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1. Background

The language under description is a variety of Romani (Indo-Aryan) spoken by long-settled Roms (Gypsies) of southern Slovakia and northern Hungary, which is classified as the Northern (non-Vendic) subgroup of the South Central group of Romani dialects (cf. Boretzky 1999, Elšík et al. 1999) and usually referred to as “Rumungro” in Romani linguistics. The variety I chose to describe is one of the few Rumungro varieties whose speakers are Hungarian bilinguals.¹ It is the language of some 1,350 Rom inhabitants of the Hungarian village of Selice (Hungarian Sók, Romani Šóka) in southwestern Slovakia. In addition, there are about 150 Roms in the village who speak a different (a North Vlax) dialect of Romani. The former Roms are referred to as Rumungri (originally ‘Gypsy-Hungarians’) by the latter group, who are called Pojáki (originally ‘Poles’) by the Rumungri. Both groups use the ethnonym Rom for their own group and both are called cigányok ‘Gypsies’ by Hungarians, although the Hungarian villagers clearly differentiate between magyar cigányok ‘Hungarian Gypsies’ (i.e. the Rumungri) and oláh cigányok ‘Romanian Gypsies’ (i.e. the Pojáki). At present, both Rom groups taken together slightly outnumber the Hungarian population of the village. Until

¹ The paper is based on my linguistic research on Hungarian Rumungro that was carried out during short but numerous fieldtrips to Selice, Slovakia, between 1997 and 2005. I wish to thank the late Milena Hübschmannová for introducing me to the Selice Rom community; Július Lakatoš and Alena Krészová for their hospitality and native speaker expertise; the Roma Culture Initiative of the Open Society Institute, Budapest, for their financial support of my Rumungro research in 2001–2002; and Adéla Gálová for her help with Hungarian example sentences. The descriptive sources on Hungarian that I have consulted include Abandolo (1988), Kenesei et al. (1998), Siptár & Törkenczy (2000), and Tompa (1968).

¹ Although all Rumungro varieties have been influenced by Hungarian, most Rumungro speakers presently live in ethnically Slovak parts of Slovakia and are Slovak bilinguals; an overwhelming majority of Rumungro communities in Hungary and in the Hungarian parts of Slovakia have undergone language shift to Hungarian.
recently, however, the Hungarians were in a demographic majority and they remain to be the socially, economically, and politically dominant group in the village.

Rumungro is prevalently an oral language; some Rumungri are able to write letters or text messages in Rumungro but the language is not used for regular written communication. Nor is it used in massmedia or in formal education. Although Romani in general is an officially recognized language in Slovakia, there is no recognition of the Rumungro dialect specifically and, so far, there have been no attempts at its standardization. The Rumungro of Selice is the language of family and in-group communication among the local Rumungri and the language of inter-group communication between the Rumungri and the local Pojáki. While the latter learn Rumungro as their second dialect of Romani (and speak a distinct ethnolect of it), the Rumungri usually do not learn the dialect of the Pojáki. Many Hungarian villagers understand Rumungro well, although only a few have some active competence in it and they are rarely fluent speakers. While all Selice Rumungri born before 1975 or so are native speakers of Rumungro, in some families children are presently spoken to only in Hungarian or Slovak, and left to acquire some competence in Rumungro in adolescent and adult peer groups, if at all. Thus, Rumungro of Selice is not a safe language, though it is not seriously endangered yet.

All school-age or older L1 speakers of Selice Rumungro are multilingual. First of all, they are fluent and highly competent in Hungarian, which they use especially in their everyday communication with the Hungarian villagers. Some young children may be monolingual in Rumungro, although early acquisition of Hungarian appears to be the prevailing pattern nowadays. In addition, most Rumungri are fluent in Slovak, the official and dominant language of Slovakia, which they use outside of the village. Also, most have acquired at least passive competence in Czech through their exposure to Czech massmedia and employment-related stays in the Czech part of the former Czechoslovakia (in 1960–1980’s almost all families of the Selice Rumungro community spent ten to thirty years there). Though both Hungarian and Slovak (and to some extent Czech as well) may be classified as current L2s of Selice Rumungro, it is clear that Hungarian enjoys a special sociolinguistic status: *inter alia* it is the language of the secondary ethnic identity of the Selice Rumungri, who frequently refer to themselves as ‘Hungarian’ Roms, accepting the attribute ascribed to them by Hungarians.

As evidenced by lexical borrowings, Rumungro shares with other Romani dialects previous contact with West Iranian (Persian and/or Kurdish), Ossetic, Armenian, and especially Greek; the latter language also had an enormous impact on Romani grammar.
On the other hand, most South Slavic loanwords in Rumungro are dialect-specific within Romani. Some of them can be identified as Serbian/Croatian or even Ikavian Serbian/Croatian (Elšík et al. 1999); for the sake of convenience, I will refer to the South Slavic contact layer of Rumungro simply as “Ikavian”, although some of the South Slavic borrowings may be of different (e.g. Southeast Slavic) origin. Linguistic contact of Rumungro with Hungarian is likely to have lasted for at least two centuries. Widespread multilingualism of the Selice Rumungrí in Slovak and Czech did not develop before the 1920’s and 1950’s, respectively. While these secondary current L2s have contributed only a few marginal loanwords, Hungarian has exerted, and continues to exert, a strong lexical and grammatical influence on Rumungro. The present paper will focus on Rumungro borrowings from Hungarian, although borrowings from other contact languages, both pre-Hungarian and “post”-Hungarian (i.e. Slovak and Czech), will also be discussed.

2. Phonology

The inventory of Rumungro phonemes is identical to that of Hungarian, with two exceptions. First, Rumungro retains distinctive aspiration in voiceless stops and affricates, e.g. čór- [ʧo:r] ‘steal’ vs ďhor- [ʧhɔr] ‘pour’, which is absent from Hungarian. Second, Hungarian rounded front vowels are usually replaced with their unrounded counterparts in loanwords, e.g. csütörtökön [ʧytɔrtɔkɔn] > éterteken [ʧiterteken] ‘on Thursday’, although some speakers now tend to retain them in certain loanwords. Both vowel and consonant inventories of Romani have been enlarged due to contact with Hungarian. Instances of contact-induced phoneme loss are rare: they include the merger of the voiceless uvular fricative [χ] with the glottal fricative /h/ [h] and the merger of the palatal lateral [ɬ] with the palatal approximant /j/ [j], e.g. *[χaɬam] > hájam [hɒ:jam] ‘we ate’. On the other hand, contact with Hungarian has given rise to several phonemic distinctions and numerous new phonemes in Rumungro.

