

A dialect with seven names

PETRA CECH and MOZES HEINSCHINK

This article presents the dialect of a non-Vlach Roma group of the region Dolenjska, Slovenia. There are phonological and morphological connections to Southern Central Dialects (SCD) as well as to Southern Balkan (SBD), especially Arli dialects. Furthermore Dolenjska Romani (DR) shows some features differing from most European Romani dialects: there are only a few Greek lexemes, no definite articles, and a morphological infinitive in *-i*. These characteristics were once regarded as archaic relics, e.g. by Rade Uhlik (1973) and also by Mozes Heinschink (1978), but a closer look at the grammatical structures reveals heavy influences by Slavic languages. Comparisons with the dialect spoken by a subgroup of Dolenjski Roma in Italy, the so-called Rom Sloveni or Hravati, show that the losses of certain morphological features might be a young development. Considering these phenomena we regard it as unlikely that the non-existence of definite articles and Greek lexemes, or the morphological infinitive, are archaic, pre-Balkan features, although the origin of the infinitive suffix *-i* is unknown.

1. Introduction

In the Slovenian region Dolenjska with its districts of Novo Mesto and Bela Krajina there lives a group of Roma whose (non-Vlach) dialect is characterized by only few structures of Greek origin on the one hand, and a morphological infinitive in *-i* on the other. This dialect was documented by

Petra Cech is a free-lance linguist who collaborates with the Romani language project at the University of Graz as well as with Romano Centro, Urschenböckgasse 8, 1110 Vienna, Austria. Email: speleo.austria@netway.at

Mozes Heinschink collected a tone archive of several hundred hours of recording covering thirty different dialects of Romani, which is now part of the Phonogram Archive of the Austrian Academy of Sciences in Vienna. He is honorary Professor at the University of Graz and a member of Romano Centro, Urschenböckgasse 8, 1110 Vienna, Austria.

Romani Studies 5, Vol. 11, No. 2 (2001), 137–184. ISSN 1528-0478

a few recordings in the 'Sammlung Heinschink' at the Phonogram Archive Vienna of the Austrian Academy of Science. The dialect seems to be related to Southern Central Dialects (SCD) as well as to the Arli dialects of the Southern Balkans (SBD).

The Dolenjski Roma were already known to Rade Uhlik, who recorded their dialect and presented his data in several publications (1947; 1973; 1978). He used the terms *Gopti* or *Lički Šijaci* for this group. According to Uhlik they moved from Croatia along the Save river into Slovenia. This migration explains the numerous Croatian lexemes in their dialect. Uhlik believed their origin to be in Turkey, which the group supposedly left before the beginning of the Ottoman Empire. He also noted that there was a group of 'rather remote relatives of the Gopti' in the area of Niš. According to Uhlik these *Čajrljije* had been sedentary in this area for five hundred years (1973: 107).

As to the history of the Dolenjski Roma's settlement in the Save- and Krka-valleys, we find information in Janez Trdina's Vol. 10 of his Collected Works (1957). Trdina gives exact details on their history in the Krka valley (listed under *Cigani Brajdiči*); according to him Roma members of the family *Brajdič* have been present since about 1830, of the family *Jurkovič* in Bela Krajina since 1860. We also owe him a number of informative notes on the language of this group from the nineteenth century. In 1980 Pavla Štrukelj described the group, naming it *Dolenjski Roma*, a term we have adopted. Štrukelj sums up the most important notes of Trdina and Uhlik and includes some exemplary texts.

During World War II the Slovenian Roma were persecuted by the Croatian Ustaša. Parts of the group left Slovenia in 1942 and settled in north-eastern Italy (Zatta 1991). Soravia dealt with the group's dialect in several papers (1977 including a recording on disc; 1979, 1981, 1988; Soravia and Fochi 1995), calling the people 'Sinti Istriani' (1977: 48 ff.). Notes on the history of the Italian 'Rom Sloveni' or 'Rom Hravati', texts and some analyses of their dialect were published by Jane Zatta (1985, 1986, 1991, 2000).

The Dolenjski Roma are sedentary throughout the year. They do not specialize in any particular trade, but selling cars is a popular job. In the communities and schools there are various projects for the promotion of culture and music as well as for the 'socialization' of Roma children. As far as we know, there are no specific language projects apart from those promoting the children's competence in Slovenian and helping them to ease their literacy. For this reason a collection of bilingual (Romani-Slovenian) fairy tales and brochures for children were produced in a private initiative.

