), *ipén ‘just, right, the very’ (from *éppen), *háti 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 *mek čák 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. *dži 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, *Sóka, 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 *őke / the postvocalic *jóke (of demonstrative origin), *őkejő, or the unstressed *ja / *jo, signal the end of an utterance, e.g. *Sóka kamav t’i káveja taj ānde štumperni rumo JÓKE ‘I also like cofee and a jigger of rum in it’, *si adla skíni vaď sar lenge phenen ŬKE ‘there are these skinheads or how they are called’, or Farkašda pe me čhavóreskero va meg asso baro fótá*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 *háti), 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. Čaraďica *na’a with a glottal stop. The prohibitive particle is *ma.

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

140
The modal particle šaj ‘to be able, allowed to, can, to be possible’ and its negation NSC našťig / NC naštiš are commonly used in all Central dialects in Slovakia (cf. also 3.13.). A similar modality may be rendered by the verb džanél ‘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 geľa ‘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 tena141 āver berš na siklijomahí románe, adadive MUSAJ má tumenca TE vakerdómahí 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 gějáhi andi ārešta ‘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 utôšono, odi pativ ‘you have to render the last thing, the respect, to the dead’, Tarnóca SITE āri liša ole tiknóre ‘s/he had to take out the little one’, or Zohra o mas SITE řines ‘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 delahí lůve ‘s/he had to give them money’. The particle site may be separated by personal pronouns from the verb, e.g. Šóka SITE man mučom rašªa 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’adala man NA SIT’üléhi ‘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 chavōra na háléhi, NA SITE ťuléhi adádí erĽavōne (elic.) ‘if those children had not eaten that, they would not have 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,

---

141 The double negation (i.e. tena ... na) is not used in Šóka, cf. te me taval na siklijomahí románe, adádí me tumenca site vakerdómahí servika (elic.).
e.g. te mri phen taval sikljáhi románe, adádí tumenca NA MUSAJ ovláhi\textsuperscript{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. \textit{préki rat mušaj šle te denašel Lehotate} ‘during the night they had to flee to Lehota’.

The particle \textit{kampe}\textsuperscript{144} ‘it is necessary, there is need for’ is attested from Zohra, Farkašda, and Biskupica, e.g. Zohra \textit{ezer koruni KAMPE ko kurko} ‘one needs one thousand crowns per week’, while the impersonal form in Šóka Romani is \textit{kampol}, and \textit{kampel} in ESR. The fully inflected verb \textit{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 \textit{kamp-} in NSC, e.g. the elicited Šóka \textit{nassine odoj kaj KAMPLE te oven}, and Klinóca \textit{nasté odoj kaj KAMPLE te oven} ‘they were not there where they should have been’, but \textit{kamp-il-} in ESR (as if based on *\textit{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,\textsuperscript{145} except for those borrowed from Hungarian Lovári by the NSC dialect of “Nógrád”, e.g. \textit{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 \textit{kopal} ‘stick’ does not exist in NC; the initial \textit{a-} is present in the NSC nouns \textit{anav} ‘name’ and \textit{alav} ‘word’ (but not in \textit{bijav} ‘wedding’, or \textit{šunel} ‘to hear’), while all NC dialects have \textit{nav} and \textit{lav}; the

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

\textsuperscript{143} A form of the conditional potentialis was used instead of the irrealis in this example.

\textsuperscript{144} For its genesis see Boretzky, this volume.

\textsuperscript{145} Taking into account the absence of any other Rumanian loans in NSC, the nouns \textit{lavuta} ‘violin’ and \textit{lavutari} ‘violin player, musician’ may be of a different origin.
nouns *ambrol ‘pear’ and *bov ‘oven’ have been replaced by Serbocroatian *kraška and *pěšta146 in NSC, but retained in the NC dialects; etc.

The NC dialects seem to be much more differentiated by old lexicophonic 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 *žukel / *žuklo 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 *žukel. (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 karfi *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 ‘throusers’ (cf. Northern and NC xolov etc.), and perhaps *trupo ‘body, trunk’ (possibly also from Serbocroatian *trip ‘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 NC 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 Šášín (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\footnote{150}), dosta ‘enough’ (from dosta), dugo\footnote{151} ‘long’ (from dug), mačka ‘cat’ (from mačka; cf. also Slovak mačka), naranča ‘orange’ (from naránča), perrnica ‘pillow’ / pernica ‘feather bed-blanket’ (from pérnica ‘feather bed-blanket’), pisinel ‘to write’ (from pisati; in NC possibly from Slovak písat’), the prefix po- (cf. 3.22.), préko ‘through’ (from préko), vičinet ‘to call’ (cf. víkatí ‘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 písti / pexši ‘jelly’ cf. 2.3.