A major contact-induced change has been the development of distinctive phonological quantity: vowel length, e.g. phirav- [pʰirav] ‘wear’ vs phirav- [pʰi:rav] ‘make [so.] walk’, and consonant gemination, e.g. čuča [ʧuʧa] ‘empty’ (an inflectional form) vs čučča [ʧuʧːa] ‘breasts’. Both types of quantity have spread to the pre-Hungarian lexical component, although some individual geminates remain restricted to the Hungarian component. The inventory of vocalic qualities, too, has been enlarged due to contact. Although the open-mid front vowels – the short /ɛ/ [æ] and the long /ě/
[æː] – are mostly restricted to Hungarian loanwords, they are phonologically distinct from their closed-mid counterparts, e.g. dë [dæ] ‘but’ vs de [de] ‘give!’. In addition to the phonological quantity difference, the long /á/ [ɒː] is distinguished through phonetic rounding from the short /a/ [a], as it is in the local Hungarian dialect. Contact with Hungarian has also triggered the development of a series of palatal consonants from palatalized dentals or palatalized velars, e.g. *[tæːtəɾ] > tatəɾ- [tacar] ‘make warm’, *[kʰil] > thil [cʰil] ‘butter’.

The Hungarian-origin phonemes play an important role in morpho-phonological alternations. In addition, several morpho-phonological rules are borrowed. For example, a morpheme-initial palatal approximant triggers gemination and a shift to a palatal of a preceding morpheme-final dental stop, as it does in Hungarian, e.g. kafid-i [kafidi] ‘table’ → {kafid-ja} kafidd-ə [kafij:ə] ‘tables’. Rumungro also borrows vowel harmony from Hungarian, although it remains restricted to a single type of alternation that affects only a few indigenous prefixes, e.g. farkaʃ-ə [farkaʃ:a] ‘wolves’ vs kæːmɪvɛʃ-ɛ [kæːmi:væʃ:ɛ] ‘bricklayers’, bika-ha [bikaha] ‘with a bull’ vs kæːʧkæhæ [kæːʧkæhæ] ‘with a goat’. Apart from the development of long vowels and geminate consonants, the syllable structure of the pre-Hungarian component has remained unaffected by contact with Hungarian. On the other hand, there is no adaptation of Hungarian loanwords in terms of their syllable structure. The distribution of long vowels in Rumungro suggests that they developed before the Hungarian-induced general shift of stress to word-initial position, e.g. *[barval'o] > *[barva:l'o] > barválo [b'arvo:lo] ‘rich’. Intonation patterns are largely identical to those of the local Hungarian dialect.

4. Typology

The typological profile of Asian (Proto-)Romani was altered rather significantly already before the arrival of its speakers to Europe. Matras (2002: 196) argues that, for example, the development of interrogative-based relativizers or the reduction of non-finite constructions could have taken place in a western Asian convergence area, i.e. before the contact of Romani with Greek in Asia Minor. The latter language nevertheless remains the major source of typological innovations that are shared by Romani as a whole: the development of a proclitic definite article, the emergence of prepositions (or a significant expansion of their inventory), the shift to a basic predicate–object order, and more (cf. Matras 1994, 2002: 198–199).
Post-Greek L2s have had a less significant impact on major typological parameters of Rumungro. Two developments in morphological typology deserve a mention. In its Greek period, Romani possessed a single prefix: the privative bi- ‘un’ of Indo-Aryan or West Iranian origin. Matter borrowing of several pronominal prefixes from Ikavian and Hungarian, of a superlative prefix from Hungarian, and a grammaticalization of another pronominal prefix due to pattern replication from Hungarian (see Sections 5 and 7), has increased the number of prefixes in Rumungro by eight. Second, there is some marginal evidence that separatist exponence, which prevails in the largely agglutinative Hungarian, has been gaining ground in Rumungro at the expense of fusion, although it is difficult to argue for contact-induced innovations here.2 Outstanding syntactic developments due to contact with Hungarian include the creation of a class of preverbs (see Section 6), the “re-introduction” of non-finite subordinate constructions (see Section 9), and various modifications in word order patterns (see Section 8).

5. Nominal structures

Nouns are commonly borrowed into Rumungro. Pre-Greek and some (presumably early) Greek noun loans show full morphological integration and are structurally indistinguishable from indigenous nouns; they have a so-called oikoclitic morphology. Some (presumably late) Greek and post-Greek noun loans, on the other hand, have so-called xenoclitic morphology (Elšík & Matras 2006: 324–333), which is characterized, above all, by borrowed nominative inflections, mostly of Greek origin. These inflections were extracted from lexical loans of nominative noun forms, and extended to later loanwords as well. For example, the xenoclitic nominative singular feminine suffix -a was extracted from Greek-origin nouns, e.g. cip-a ‘skin’ < tsip-a, and extended to nouns borrowed from Ikavian, e.g. pět-a ‘oven’ < pěč, and Hungarian, e.g. virág-a ‘flower’ < virág. Hungarian does not contribute any xenoclitic noun inflections: although the Hungarian ablative suffix -tú does get borrowed into Rumungro, it

---

2 To mention one example: Most Romani dialects possess a small class of nouns that fuse their roots with an oblique suffix due to a phonological contraction: cf. mos- < *muj-es-, an oblique stem of muj ‘face, mouth’. In Rumungro, the oblique stem of the above noun is non-fusional (muj-es-), although the noun mos-tar ‘slap in the face’ (a lexicalized ablative) suggests that the contraction had affected Rumungro as well. While the non-fusional inflection of muj clearly results from a secondary, morphological, development in Rumungro, it is impossible to prove that this instance of morphological decomposition is due to Hungarian influence.
functions as an adverb-deriving marker rather than an inflectional case marker (see Section 7).

Like nouns, adjectives, too, are commonly borrowed. The distinction between xenoclitic and oikoclitic adjective inflection, which is reconstructable for earlier post-Greek stages of Romani, has been lost in Rumungro due to internal analogical developments (Elšík & Matras 2006: 329). Borrowed adjectives now inflect like indigenous adjectives, showing Indo-Aryan inflections, e.g. žut-o ‘yellow’ < Ikavian žut. Unlike earlier adjective loans, adjectives borrowed from Hungarian contain the overt adaptation suffixes -av- or -n- of Ikavian origin, in addition to the indigenous inflections, e.g. sirk-av-o ‘grey’ < szürke, kík-n-o ‘blue’ < kék. Although Rumungro possesses indigenous means to derive manner adverbs from adjectives, most manner adverbs corresponding to Hungarian-origin adjectives are lexical loanwords from Hungarian rather than internal derivations, e.g. okoššan ‘wisely’ < okosan (cf. okoš-n-o ‘wise’ < okos).