As to the Rom Sloveni in Italy, Zatta (1983; cited Zatta 2000: 187) reports the use of Romani in a public primary school in the district of Padova. Beginning in 1981–82, Romani has been a definite subject of the school curriculum in this school, whereas in Slovenia (Novo Mesto) the use of Romani in (pre)school is due to the private initiative of Duška Balažek, a *gadži* who grew up among the Roma as a bilingual girl, married a Dolenjsko Rom and is in charge of the children in the Roma settlement of Novo Mesto.

The present work gives a short survey of the grammatical structures taken from our own texts, local texts, from inquiries of native speakers at Novo Mesto as well as Kanižarica. Occasionally examples are cited from M. Heinschink's recording of the Italian group at Cittaducale, Italy. For Southern Balkan Dialects (SBD) we refer to the works of Boretzky (1996 and 1999b); for Central Dialects (CD) mainly to the article by Elšík, Hübschmanová and Šebková (1999) and to Boretzky's work (1999a), both in the book *Die Sprache der Roma*. Our information about Erli is taken from Boretzky's article on Erli in *Studii Romani IV* (1998).

An edition of texts and a glossary of the Dolenjski dialect are in progress. Our basic material is taken from our own studies, from unpublished lyrics and prose of the poet Rajko Šajnovič from Šmihelj/Novo Mesto. Some additional printed matter from Novo Mesto as well as the bilingual material are quoted as references to examples in the following way:

- School brochure *Za soncem—šu kham, Glasilo romskih učencev Oš Šmihe* by Fanika Konec and Jelenka and Davorin Kovačič 1998/99: quoted as 'B1'.
- Brochure *Pravlice za Romske Otroke*, a collection of fairy tales in Romanes and Slovenian by Duška Balažek and Magdalena Jazbec, Novo Mesto 1994/95: quoted as 'B2'.
- Rajko Šajnovič 1995: *Pot/Drom*. Literarna zbirka Siga 21, Novo Mesto: Dolenjska Založba. Poetry, quoted as 'DROM'. Unpublished texts by Rajko Šajnovič are marked with 'RK'.
- Examples without references are taken from our own records.

2. Phonology

In the following we present some typical phonological characteristics which we believe to be relevant for the classification of the dialect, especially concerning its relation to Arli and Southern Central (SC) dialects.

(a) Reflexes of old cerebral *-ŋd-*: The old cerebrals are represented by /r/

in Dolenjska Romani, likewise in the SCD and in Arli. There exist no lexemes with /rr/ or similar reflexes, as they can be found in Romungro and Gurvari (as well as in old Erli): *hari* 'a little', *haro* 'sword', *maro* 'bread', *jaro* 'egg', contracted *mro* 'my' and *pro* 'foot' (cf. the same lexeme in Burgenland-Roman; see Halwachs 1998); the indigenous word for *kanro/kandro* 'thorn' is missing.

- (b) *o/u*-alternations in stressed syllables: In unstressed position *-o/-u*-alternations are common in many Balkan dialects, but in Arli they appear in certain lexemes independently of stress. The same applies to DR: as in Arli there are *koši* 'to swear' (instead of *akušel*), *voš* 'lip' (instead of *vuš*); the indigenous *phuv* 'brow' and *angrustik* 'ring' are replaced by Slavic words. Further alternations are the prepositions *po/pu*, *ko/ku*, *zoro/zuro* 'out of', *kon/kun* 'who', *brzo/bruzu* 'without'. In the verbal inflection first person present forms alternate between *-o* in Novo Mesto and *-u*: *hino* 'I am', *phenu* 'I say' etc. A strengthening of the alternation may have happened through *o/u*-change between Croatian and Slovenian, the two consecutive contact languages of the Dolenjski Roma: see Croatian *put* vs. Slovenian *pot* 'path' and many more.
- (c) *e/i*-alternations independently of stress, like in Arli: *kedi* 'to collect', 'to read' (instead of *kidel*), *čirmoro* 'little worm' (instead of *khermoro*), *beršin* 'rain' (instead of *biršind/brišind*).
- (d) Long vowels are very prominent; the accent is on the penultimate syllable. This is the stress pattern of SCD, not of SBD with their conservative oxytonic stress. Furthermore some CD show initial stress. Boretzky states (1999a: 216) that they were all based on a penultimate accent; initial accent developed in some dialects under the influence of further contact languages (Hungarian, Slovak). In this respect DR would represent a conservative state of CD.
- (e) The uvular fricative /x/ has turned to the laryngeal /h/ in all positions and lexemes. This is a feature common to the CD, but not to Arli and other SB ones. There is no distinction between old /x/ and /h/: *hari* 'a little', *handžovi* 'to scratch', *habe* 'food', *her* 'donkey'. The cluster /xt/ appears as /jt/: *bajt* 'luck'. There is a parallel in SCD but not in Arli: Roman *bast*.
- (f) Aspirated consonants are well preserved; furthermore there are strong secondary aspirations, probably motivated by homonymous forms such as *pro* 'foot', which would coincide with the reflexive possessive 'his own'. The latter, however, has a secondary aspiration. The strange form of *hik-*