The specifically NSC Serbocroatisms are, for example, the nouns bob ‘bean’ (from bob), briga ‘grief’ (from briga ‘care, worry’), duhna / dunha ‘bed-blanket’ (from duhinja), gizada ‘pride’ (from gizada ‘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” piťi ‘oven’ (from pěč), plastá ‘bed-sheet’ (cf. 2.3.), praho ‘ashes, dust’ (from práh ‘dust’; praxos in ESR more likely from Slovak), prísto / “Nógrád” prosto (from prost ‘simple, common, gross’, cf. 1.2.), Čobánka sveto / “Nógrád” svecu ‘feast’ (cf. svět ‘saint’), šliva ‘plum’ (from šljiva), vóľa / vója ‘good mood’ (from vôľa ‘will, taste’), and perhaps “Nógrád” pekečuca ‘pouched marmot, gopher’;\footnote{152} the adjectives brižiko\footnote{153} ‘sorrowful’ (cf. brížan or brižljiv ‘careful, solicitous’), drágo ‘dear’ (from drág; cf. also Hungarian drága), erđavo ‘evil, bad’ (from ľav, gizada ‘proud’ (from gizada ‘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” šlužinel ‘to serve’ (cf. služiti; služínel in NC from Slovak služiti); 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 dubaho ‘tobacco’ in Farkašda, “Nógrád”, and Vend

\footnote{150} The Vendid dialects possess the form stáklo (Halwachs 1996 et al.: 83; Vekerdi 1983: 153), which must have been borrowed from a different Serbocroatian dialect.

\footnote{151} Attested only in some NC dialects, e.g. in Šalčin or Košice. Most ESR varieties use dindardo ‘long (spatially)’ and baro ‘big, long (temporally, abstractly), etc.’.

\footnote{152} Kostič (1994: 47) explains the noun pekečuca 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 ige (from Hungarian írge; also in ESR), but one of them knew the form pekečuca, 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 Herzegovina. 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, Hraďšťa, 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; Budća Romani has already borrowed the Slovak noun: Ňemco (from *Nemec, Nemic*).

The form *cilo* exists in the Vendic dialects, Šóka, and Čaraďica Romani, and as *cilo* in Farkašda Romani and in Velký 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 varities 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. Štole 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 -*ljiv*).

\(^{154}\) 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 *hjasna* ‘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’, *dílos* ‘midday’, *garašis* ‘penny, Groschen’, *handa* ‘ant’, *harangos* ‘bell’, *helos* ‘place’, *igen* ‘very’, *kapuvi* ‘gate’, *kareka / kereka* ‘wheel’, *kepehégos* ‘cloak’, *kerestos* ‘cross’, *kestuva* ‘glove’, *lancos* ‘chain’, *leketova* ‘apron’, *meg* ‘still’, *mindar* ‘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’, *teštvírkíha* (beside *phen*) ‘sister’, *bečelato* (beside *pativ*) ‘honour, respect’, or *ileto* (beside *dživbe*) ‘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 Vendic features see Vekerdi’s (1984) comparative notes, and Boretzky (this volume). The Vendic 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 Vendic dialects share the copula form *nána* (cf. 3.17.) with Biskupica and Tarnóca; the copula *∑*-stem *-s* (cf. 3.17.) with Biskupica, Farkašda, and Šóka; the irregular inchoative form *bárđol* (cf. 3.19.) with Farkašda and Šóka; the formant *-in-ger*- (cf. 3.21.) with Farkašda, Šóka, and Čobánka; the Ikavic *ciło / cílo* (cf. 4.1.) with Farkašda, Šóka, and Čaraďica; 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 > di* (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 *ôda* with Zohra Romani (cf. 2.8. and 3.12., respectively); or the forms *år* (< *ąri*) and *ôl* (< *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 {šl} 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 bárđol 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 Hradšťa and Klinóca, etc. Some isoglosses reflect a higher degree of Hungarian influence rather than geographical proximity, e.g. the assimilation *ňď > ďď in Farkašda and Nógrád. (The contact-induced generalization of ŏj 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 *dě > 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 ŏnk (cf. 3.9.), sorge, 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 xaňigöri ‘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 pindžarelo), or ávlon ‘I came’ (vs. áľom / ájom, cf. 2.10.) in Prenčov, žúžo ‘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, prindžarelo, or avri in Teplica.

On the other hand, many words are borrowed from NSC together with their lexicophonetic peculiarities, e.g. halol ‘understand’ (vs. xalol, cf. 2.3.) in Prenčov, ájom, pindžarelo, grasta, or anav ‘name’ (vs. nav, cf. 4.1.) in Chyžné, ájom, livinel ‘to shoot’ (vs. ľivinel, 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 roschingerele ‘to tear up’), the absence of the final n-lessness (apart from individual lexemes, e.g. márbe ‘war’ in Prenčov, but cf. xáben ‘food’, or raňišen ‘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 dive containing the NC palatalization plus the NSC s-lessness, or Prenčov hofisaľol ‘to get angry’ containing the NC derivation (cf. 3.19.) plus the NSC initial laryngeal.
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