Extraction from lexical borrowings is the source of several derivational affixes in Rumungro. There are three borrowed noun-deriving affixes that are productive, in addition to several lexically restricted ones, which will be left out of the present discussion. First, the Ikavian-origin suffix -kiň- derives nouns denoting female humans from loanwords of Hungarian human nouns, e.g. sakáč-kiň-a ‘female cook’ ← sakáč-i ‘cook’ (< szakács ‘cook’).\(^3\) Second, the Hungarian-origin suffix -áš- derives action nouns from internal verb derivations in -áz- (see Section 6), e.g. díj-áz-áš-i ‘singing’ ← díj-áz-in- ‘song’ (< díl-i ‘song’), and from a few underived indigenous verbs, e.g. muk-áš-i ‘divorce, separation’ ← muk- ‘leave, let’. Finally, the Hungarian-origin prefix mí- derives nouns denoting artificial body parts from nouns denoting ordinary body parts, e.g. mf-dand ‘artificial tooth’ ← dand ‘tooth’. The prefix has been extracted from loanwords of Hungarian compounds consisting of the noun mű ‘creation, artificial thing etc.’ and a body part noun, e.g. mf-kēneška-a ‘artificial elbow’ < mű-konyők.

Extraction of adjective- and adverb-deriving affixes is also attested. The Greek-origin suffix -(i)k- derives several semantic types of relational adjectives from nouns, e.g. dévl-ik-o ‘divine’ ← děl ‘God’, ninc-k-o ‘German ADJ’ ← ninc-o ‘German N’ (< Ikavian nimec), meňassoň-ik-o ‘bridal’ ← meňassoň-a ‘bride’ (< Hungarian menyasszony). Ethnic adjectives in -(i)k- then form manner adverbs by the suffix -a,
which is likewise of Greek origin, e.g. *nínc-k-a* ‘in (a) German (way)’. The Ikavian-origin suffix *-ast-* is a fully productive means to derive attenuative adjectives, e.g. *gull-ast-o* ‘rather sweet’ ← *gull-o* ‘sweet’, *míl-n-ast-o* ‘rather deep’ ← *míl-n-o* ‘deep’ (< Hungarian *mély*). The Hungarian-origin suffix *-őš-* derives a few active adjectives from causatives of a class of indigenous verbs, e.g. *dara-v-őš-n-o* ‘frightening’ ← *dara-v-* ‘to frighten’ (← *dara-* ‘to fear’); the obligatory presence of the adaptation suffix *-n-* after *-őš-* shows that the latter has been extracted from adjectives borrowed from Hungarian. Finally, a complex interplay of matter borrowing from Hungarian and internal re-analysis has resulted in the development of the suffix *-šon*, which derives manner adverbs from a class of attenuative adjectives, e.g. *roman-iká-šon* ‘in a rather Gypsy way’ ← *roman-ikán-o* ‘Gypsy-like’ (← *roman-o* ‘Gypsy ADJ’).

Affix extraction, however, does not appear to be responsible for the borrowing of the superlative prefix *lēg-* from Hungarian, which derives the superlative from the comparative, e.g. *lēg-bar-eder* ‘the biggest’ ← *bar-eder* ‘bigger’ (← *bár-o* ‘deep’), *lēg-míl-n-eder* ‘the deepest’ ← *míl-n-eder* ‘deeper’ (← *míl-n-o* ‘deep’ < Hungarian *mély*). The superlative prefix must have been borrowed directly, without the mediation of lexical borrowing, since Rumungro superlative forms are internal derivations rather than borrowings of Hungarian superlatives, such as *lēg-mély-ebb* ‘the deepest’. The direct borrowing of the superlative prefix was probably facilitated by the resulting structural isomorphism between the Rumungro and the Hungarian degree derivation, viz. derivation of comparatives by suffixation and of superlatives by further prefixation. Although the Rumungro comparative suffix is pre-Hungarian (Indo-Aryan or, more likely, Iranian, cf. Matras 2002: 196), dialect comparison with other Romani dialects suggests that the retention of synthetic comparatives in Rumungro is likely to be due to contact with Hungarian.

An unambiguous instance of pattern replication from Hungarian is the creation of associative plurals in Rumungro human nouns, which are distinct from their regular plurals, e.g. *kēmīvēš-ingere* ‘bricklayer and his work team’ vs *kēmīvēšš-e* ‘bricklayers’ (← *kēmīvēš-i* ‘bricklayer’); the category, undocumented in other Romani dialects, replicates an identical distinction in Hungarian, e.g. *kōmūves-ěk* vs *kōmūves-ek* (← *kōmūves*). Probably due to pattern replication from the genderless Hungarian, Rumungro has lost feminine derivation with nouns denoting (higher) animals: for

---

4 The Rumungro associative plurals are similar in form to nominative plural agreement (*Suffixaufnahme*) forms of inflectional genitives of the respective nouns, though they differ from them in some interesting structural details (see Elšík & Matras 2006: 322–323).
instance, the masculine gra ‘horse’ (originally also *‘stallion’) has lost its inherited feminine counterpart *gras-n-i ‘mare’ and is now a generic designation of the species.⁵

There are numerous instances in Rumungro of pattern replication concerning the syntax and semantics of case markers. To mention just a couple of examples: the dative case, which encodes beneficiaries and some recipients, is now also used to encode certain predicate complements (Rumungro 1a, Hungarian 1b), and the inferior spatial preposition tal ‘under’ also encodes temporal telic extent (2ab). Finally, the Hungarian model has triggered the grammaticalization of indigenous spatial adverbs into a series of separative prepositions, cf. the Rumungro preposition anglal (3a), and the Hungarian postposition elől ‘from the front of’ (3b).

(1) a. romes-ke man hajovav
   Gypsy.OBL-DAT 1SG.ACC feel.1SG
   ‘I feel as a Gypsy’

   b. cigány-nak érzem magam
   Gypsy-DAT feel.1SG EMPH.1SG
   ‘I feel as a Gypsy’

(2) a. tal o pándž dí ári sastija
   under DEF five day outward get.healthy.PFV.3SG

   b. öt nap alatt gyógyult meg
   five day under get.healthy.PRET PFV
   ‘s/he recovered in five days’

(3) a. naššov anglal mre jakha
   get.lost.IMP from.the.front.of 1SG.GEN:PL eye.PL

   b. tűnj a szemem elől
   get.lost.SUBJ DEF eye.1SG.POSS from.the.front.of
   ‘get out of my sight!’, lit. ‘get lost from the front of my eye(s)!’