'to see' as well as the comparative *hede(r)* for *feder* 'better' may be further manifestations of the same phenomenon.

- (g) Elision and 'aspiration' of *-s*: Final and grammatical *-s* are omitted in the nominal inflection; intervocalic grammatical *-s-* becomes a laryngeal: *rome* 'man-ACC', *loke* 'easily', *hereha* 'with the donkey', but, as usual, *dive-divesa* 'day(s)'. The old cluster *-st* in *grast* 'horse' and *vast* 'hand' was first simplified to *-s*, the latter being dropped: *gra*, *va*. Final *-s* has been preserved only in one-syllabic nouns in simple *-s*, such as *mas* 'meat', *khas* 'hay' and *phus* 'straw'. This situation corresponds to Arli, whereas in the SCD nominal final *-s* is omitted in the acc. singular masc. and in adverbs. The reflexive *pes* is not reduced in Arli, but in DR it is *pe* as in SCD.

Final *-s* in verbal inflection is reduced throughout the paradigm, except for the second person singular preterite in *-as* (and second person singular present of the copula), and second person singular present and future of *hal* 'to eat': *has*, *hasa* (see above). Therefore it is *hike* 'you see', but *phendžas* 'you said'. Intervocalic *-s-* is also aspirated in the past and the future tenses. In this the dialect is closer to Arli variants, where final *-s* is also generally reduced, with the exception of *xas* 'you eat'. Both dialects have this form as an exception.

- (h) Palatalizations of dentals and velars: Dentals *t*, *d* before *-i* are unchanged in root internal position and in grammatical suffixes: *dive* 'day', *diz* 'town, castle', *buti* 'work' with the plural *butja*; like in CD, the formants *imbe* (=ime) and *-ipe/ibe* do not result in palatalization of the preceding dental: *sastipe* 'health'. In SCD palatalizations are less abundant compared to Northern Central Dialects (NCD). In Arli, however, grammatical palatalization occurs: *bukja* 'work'-PL, *lulugja* 'flowers' (*luludi* is missing in DR and could not be verified).

Dentals before *-j* are palatalized, more frequently in grammatical suffixes than root internally: *rat-rača* 'night(s)', *tačari* 'to warm up', *saščovi* 'to get well'. In general *-dj-* of the preterites enforces palatalization: *vakerdžum* 'I said', *phendža* 'he said', *lindža* 'he took'—but not before *-e*: *phende* 'they said', etc. This corresponds to the slightly palatalized forms in the Arli of Gnijale such as *dilindžol* 'to turn mad' (Boretzky 1996: 5). Besides forms with a reduced dental are abundant: *pheja* 'he said', *daraja* 'he feared'. They generally appear in the Italian texts in all persons including the third person plural: *mothaje* 'they told' (Soravia 1981: 2); for the Balkans they are noted by Boretzky as typical of Arli from Gnijale living in Belgrade (Boretzky 1996: 6).

The velars *k*, *g*, *kh* before *-i* and *-j* are palatalized, occasional aspirations are preserved: root internally *počini* ‘to pay’, *čirmoro* ‘little worm’, *džilav* ‘song’ (*džilavi* to sing), *čhil* ‘fat’. The forms *pot’inel* (*počini*) ‘to pay’, *džili* ‘song’, *pačal* ‘to believe’ and *džiz* ‘town’ are also found in SCD, but palatalization is limited to some lexemes: with *kirvo* ‘godfather’, one of the few Greek words in DR, it is missing, as in the SCD. In the Arli of Macedonia velars before *-j-* vary in their degree of palatalization (*agjare* ‘thus’, *jačha* ‘eyes’): before *-i-* they are slightly palatal. In the dialect of Gnijale we find the palatals /dž/ and /č/ partly before *-e*. The only example of a palatalized velar before *-e-* in DR is *leđzi* ‘to bring’, a variant of *ligeri* (cf. *legerel*, *gelel* in other dialects).

- (i) The palatalization of *-l-*: *V-lj* : *lj* varies in the dialect of the Dolenjski Roma: it is sometimes preserved as in *aljum* ‘I ate’ - at the same time either of the consonants may be reduced: *ajum*, *gelum* or *gejum* ‘I went’, *haja* ‘he ate’. This is rather peculiar, as the SCD have *V-lj* > *V-j*, such as *geljom*, *ajom*, *geja*, with appearances of *gela* at the eastern borders of SCD. Arli, on the other hand, has preserved a weak cluster *-lj-* occasionally with a tendency to reduce palatalization in Macedonia: *aljum* ‘I ate’, *halja* ‘he ate’, *doljol* ‘to grab’, *lelja* ‘he took’. In the dialect of Gnijale *-lj-* is better preserved. In DR there seems to be a mixture of forms, where none of them can be attributed to a single subgroup (Novo Mesto or Kanižarica).

C-lj is sometimes preserved as a whole, with the usual variants of elision or depalatalization: *džuvlji* (‘girl’) seems to be more frequent than *džuvli*; *čirikli* (‘bird’) seems unpalatalized, but the plural may be *čiriklja* or *čirikja*. There is no preference for *čirikljori* (‘bird’-DIM) or *čirikjori*, *hikljum*, *hiklum*, *hikju* or *hikum* (‘I saw’). In SCD the situation is rather similar: Boretzky (1999a: 214 ff.) notes *dikja*, (‘he saw’) but for Romungro *muklòm* and *mukjom* (‘I let’). In Arli again there is a tendency to reduce palatalization due to Macedonian influence: *iklol* (‘to walk out’), *rakla* (‘girls’), *resla* (‘he met’) and more (Boretzky 1996: 4).

- (j) Palatalization of *-n-*: *-nj-*: in contrast to the lateral, the nasal loses the palatal, often after vowels and even more after consonants: we find *hinjum* (‘I am’) and at the same time *hino*, *hinu*. This elision might have been preceded by a metathesis: *hinjum* > *hijnum* > *hinu(m)*, *hino*. Boretzky (1996: 5) explains this development for the copula of Arli dialects. After consonant: *lumnori* ‘little prostitute’ without a palatalized nasal, contrasting with *-lj-* in diminutives, cf. *čirikljori* ‘little bird’. The

Arlj of Serbia and Gnijale have also kept *-nj-* better than Macedonian groups: there are *buzni* 'goat', pl. *buznja* which could not be checked for the Dolenjski Roma, as the word is missing (and others such as *phukni* 'pimple' etc. as well). In the SCD palatal *-nj-* exists, but only root internally, and it is not as abundant as in NCD.

'Verschärfung', i.e. the development of *-rj-*, *-vj-* and *-sj-* > *-rč/rdž-*, *-vč/vdž-* and *-sč-* in Burgenland Roman and the Prekmurski dialect (and, partly, in Vend dialects), does not occur in DR: we find *barjovi*, *svvja*. In Arlj dialects *-rj-* has turned into *-jr-* due to metathesis: *bojra*, *phujra* etc. We find metatheses in some cases with the DR, such as *khajni* instead of *khanji*; another example is *romnajipe* 'cursing', a denominal abstract noun from *roman* 'curse' (which itself might be the product of a metathesis < *arman*), presumably *romanjipe* > *romnajipe*. Zatta (2000) also stresses the abundance of metatheses in the Italian subgroup. One of her examples is *gadžendra* ('non-Gypsies'-ABL) instead of *gadžendar*.

3. Verbal inflection

The verbal inflection seems strongly altered in comparison to other, conservative dialects. As repeatedly stressed by informants, there are two variants differing, above all, in the first person plural of the verbs. Table 1 shows the type of Novo Mesto, with the forms used in Kanižarica in brackets, as far