⁵ Although Hungarian does differentiate between mén or csődőr ‘stallion’ and kanca ‘mare’ (in addition to the generic ló ‘horse’), the sex difference is lexically, rather than derivationally, encoded. If the sex difference is to be emphasized, Rumungro speakers may use nonce lexical borrowings of the Hungarian terms, or disambiguate by collocations such as murš gra [man horse] ‘stallion’ vs džuvli gra [woman horse] ‘mare’.
6. Verbal structures

Verbs are commonly borrowed into Rumungro. Pre-Greek and early Greek loan-verbs show full morphological integration and are structurally indistinguishable from indigenous verbs. Post-Greek loan-verbs, on the other hand, are marked out by a specific adaptation marker, the Greek-origin suffix -in-, which is added to an inflectional stem of the source verb, e.g. vič-in- ‘shout’ (< Ikavian vič-), dógoz-in- ‘work’ (< Hungarian dolgoz-), and followed by regular indigenous inflections. The suffix was extracted from lexical borrowings of Greek verbs with the present stem in -in-. Through none of these have been retained in Rumungro, the suffix has been extended to those Greek loan-verbs that originally contained a different suffix, e.g. rum-in- ‘spoil’ < Greek rim-az-. Dialect comparison suggests that the suffix -in- was originally specialized for non-perfective adaptation of some transitive loan-verbs in Romani (Matras 2002: 130). In Rumungro, however, it has developed into a general, aspect- and valency-neutral, verb-adaptation marker.  

Nonce loan-verbs from Slovak (or Czech) show a distinct pattern of morphological adaptation: their infinitive stems get adapted by the Hungarian-origin suffix -ál-, in addition to the regular adaptation suffix -in-, e.g. sledov-ál-in- ‘observe, follow’ (< Slovak sledova-). While the suffix -ál- is a de-nominal verb-deriving marker in Hungarian, its selection for the loan-verb adaptation function in Rumungro has probably been triggered by the formal similarity of the stems in -ál- to the Slovak past participles in -l, e.g. Rumungro sledov-ál- ≈ Slovak sledova-l.

The adaptation suffix -in- is absent in passive participles of morphologically adapted borrowed verbs. Instead, the participles contain the Greek-origin participle suffix -ime, e.g. rum-ime ‘spoiled’, vič-ime ‘shouted’, télé dógoz-ime ‘worked away’ (lit. ‘downward worked’), sledov-ál-ime ‘observed, followed’. The suffix was extracted from Greek lexical borrowings and extended to post-Greek loan-verbs and several indigenous verb classes, e.g. d-ime ‘given’ (← d- ‘give’; cf. Elšík & Matras 2006: 331–332). Another borrowed non-finite marker is the Hungarian-origin infinitive suffix -nī (cf. Elšík & Matras 2006: 179), which has been extracted from lexical borrowings of Hungarian infinitives and extended to a class of non-borrowed verbs, viz. those derived

---

6 The Greek-origin suffix *-(V)s, which appears to have been the marker of perfective adaptation of all loan-verbs and of non-perfective adaptation of intansitive loan-verbs (Matras 2002: 130), has acquired novel functions in Rumungro: it is now an integral part of the suffix -(is)al-, which serves as a stem extension in several valency-changing or aktionsart derivations, e.g. cid-(isaj)-ov- ‘stretch ITR’ (anticausative) ← cid- ‘pull’, těrn-(isaj)-dr- ‘make young’ (factitive) ← těrn-o ‘young’, khand-(isaj)-ov- ‘stink intensively’ (intensive) ← khand- ‘stink’.
by the suffix -áz- (see below). Like the participle suffix -ime, the infinitive suffix -ő is incompatible with the adaptation suffix -in-, e.g. dőj-áz-ő ‘to sing’ (← dőj-áz-in- ‘sing’). Unlike Hungarian infinitives, the Rumungro Hungarian-origin infinitives do not allow any nominal inflection (see Section 8 for syntactic details).

Extraction from Hungarian loanwords is also the source of two Rumungro verb-deriving affixes. The suffix -áz-, in conjunction with the following adaptation suffix -in-, is a productive means to derive intransitive verbs from pre-Hungarian nouns, e.g. paramis-i ‘fairy-tale’ (< Greek) → paramis-áz-in- ‘tell fairy-tales’. The second extracted derivational affix is the causative suffix -tat-. Rumungro allows three different structural types of causatives of Hungarian loan verbs: lexical borrowing and adaptation of Hungarian causatives, e.g. dőgoz-tat-in- ‘make [so.] work’ (< dolgoz-tat); internal derivation from a non-causative loan-verb by an indigenous causative marker, e.g. dőgoz-in-av-; or, most commonly, a combination of both types, which results in double causative marking, e.g. dőgoz-tat-in-av-. This pattern of double causative marking has also been analogically extended to some classes of inherited and internally derived verbs, e.g. dőj-áz-in- ‘sing’ → dőj-áz-tat-in-av- ‘make [so.] sing’.

While morphological causatives have been inherited from Indo-Aryan, dialect comparison within Romani suggests that their retention and productivity in Rumungro is due to pattern replication from Hungarian (cf. Hübenschmannová & Bubeník 1997). Morphological frequentatives, on the other hand, represent a novel category in Rumungro: the existence of suffixal frequentatives in Hungarian has triggered the development of the Romani transitive suffix -ker- ~ -ger- into a valency-neutral frequentative marker in Rumungro, e.g. tőn- ‘buy’ → tőn-ger- ‘buy frequently’. Pattern replication from Hungarian is also responsible for the creation of a specific class of preverbs (coverbs, verbal particles), i.e. free adverbial forms that encode spatial, aktionsart or lexical modification of the verb. Most, though not all, preverb constructions are exact translations of their Hungarian models, e.g. tőe thev- < le-tész [downward put] ‘pass (e.g. an exam)’, but Rumungro ánde sov- [inward sleep] vs Hungarian el-alsz- [away sleep] ‘fall asleep’. Most preverbs arose through grammaticalization of pre-Hungarian spatial adverbs and many, though not all, of these still retain their spatial functions as well (cf. also Schrammel 2005). In addition, numerous preverbs are matter borrowings from Hungarian (see Section 7).

---

7 When preposed to the verb they modify, Hungarian preverbs are orthographic prefixes. Nevertheless, they are syntactically free elements.
7. Other parts of speech

In addition to lexical verbs, nouns, adjectives, and manner adverbs, Rumungro has borrowed numerous function (or less lexical) words from its different L2s. The modal particle of possibility šaj ‘can’ is likely to be of West Iranian origin (Matras 2002: 196). Greek is the source of the cardinal numerals efta ‘seven’, ofto ‘eight’, ěňňa ‘nine’, and trianda ‘thirty’ and the ordinal trito ‘third’; the quantifier buka ‘a little, a piece of’; the address particle more ‘hey, man!’; the temporal deictic particle palaeg ‘then, after that’ (< ‘again’); and the temporal adverb táha ‘tomorrow’. Ikavian provided the quantifiers dosta ‘enough’, sako ‘every’, and cilo ‘whole’; the distributive particle po; the optative/permission particle nek ‘let’, which has also been grammaticalized into a subordinator (cf. 11e,f); the focus particle ni ‘not even, neither’ and the related coordinator ni – ni ‘neither – nor’; the negative pronoun ništa ‘nothing’; and the preverb préku ‘through; across, over’, which has been grammaticalized within Rumungro from a borrowed spatial adverb (cf. Section 6). Only some elderly speakers of Selice Rumungro use the proximative preposition uze ‘at/to the vicinity of’ of Ikavian origin; others use an indigenous proximative preposition.