TABLE 1. The copula

	Present	Soravia	Zatta	Past	Soravia	Zatta
1 sg.	<i>hinjum</i> , <i>hinju</i> , <i>hinjo</i> , <i>hijo</i>	<i>hinun</i>	<i>hinium</i>	<i>hinjave</i>	<i>hinome</i>	–
2 sg.	<i>hinjas</i> , <i>hijes</i> , <i>hinaš</i> (<i>hinjas</i>)	<i>hinas</i> <i>hinje</i>	<i>hinias</i>	<i>hinjehe</i>	<i>hinesse</i>	<i>hinjehe</i>
3 masc.	<i>hi lo</i>	<i>hilo</i>	<i>hilo</i>	<i>hine</i>	<i>hine</i>	<i>hine</i>
3 fem.	<i>hi li</i>	<i>hili</i>	<i>hili</i>	<i>hine</i>	<i>hine</i>	<i>hine</i>
1 pl.	<i>hinjam</i> , <i>hinamo</i> (<i>hinjumo</i>)	<i>hinamo</i>	–	<i>hinjame</i>	<i>hinane</i>	<i>hinjemme</i>
2 pl.	<i>hijen</i> , <i>hinjen</i> (<i>hinjete</i>)	<i>hinen</i> (<i>hinjene</i>)	<i>hinjen</i>	<i>hin(j)ene</i>	<i>hinene</i>	–
3 pl.	<i>hi le</i>	<i>hile</i>	<i>hile</i>	<i>hine</i>	<i>hine(ne)</i>	<i>hine</i>

Note: based on Soravia (1977: 70); Zatta: forms we found in her texts (1985, 1986, 1991, 2000). Forms in brackets are typical of speakers in Kanižarica

as they differ from those in Novo Mesto. The changes brought about many homonymous forms.

The whole paradigm of the copula is aspirated, forms with initial *s-* are missing. It corresponds to the copula verb with *h-*, which is possible but not obligatory in Arli dialects (apart from the one with *s-*), whereas in the CD, except for the Gurvari, the aspiration appears only in the third person singular, but not obligatorily, and partly in the negated copula. The present and future of the other verbs do not coincide with the Arli, where present tense is formed with *-a* and the future with *ka-*, at least partly. The verbal paradigm of the Dolenjski Roma follows the CD in as far as there are short forms for the present, and extended forms in *-a* for the future tense. The future has a strong modal component.

In general the present of the copula resembles the aspirated forms in Arli dialects. The second person singular in *-as* cannot be a new development, as both the Slovenian and Italian subgroup have the same forms. It must be, however, of later origin than the aspiration of final *-s*. *Hinaš*, typical of Rajko Šajnovič and a few other speakers, may be a contamination of Romani *-as* with Slavic second person singular *-Vš*. This form is not in general use.

The first person singular shows a striking variability. We do not know whether the particular forms are really variants of one basic form—e.g. with *hinjum*—or if they go back to different bases. They appear within the same group, so the latter seems rather unlikely to us. As to such forms in Bugurdži, Arli and Erli, Boretzky (1995: 38, and 1999b: 75 ff.) notes that *-nj-* in these dialects must be stable and should not have undergone any change. Perhaps the purely palatal forms without the nasal, such as *hiju* in DR, nonetheless originated from *hinju*.

Of all variants of the first person singular present, *hino/hinu* is the most frequent one. The question is whether these forms without final *-m* developed by analogy to the paradigm of the remaining verbs (see below).

There exists another clear difference between the forms in Novo Mesto and those in Kanižarica: the suffixes apparently developed further in Kanižarica, including loaned suffixes for the first and second persons plural. These can easily be traced back to the influence of the Slavic suffixes *-Vmo* and *-Vte*. The same may be said about the first person plural in the Italian variant.

The Italian variant appears rather uniform, with slight differences between Soravia's and Zatta's texts. The group recorded by Zatta generally shows more palatalization than the one presented by Soravia. With Soravia we find

the second person singular future with unaspirated *-s*, which should normally be aspirated between vowels.

The combination of *hi* with the clitic pronouns *lo*, *li*, *le* is obligatory for the third persons singular and plural with a few exceptions. It is also spontaneously codified as *hilo*, *hili*, *hile*. Thus a secondary differentiation between the third person singular vs. plural appears in this dialect, as in dialects of the Kalderaš, where the clitics *lo*, *li*, *le*, need not, however, necessarily be combined with the copula. In DR the clitics might only be omitted in questions, i.e. *so hi andre?* beside *so hi lo andre* ‘what is inside(?)’: the combination copula–clitic is not so strict as might be expected, considering simple statements. This is the reason why we codified the copula with *hi lo*, *hi li*, *hi le*. Also, like in other dialects, the clitic alone suffices in combination with *kaj* ‘where’:

- (1) *Kha lo lakero kher?*
 where CLITIC her house
 ‘Where is her house?’ (B2: 1)

The negation of verbs is usually formed with *na*, prohibitive *ma*. In connection with *džal* ‘to go’, *ma* bears a nasal.

- (2) *Ma mislinen po bokhale pera!*
 PROH think-IMP.PL PREP hungry stomachs
 ‘Don’t think of your hungry stomachs!’ (DROM: 61)
- (3) *Man dža ku dova kher!*
 PROH go-IMP PREP that house
 ‘Don’t go into that house!’

Gender-inflecting third persons of the copula are sporadically found in SBD and CD, e.g. in the dialect of Terzi Mahalla, Prizren (*hi-to* masc., *hi-toj* fem., *hi-ton* pl.), Southern Central in a variant of Romungro (Lípa 1965: cited from Boretzky 1995: 33: *hilo*, *hili*, *hile*), and in NCD (Boretzky 1999: 237: *hin-ol-il-e*). According to this criterion the Dolenjska Romani would be closer to Central dialects than to Southern Balkan ones.

The negations of the third persons are *naj* or *nane*, both for ‘is not’, and *na hine* ‘was not’. *nič*, *niči* are very frequent as negative particles, next to *nindar* and *niti*.

The verb ‘to have’ is usually expressed with the copula. It is striking that the semantic subject appears mostly in the locative, rarely in the accusative. The verb *theri* does exist, however—like in Gurbet—its original meaning ‘to hold’ was extended to ‘to deserve’. It is not used for ‘to have’ as in some SBD

(Prilep, Sepečides Romani, but not in Arli). For ‘to like’ *rado dikeri* (cf. other dialects *dikerav* ‘hold’, + Slavic *rad*) is used.

The verb *ov-* means ‘to become’, as in SCD and SBD dialects (Sepečides-Romani excepted). It replaces the copula in the future (*ovela* contracted to *ola*) and subjunctive, and occasionally even the verb ‘to come’ in the future:

- (4) *I ka ovsa do veš, morine phiri samo*
 and when will be-2SG PREP wood must-2SG walk-INF only
dromeha.
 path-INST
 ‘And when you’ll come into the wood, you may only walk on the path’
 (B2: 1)

Since both dialect groups, the Southern Central Dialects and Arli, have *ovel*, in contrast to *avel* in Northern Central and Vlach dialects, its existence is no criterion for the closer relationship of the dialect to either group. But, interestingly, we have no evidence of the participle *ulo/olo* in DR.

Summing up the forms of the copula according to its relations with groups of dialects, we see the pattern in Table 2: we are following the tables in Boretzky (1999a: 47; 1999b: 237 ff.). In general the Dolenjska dialect resembles the Arli pattern in most items, but a few alternations can be observed: the second person singular present ends in *-s*; the third person singular bears clitics of a Southern Central type. The negated third person singular past *hine* follows the Arli type, but both Zatta and Soravia note only *naj* for ‘is not’ and *nane* for ‘was not’. The latter may be either a contamination with the present or it represents Southern Central *nana*.

Other verbs

We present the verb *hiki* ‘to see’ for the verbal paradigm (see Table 3). The

TABLE 2.

	Dolenjski Roma	SCD	SBD (Arli)
1 sg.pres.	<i>hinjum/hinu/hino</i>	<i>som</i>	<i>hinjum</i>
2 sg.pres.	<i>hinjas/hinjaš</i>	<i>sal</i>	<i>hinjan</i>
3 sg.pres.	<i>hi lo, hi li, hi le</i>	<i>si/hi, + lo, li, le</i>	<i>hi + to, toj, ton (Prizren)</i>
3 sg.pres. neg.	<i>naj/nane; naj (Ital.)</i>	<i>nan/nane</i>	<i>nane</i>
3 sg.past.neg.	<i>nahine; nane (Ital.)</i>	<i>nana/nasja</i>	<i>nahine</i>
3 past	<i>hine</i>	<i>sin(a)/sin(e/-ahi)</i>	<i>hine</i>

form *dikh-* does not exist. The segmented suffixes appear with all presents forms in *-e*. The forms typical of Kanižarica are given in brackets. The first singular ends in *-u*, as the copula has already shown. There are models for it in the first person singular of Slavic modal verbs, such as *moğu* 'I am able to'. But these verbs are irregular and very few ones. A slurring of *-av* similar to Sinti from *-av > -au/-ao > -u/-o* is more probable than a Slavic influence on the basis of just a few verbs. Moreover the Italian subgroup has *-ao*, as in Sinti dialects. This could be an internal development; the first person plural in *-am(o)* may, however, be due to Slavic influence. For the first and second persons preterite Slavic influence is certain. The Italian paradigm corresponds rather to that of Kanižarica with the first person plural in *-an* and third person plural in *-en*. In the second person plural preterite it still shows the uninfluenced form. The variants for the first plural present in Novo Mesto, *-am(o)* vs. *-an*, might be a recent development.