Most function words have been borrowed from Hungarian, the current L2. Hungarian is the source of numerals (see below), the quantifier čepe ‘few, little; a few, a little’ (< ‘a drop of’), the degree words igēn ‘very, very much’ and túl ‘too, too much’, the generic obligatory particle musaj ‘one has to’, numerous preverbs (e.g. át ‘through; across, over’ or sit ‘apart’), and a few marginal postpositions (e.g. sērint ‘according to’ or fēlé ‘in the direction of’). Rumungro commonly borrows inflectional forms of Hungarian nominals, including pro-words, which function as adverbs in the recipient language, e.g. aňňira ‘to that extent’ (< sublative of annyi ‘that much’), magátú ‘by oneself’ (< ablative of the reflexive-emphatic pronoun maga), idēgembē ‘abroad’ (< inessive/illative of idegen ‘foreign country’). Especially temporal adverbs of this kind are abundant, e.g. akármikor ‘anytime whatsoever’, tavaskor ‘in the spring’ (< temporal case of akármi ‘anything whatsoever’ and tavasz ‘spring’), dībē ‘at noon’, márciušba ‘in March’ (< inessive of dél ‘noon’ and március ‘March’), serdān ‘on Wednesday’ (< superessive of szerda ‘Wednesday’). Borrowing from Hungarian is

---

8 The repetition particle papaleg ‘again’ (< *pal-pale) has developed through reduplication of the Greek loanword.
extensive in discourse-related function words, such as repetition adverbs (újbú or újra ‘again, anew’), utterance-level adverbs (talán ‘perhaps’, bistroš ‘certainly’, përsë ‘of course, sure’, bizoň ‘indeed’), phasal adverbs (még ‘still’ and má ‘already’), focus particles (iš ‘also, too’, čak ‘only’, ippën ‘just’, pont ‘exactly’, ěgis ‘entirely’), affirmative answer particles (the regular hát ‘yes’, and the contrary-to-expectation dë ‘but yes’), interjections (ěhő), fillers (hát), sequential discourse markers (no), and more. Borrowed coordinators and subordinators are common and will be discussed in Section 9.

In addition to function words, Rumungro has borrowed several function-word affixes. The Greek-origin suffix -t- derives regular ordinals from cardinal numerals, e.g. dúj ‘two’ → dúj-t-o ‘second’. The Hungarian-origin suffix -tú marks separative orientation in local adverbs and posterior-durative relation in temporal adverbs, e.g. ánglal ‘in/to the front’ → ánglal-tú ‘from the front’, ídž ‘yesterday’ → ídž-al-tú ‘since yesterday’. The Ikavian-origin prefix ni- and the Hungarian-origin prefixes vala-, akár-, and minden- apply to interrogative pro-words, e.g. káj ‘where’ → ni-káj ‘nowhere’ (negative), vala-káj ‘somewhere’ (specific indefinite), akár-káj ‘anywhere whatsoever’ (free-choice), and minden-káj ‘everywhere’ (universal quantification). The Hungarian-origin prefixes am- and udan- apply to deictic pro-words, e.g. asso ‘such’ → am-asso ‘such like the other’ (deictic contrast) and udan-asso ‘just such like this/that one’ (deictic identity). All of the pronominal prefixes must have been borrowed without the mediation of lexical borrowing.

There are also several instances of pattern replication from Hungarian in function words. The genderless Hungarian is the source of gender neutralization in the nominative of the Rumungro third person singular pronoun: the original feminine form ój ‘she’ has replaced the original masculine form *óv ‘he’, assuming a gender-neutral function ‘s/he’ (cf. H ó ‘s/he’).9 On the other hand, the development of a distinction between local pro-words of stative location and direction, e.g. káj ‘where’ vs kiija ‘whither’, is likely to have been modelled on an identical distinction in Hungarian. Due to a complex interplay of pattern replication and internal re-analysis, the universal-quantification prefix sa- has developed as an alternative to the borrowed universal-quantification prefix minden- (see above), e.g. sa-káj ‘everywhere’. Pattern replication has also been involved in the grammaticalization of the reciprocal pronoun jékh-ávr-

---

9 However, oblique case forms of the pronoun have remained differentiated for gender, e.g. the accusative le ‘him’ vs la ‘her’ (cf. Hungarian ŏt ‘him, her’).
[one-(an)other-] ‘each other’, which is a compound of an identical structure as the Hungarian reciprocal pronoun egy-más. The expression of the phasal expression ‘no longer’ as a negation of ‘already’ is clearly modelled on Hungarian.\(^\text{10}\) In syntax, adnominal cardinal numerals (optionally in case of ‘one’) have lost case agreement with their head nouns due to Hungarian influence, e.g. dúj (*dúj-e) muršenca [two (*two-OBL) man.PL.SOC] ‘with two men’.

A final note concerns borrowing of Hungarian numerals. Two types of loans must be distinguished: morphologically integrated loanwords, which have no inherited, pre-Hungarian alternative (the cardinals nulla ‘zero’, ézeri ‘thousand’, and miliomo ‘million’, the ordinal éšéno ‘first’, and most fraction numerals), and morphologically unintegrated loanwords, which alternate with inherited numerals. The unintegrated numerals allow or require, due to Hungarian influence, the singular of some of their head nouns, viz. of some Hungarian-origin nouns denoting currency units: contrast pándžvárdeš hallér-ja ‘fifty hellers’ (indigenous numeral, plural noun) with étvën hallér-i ‘fifty hellers’ (Hungarian numeral, singular noun) < ötven hallér. Note that the latter construction is not necessarily a code-switch, as the singular noun is morphologically adapted in Rumungro. The alternation between inherited and borrowed expressions also concerns various de-numeral derivations and compounds, e.g. tritóneste [third.LOC.SG.M] or harmadikán (< Hungarian) ‘on the third [day of a month]’, eftavardesberšiko or hëtvënívëšno (< Hungarian) ‘seventy-year-old’.

8. Constituent order

Linear order of the predicate, its arguments and adverbial adjuncts is flexible in Romani, being largely determined by pragmatic factors (cf. Matras 1995, 2002: 167–174). While syntactic non-configurationality is also characteristic of Rumungro, numerous aspects of Rumungro clause-level order appear to have been borrowed from Hungarian, likewise a non-configurational language. A prominent example is the tendency to position focussed constituents immediately before the finite verb; this frequently results in clause-final position of the copula in non-verbal predications (1; second line).

\(^{10}\) The expression of ‘not yet’ as a negation of ‘still’ is congruent with Hungarian, but is likely to be pre-Hungarian.
On the other hand, linear order at the noun phrase level is syntactically determined in Rumungro: all types of adjectival modifiers, including descriptive adjectives, adnominal possessors, demonstratives, and numerals, always precede their head nouns. While the modifier–noun order prevails in all Romani dialects (cf. Matras 2002: 165–167), it has been fully grammaticalized in Rumungro due to contact with Hungarian. The alternative noun–modifier order is simply ungrammatical, except in cases of afterthought whereby the postposed modifier is a substantivized apposition. Rumungro exhibits an etymological split in the order of adpositions: while those borrowed from Hungarian are postposed to their object noun phrases, adpositions of pre-Hungarian origin always remain preposed.\(^{11}\) An analogical split occurs with focus particles meaning ‘also, too’: the indigenous \textit{\textipa{te}} is preposed to the focused element, while the Hungarian-origin \textit{\textipa{iš}} is postposed.

9. Syntax

A number of clause-level syntactic features that Rumungro shares with Hungarian is due to a typological or areal similarity between the two languages, rather than due to immediate borrowing from Hungarian into Rumungro. For example, both languages have uninflected pre-verbal negators, allow pro-drop, and use a copula verb in non-verbal predication (though, unlike Hungarian, Rumungro does not allow copula deletion in the third-person present affirmative). Rumungro also shares with Hungarian negative agreement of the predicate with negative pro-words; this is clearly a post-Greek pattern in Rumungro, though Ikavian is a more likely source than Hungarian.

The major structural domain of syntactic borrowing from Hungarian into Rumungro is clause combining and phrase combining. Rumungro borrows all of its coordinating conjunctions with the exception of conjunctive coordinators, which are pre-Hungarian:

\(^{11}\) This contrasts with the contact-induced postpositioning of inherited prepositions in some Romani dialects influenced by postpositional languages such as Turkish or Finnish (cf. Matras 2002: 206).
plain disjunctive vad ‘or’, contrastive disjunctive vad – vad ‘either – or’, free-choice alternative ha – ha ‘whether – or’ (5), and several connectors with adversative and contrastive functions, e.g. dé ‘but’, azomba ‘however’, mégiš ‘still, even so’, hanem ‘but rather’, and meg and pédig ‘but, in turn’ (6). Borrowed adverbial subordinators include the causal mért and mivél ‘since, because’ (7), and several non-simultaneous temporal subordinators: the posterior mire and miélét ‘before’ (8), the posterior–durative még ‘until’ (9), and the anterior durative mióta ‘since’ (10).

(5) beršeste čak trínval bašavlahi vad bijav, vad bánko
year.LOC.SG only three.times play.3SG.REM CONJ wedding CONJ ball
‘in a year he just played three times, either at a wedding, or at a ball’

(6) dé ón na džan ángyal, hanem téle džan
CONJ 3PL NEG go.3PL to.the.front CONJ downward go.3PL
‘but they are not progressing, they are rather sinking’

(7) mivél čoháni ssa,
CONJ witch COP.3SG.PRET
na tromalahti and-i khangéri te džan
NEG dare.3SG.REM in-DEF.F church(F) COMP go.3PL.SUBJ
‘since she was a witch, she did not dare to go to the church’

(8) miélét hasa, thov tre vasta
CONJ eat.2SG.FUT wash.IMP 2SG.GEN:PL hand.PL
‘before you are going to eat, wash your hands’

(9) addig phírdom, még le n- alakjom
to.that.extent walk.PVF.1SG CONJ 3SG.M.ACC NEG find.PVF.1SG
‘I did not stop walking until I found him’

(10) mióta džukela hi amen, náne amen mačka
CONJ dog.PL COP.3.PRES 1PL.ACC COP.NEG.3.PRES 1PL.ACC cat
‘since we have kept dogs, we do not keep a cat’
Clausal complements of predicates of utterance, propositional attitude, (acquisition of) knowledge, immediate perception and the like, are introduced by the Hungarian-origin general subordinator *hoď* (11a). Like in Hungarian, this subordinator is also employed to introduce several types of adverbial clauses (11b: reason clause) and, optionally, embedded interrogative clauses (11c) and embedded polar questions (11d). The latter are – obligatorily, unless an alternative construction is used – marked by the question enclitic -i, which is also borrowed from Hungarian. The subordinator *hoď* may also precede various pre-Hungarian subordinators that introduce embedded commands and other clausal complements of manipulative predicates (11e), and purpose clauses (11f). Unlike in Hungarian, however, the subordinator *hoď* cannot introduce such clauses by itself.

(11) a. halíjom, **hoď** má n- aná le uppe gódi
understand.PFV.1SG COMP already NEG bring.1SG.FUT 3SG.M.ACC on brain
‘I understood that I will not persuade him any more’

b. daráhi, **hoď** našlíja o lóvo
fear.1SG.REM COMP get.lost.PFV.3SG.DEF.M money(M)
‘I was afraid that the money had gotten lost’

c. na šunde láčhe.(hoď) ko vičinel taj so
NEG hear.PFV.3PL well COMP who shout.3SG and what
‘they did not hear well who was shouting and what’

d. na džanav, (hoď) muká -i man tutar te ěumiden
NEG know.1SG COMP let.1SG.FUT -Q 1SG.ACC 2SG.ABL COMP kiss.3PL.SUBJ
‘I do not know whether I will let you kiss me’

e. phenda mange, (hoď) khére nek áčhovav
say.PFV.3SG 1SG.DAT COMP at.home OPT stay.1SG.SUBJ
‘s/he told me to stay at home’

f. site le papaleg uppe alakhes,
must 3SG.M.ACC again upward find.2SG
( hoď) káj nek džanesahi le te phenen
COMP where OPT know.2SG.REM 3SG.M.ACC COMP say.3PL.SUBJ
‘you have to discover it again, in order to be able to say it’

Due to pattern replication from West Iranian or Greek, complement clauses of modal predicates were finite in the early European stages of Romani: the subordinate
verb was introduced by an indigenous non-factual complementizer and showed subject person–number agreement with the matrix verb (Matras 2002: 161). Pattern replication from Hungarian has resulted in a development of a non-finite complement form in Rumungro, through fossilization of a frequent finite form of the subordinate verb: the subordinate verb now invariably shows third plural subjunctive inflections, irrespective of the person–number of the matrix verb. This non-finite construction, which may be termed the subjunctive infinitive (or the “new” infinitive, Boretzky 1996), encodes not only clausal complements of modal predicates (12a, see also 11f) but also clausal complements of some manipulative verbs (13a, see also 11d) and tightly integrated same-subject purpose clauses (14a). The Hungarian-origin infinitive in -ő (see Section 6) is used in identical syntactic contexts as the subjunctive infinitive. Like the infinitive in Hungarian (12–14c), the Hungarian-origin infinitive in Rumungro does not allow any complementizer (12–14b).