The third person singular in *-i* is rather rare in other European Romani dialects. Sampson records a few impersonal, borrowed verbs with the suffix *-i* in the dialect of Wales, e.g. *mazini* 'it is freezing' (1968: 117 ff.). He assumes a Slavic origin. Some dialects of Latvian Roma have a similar suffix as variants of third person singular *-el*, again restricted to loan verbs, and in Arli alternations between *-i* and *-el(a)* in the third person singular occur with all verbs. In DR *-Vl* appears in monosyllabic verbs and in the third person singular of past and future tenses of verbs in general. Thus we suppose that once there was a situation similar to present-day Arli with two alternatives; *-i* has gradually asserted itself for the third person singular present

TABLE 3.

	Present	Zatta	Preterite (DR and Ital.)	Past	Zatta
1	<i>hik-u</i>	<i>-u</i>	<i>hik(l)-um (hikljum)</i>	<i>hik-ave</i>	<i>-ave</i>
2	<i>hik-e</i>	<i>-e</i>	<i>hik(l)-as (hikljas)</i>	<i>hik-se, hikehe</i>	<i>-se</i>
3	<i>hik-i</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>hik(lj)-a</i>	<i>hik-ele (hiklje)</i>	<i>-ie</i>
<i>Plural:</i>					
1	<i>hik-am(o)</i> (<i>hikan</i>)	<i>-an</i>	<i>hikl-am(o)</i>	<i>hik-am(n)e</i> (<i>hikane</i>)	<i>-ane</i>
2	<i>hik-en</i>	<i>-en</i>	<i>hikl-ate</i> (Zatta: <i>hikl-e</i>)	<i>hik-ene, hik-ne</i>	<i>-ene</i>
3	<i>hik-e (hiken)</i>	<i>-en</i>	<i>hikl-e (hikne)</i>	<i>hik-ne</i>	<i>-ene</i>
<i>Imp.:</i> <i>hik, hiken!</i>					
<i>Inf.:</i> <i>hiki</i>					

of all polysyllabic verbs, and consequently it was also used as an infinitive. Apart from the Slavic verbs also the Greek third person singular present in *-i* could be the source of this suffix in Romani, so its precise origin is unknown.

The suffixation of the past tense poses a few problems: in the singular past the original suffixes of the present *-av*, *-es* and *-el*, suffixed with *-e*, can still be recognized. Another form of past tense does not exist. In the past and future many verbs are contracted by elision of *-e* in the second and third persons plural. They are also codified by the poets and do not seem to be allegro forms: *hikle*, *hikne* 'he lived, they lived', future *hikla*, *hikna* 'he will see, you/they will see'.

In verb stems with sibilants such contractions seem to be uncommon: *ledžehe* 'you brought', and *ledžeha* 'you will bring', the same in second and third person plural *ledžene*, *ledžena* (past and future). For *piji* 'to drink' only *pijehe*, *pijeha* are found, although *pijse*, *pijsa* would not be phonologically absurd.

These forms also appear in borrowed verbs (with stem extension *-in-*), without clear rules to be recognized: *živinle* 'he lived', *hraninele* 'he nourished'. They might be synchronically formed contractions, but the contractions of the second person singular could be older. Forms such as *hikse*, *phense*, *ovsa*, etc. may have been variants of *hikese*, *phenese*, *ovesa*, when intervocalic *-s-* was not yet aspirated. Due to the contraction the *-s-* of the original second person singular is not in intervocalic position and safe from aspiration. We also find the full forms *hikehe* and the future *hikeha* with aspirated *-s-*. In the Italian variants intervocalic *-s-* is not as strictly aspirated as in DR. Soravia (1977) has it listed regularly in second person singular past and future, Zatta (2000) in second person singular conditional.

In the first person present the forms in *-u* must either have been non-existent or alternatives to the forms in *-av*, not apt for suffixation with *-e*. In the third person singular the old suffix *-el* was grammaticized together with the past and preserved. For the third person singular past, Zatta (2000) notes the form *činie*—a suffix *-ie* (*-je*).

For the past tense formation of new loanwords the following suffixes are productive: *-ave*, *-se*, *-(e)le*, *-anel/-ame*, *-(e)ne*, *-(e)ne*. The same suffixes are also used for the past tense of the copula, where endings such as *-ave* never existed. Furthermore it remains puzzling how the suffix *-am* of the first person plural present was also grammaticized as the past suffix, although it seems to be a recent Slavic influence: it is not found with the Italian Rom

Sloveni. If we assume *-an* for the first person plural present as the older, and *-am(o)* as the younger form, it is mysterious why the ‘young’ form also appears in the past tense (*-ame*, also *-amne*). A late adaptation of the first person plural of the past tense must have taken place by analogy to the first person plural present, but this would mean that the past tense formation as ‘present + *-e* = past tense’ is still partly transparent to speakers.