(12)a. kam-áhi te dógoz-in-en
   want-1SG.REM COMP work(V)-LOAN-3PL.SUBJ
b. kam-áhi dógoz-ő
   want-1SG.REM work(V)-INF
c. akar-né-k dolg-oz-ő
   want-COND-1SG work(N)-V-INF
   ‘I would like to work’

(14)a. muk-j-a l-a te dįį-áz-in-en
   leave-PFV-3SG 3SG-F.ACC COMP song-V-LOAN-3PL.SUBJ
b. muk-j-a l-a dįį-áz-ő
   leave-PFV-3SG 3SG-F.ACC song-V-INF
c. hagy-t-a ének-el-ő
   leave-PRET-DEF song-V-INF
   ‘s/he let her (c: him/her) sing’

(15)a. dža-s te huhur-áz-in-en
   go-1PL COMP mushroom-V-LOAN-3PL.SUBJ
b. dža-s huhur-áz-ő
   go-1PL mushroom-3PL.V-INF
c. megy-ünk gambá-z-ő
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Pattern replication from Hungarian has also occurred in relative clauses. Although Selice Rumungro relativizers are formally identical to interrogatives, whereas Hungarian relativizers are not, the former partly copy the “ontological” restrictions of the latter: human head nouns usually select a person pro-word (‘who’) as a relativizer in Rumungro, while non-human head nouns mostly select a thing pro-word (‘what’).

10. Lexicon

Out of a much larger inventory of early loanwords into Romani (as attested in different Romani dialects), Rumungro of Selice retains ca. 20 loanwords from Iranian languages, ca. 10 loanwords from Armenian, and ca. 30 loanwords from Greek. In addition, there are over 40 loanwords from South Slavic, many of which can be identified as (Ikavian) Serbian/Croatian and which are mostly not shared with other dialects of Romani. Most of the pre-Hungarian loanwords are nouns, while verbs and adjectives are less numerous. Only relatively few pre-Hungarian function loanwords have been retained (see Section 7).

While there are a few stable noun loanwords from the secondary L2s of Selice Rumungro speakers (e.g. obrazovka ‘screen’ from Slovak, pepšo ‘black pepper’ from Czech), and while nonce borrowing of nouns and verbs from these languages is rather common, the by far most important current source of loanwords is Hungarian. Hungarian loanwords include basic vocabulary in domains such as body parts, bodily functions, kinship, or physical properties (e.g. ‘knee’, ‘breathe’, ‘son-in-law’, ‘weak’). Unlike some Romani varieties that employ internal word-formation processes to create a layer of secret vocabulary in certain semantic domains (cf. Matras 2002: 223), Rumungro does not seem to avoid loanwords (such as čëndéri ‘policeman’) in these domains. Instances of pattern replication without matter borrowing in complex referring expressions are exceptional, e.g. sobota-kurko [Saturday-Sunday] ‘weekend’ calquing

---

12 The ontological match is not complete, however, as the thing relativizer is not ungrammatical with human head nouns, although it is much rarer than, say, in Slovak-influenced varieties of Rumungro. In addition, the indigenous local interrogative (‘where’), which was, due to pattern borrowing from Greek, the general relativizer in earlier stages of Romani (Matras 2002: 177), is still rarely attested with non-local head nouns in Rumungro.
local Hungarian *szombat-vasárnap*. An overwhelming majority of Hungarian compounds are borrowed rather than translated, e.g. *fog-orvoš-i* ‘dentist’ < *fog-orvos* [tooth-doctor], though translations of lexicalized preverb–verb collocations are common (see Section 6). Some Hungarian compounds may be decomposed into adjective–noun collocations, e.g. *világ-ik-o háború* [world-ADJ-NOM.SG.M war] ‘world war’ < *világ-háború* [world-war].

Phraseological idioms are commonly translated from Hungarian; for an example see (3). As several Hungarian types of greetings and similar expressions are missing in the traditional Rumungro culture, some speakers have started to fill in the “gap” by using Hungarian expressions, e.g. *szia* ‘hi; bye’, *jó étvágyat* ‘bon appetit’. Some indigenous politeness expressions are used in wider contexts due to cultural contact. For example, *palikerav* ‘I greet; I thank’ is not traditionally used after being served a meal or coffee at home, but some Rumungri would now use it in this context, as the local Hungarians do.

11. Conclusions

The sociolinguistic situation of all Romani varieties is highly favourable to contact-induced developments, since almost all Romani speakers are bilingual in the relatively prestigious languages of the dominant “matrix” populations and since, at the same time, Romani linguistic ideologies are relatively tolerant of borrowing in most functional domains. Moreover, the long-settled Roms of the Hungarian regions of Slovakia have developed a strong orientation towards Hungarian cultural models, which facilitates Hungarian-induced linguistic changes in the few extant Hungarian Rumungro varieties, including Rumungro of Selice. This concluding section is an overview of various types of contact-induced developments that have affected the structure of this particular Romani variety.

Both matter borrowing and pattern replication are well attested in Rumungro. *Lexical matter borrowing*, i.e. borrowing of syntactically free symbolic form–function units, is common in Rumungro with all grammatical classes of content words (verbs, nouns, adjectives, and manner adverbs) and with most classes of function words. Borrowed adpositions are rare, however, and there is no matter borrowing of personal pronouns or of the definite article. Also, only adverbial categories of reflexive, deictic, interrogative, and indefinite pro-words are lexically borrowed (so not, for example, adnominal or pronominal demonstratives).
Lexical matter borrowing of paradigmatically related pairs (or sets) of words may result in what I have termed *affix extraction*, i.e. indirect or lexical affix borrowing. Note that affix extraction assumes not only an adoption of an affix within loanwords from a certain L2 and its (potential) paradigmatic identification, but also its analogical, language-internal, extension to other etymological compartments within the L1 lexicon. There are numerous instances in Rumungro of lexical matter borrowing of morphologically complex Hungarian words (e.g. derived frequentative verbs) whose affixes do not extend to non-Hungarian bases, and which are therefore not considered to be instances of affix borrowing. Categories whose affixal markers did get extracted in Rumungro are nevertheless numerous, and include derivational as well as inflectional categories. Extracted affixes of pre-Hungarian origin are: nominative noun inflections; a passive participle marker; non-inflectional loan-verb and loan-adjective adaptation markers; and markers deriving: feminine human nouns; relational and attenuative adjectives; ethnic and attenuative adverbs; and ordinal numerals. Affixes extracted from Hungarian loanwords include: an infinitive inflection; a non-inflectional loan-verb adaptation marker; and markers deriving: action and artificial body-part nouns; active de-verbal adjectives; de-nominal and causative verbs; and a few more unproductive derivational markers.

The patterns of analogical extension of the extracted affixes to different etymological compartments of the Rumungro lexicon are rather varied, and they are not discussed in any detail in this paper. I should only like to point out here that several extracted affixes appear to have been “activated” to apply to loanwords from a chronologically following L2. For example, the Ikavian-origin suffixes -av-, -n-, and -kiň- apply to Hungarian loanwords (see Section 5), and the Hungarian-origin suffix -ál- applies to Slovak and Czech loanwords (see Section 6). Also left out of discussion were the details of various processes of language-internal re-analysis that are involved in extraction. For example, the Rumungro de-nominal verb-deriving suffix -áz- (see Section 6) does not correspond to any allomorph of its Hungarian source, as its extraction involved a re-analysis of its boundary, e.g. *cigarett-áz-in* ‘smoke cigarettes’ ← *cigarett-a* ‘cigarette’ (< *cigarettá* ← *cigaretta*).

Although affix extraction is the source of a greater part of borrowed Rumungro affixes, there are also affixes the borrowing of which appears not to have been mediated by lexical matter borrowing. This is the case of the Hungarian-origin superlative prefix (see Section 5), of several pronominal prefixes of Hungarian and Ikavian origin, and possibly also of the Hungarian-origin separative suffix in spatial adverbs (see Section
7). These affixes must have been borrowed directly, “by themselves”, since there are no paradigmatically related pairs of lexical borrowings that could have served as a source of their extraction. The process of direct affix borrowing, whose possibility is sometimes claimed to be in need of demonstration (cf. Winford 2003: 61–64), appears to be restrained by certain structural factors. Note especially that direct affix borrowing only takes place in Rumungro when the resulting morphological construction is, in effect, a “semicalque” on a semantically equivalent L2 construction. For example, the Rumungro pro-word vala-káj ‘somewhere’ consists of a directly borrowed indefiniteness prefix and an indigenous local interrogative base, which “calques” the local interrogative base of the Hungarian model vala-hol.

Several types of selective borrowing are attested in Rumungro. First, only some inflectional forms of Hungarian nominals may be borrowed without a parallel borrowing of the base forms of these nominals, e.g. the sublative új-ra ‘again, anew’ (lit. ‘onto a/the new one’) but not the nominative *új ‘new’. Not surprisingly, the borrowed inflectional forms are those that fulfil adverbial or discourse-related functions. Second, only some allomorphs of an affix, or alternatives within an affix paradigm, may be borrowed. While structural factors such as the degree of transparency in the source language are known to play a role here (Winford 2003: 91–97), sometimes functional factors are clearly involved as well. For example, Rumungro borrows the distal deictic-contrast prefix am- from Hungarian (see Section 7) without however borrowing its proximal, equally transparent, counterpart em-. Finally, several function words are borrowed only in some of their source functions. Sometimes differences in the distribution of the source word appear to be responsible for selective borrowing, as in the case of the Hungarian question clitic (see Section 9), which is borrowed as a marker of embedded polar questions (obligatory in Hungarian), but not as a marker of independent polar questions (optional in Hungarian). In other instances, however, selective borrowing reveals functional motivations. For example, the Hungarian coordinators meg and pédig ‘and; but, in turn’ have only been borrowed in their adversative uses, in which meg is postpositive and pédig prepositive (see Section 9). Their conjunctive uses, in which meg is prepositive and pédig postpositive, are unattested in my Selice Rumungro text corpus. Selective borrowing confirms that borrowing is motivated by functional, as well as structural, factors.

In addition to matter borrowing, Rumungro frequently replicates grammatical patterns (constructions and categories) of its L2s without necessarily borrowing the linguistic matter that encodes these patterns. As discussed in Section 4, Greek was the
major structural model for Romani in this respect. There are not many constructions in present-day Rumungro whose origin is Ikavian: the negative agreement with, and the de-interrogative structure of, negative pro-words are rare examples. Numerous syntactic patterns, on the other hand, have been modelled on Hungarian, the current L2: the so-called subjunctive infinitive; the syntactic category of preverbs and many individual preverb constructions; encoding of various case relations; absence of case agreement in numeral constructions; negation of phasal adverbs; ontological restrictions on relativizers; certain pragmatic and syntactic aspects of linear constituent order; and more. Pure replication of morphological constructions is rare, being represented especially by occasional translations of Hungarian compounds, including the reciprocal pronoun. However, replication from Hungarian is responsible for the creation or elaboration of some morphological categories (associative plurals in nouns, frequentatives in verbs, and orientation in spatial adpositions and pro-words) and for the reduction of others (gender in anaphoric pronouns and feminine derivation in nouns denoting animals). Also, the retention and productivity of some inherited morphological categories (degree in adjectives and causatives in verbs) are likely to have been motivated by pattern replication from Hungarian.

Matter borrowing and pattern replication frequently go hand in hand, conspiring, so to speak, to make the L1 more like the L2. To mention some examples: Hungarian-origin adpositions retain their postpositioning in Rumungro; unintegrated Hungarian numerals tend to retain their property of requiring singular head nouns; the replicated category of preverbs is enhanced by a few lexically borrowed members; direct affix borrowing results in “semcicalques” of the model constructions (as discussed above); new phonemes, which are first adopted within loanwords, may be later extended to other lexical compartments, copying to some extent the phonotactics and morphophonological rules of the model language; and so on. However, matter borrowing and pattern replication may also result in competing constructions, as in the case of the two Rumungro infinitives (see Section 9), one of which (the Hungarian-origin infinitive) does not allow a complementizer, while the other (the replicated subjunctive infinitive) requires one.

**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>first person</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>third person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>second person</td>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablatve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| ACC | accusative     | N   | noun          |
| ADJ | adjective(-deriving marker) | NEG | negator or negative form |
| COMP | complementizer | NOM | nominative |
| COND | conditional | OBL | oblique |
| CONJ | conjunction | OPT | optative–permissive particle |
| COP | copula | PL | plural |
| DAT | dative | POSS | possessive |
| DEF | definite article or conjugation | PRES | present |
| EMPH | reflexive–emphatic pronoun | PRET | preterite |
| F | feminine | Q | question particle |
| FUT | future | REM | remote tense |
| GEN | genitive | SG | singular |
| IMP | imperative | SOC | sociative |
| INF | infinitive | SUBJ | subjunctive |
| ITR | intransitive | TR | transitive |
| LOAN | loan-verb adaptation marker | V | verb(-deriving marker) |
| LOC | locative |     |               |
| M | masculine |     |               |
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