The absence of the usual past tense in *-as* is a similarity to Arli, where past tense can only be formed analytically with the copula *hine*. In the dialect of Priština (*teluni mahalla* ‘lower quarter’), for instance, a suffix-like formant *-ai-* or *-aine-* is used: *phenavai* or *phenavaine* ‘I said’. Maybe the past tense suffixes of DR represent a grammaticized state of a former analytical construction with *hine*, or old *-as* was simply reduced to *-a* by elision of final *-s*, followed by *-a > -e* in unstressed final position.

The past and preterite tenses have no functional specification. Especially with verb stems in *-l-* both past and preterite are used in free variation without any apparent regularity according to specific functions. See also an example from Zatta’s texts:

- (5) *Hikne len, sa Roma hikle.*
 they saw-PAST them all Roma they saw-PRET
 ‘They saw them, all the Roma saw them.’ (Zatta 1985: 40)

Some adverbs, however, are preferably combined with past tense, such as *but pute* ‘many times’, others with preterite, e.g. *jekhar* ‘once’—this probably indicates a former functional differentiation that has been lost except in certain contexts. Verbs combined with the Slavic prefixes *za-*, *od-*, *po-*, *do-* usually have preterite, as the prefixes denote non-durative, rather ingressive actions.

We do not have an idea about the origin of the suffix *-an* for the first person plural present. It appears as an absurd exchange of the suffixes for first person plural present and second person singular preterite ending in *-as* instead of *-an* with all verbs and, correspondingly, with the present of the copula as well. Here final *-s* is preserved. Such an exchange can hardly be explained. Maybe the indigenous paradigms of verbal inflection are decaying and therefore susceptible not only to massive Slavic influences, but also to intraparadigmatic exchanges.

The first person singular preterite ends in *-um*, as in Romungro (and Prekmurje-Romani); this is also a coincidence with Arli and other SBD (plus

Prilep), although Boretzky (1999a: 230) does not regard it as a historical change common to the dialects concerned.

In our records from Italy, a preterite *hikli*, *hiklo* apart from *hikla* ‘he saw’ was used. In the preterite of the other verbs we find variants, such as first person plural *phendžimo* in Novo Mesto, *phendžamo* in Kanižarica, second person plural *phendžite* in Novo Mesto, *phendete* in Kanižarica (see Table 4). The imperative plural has a long form: *džanen katar!* ‘go away!’, a homonymous form to ‘you know’! A long form of *len* ‘they take’ is *lenen*: *lenen krpa* ‘they take the rag’.

It is remarkable that in monosyllabic verbs the first and third persons singular present follow the general paradigm of most European Romani dialects. But there is a tendency towards analogical levelling: there are alternations of *džav* with *džavu*, *lav* with *lavu*, that is: *džavu*, *džaj*, *džal* ‘I go’, ‘you go’, ‘he goes’, as well as *lavu*, *lej*, *lel* . . . ‘I take, you take’, ‘he takes . . .’. Just *hal* ‘to eat’ is a stable monosyllabic verb.

There is another phenomenon which we assume to be analogical levelling with the monosyllabic verb *del* and *džal*, which does not occur with *lel* and *hal*: Combined with the negation ‘not to give’ and ‘not to go’ inflect in the following way: *nadu*, *nade*, *nadi*, and *nadžu*, *nadžaj* (*nadže*), *nadži*.

- (6) *Hik le, kava nadi miro da sovu.*
 look-IMP he-ACC this not-gives silence COMPL sleep-1SING
 ‘Look at him, he doesn’t let me go to sleep!’ (B2: 20/21)

TABLE 4. *Džal* ‘to go’ (presented as representative of monosyllabic verbs)

	Present	Preterite	Past	Future
1	<i>džav, džavu</i>	<i>gelum, gejum</i>	<i>džave</i>	<i>džava</i>
2	<i>dža, džaj</i>	<i>gelas</i>	<i>džavse, (džahe)</i>	<i>džaha</i>
3	<i>džal</i>	<i>gelo,-i</i>	<i>džale</i>	<i>džala</i>
<i>Plural:</i>				
1	<i>džam, (džan)</i>	<i>gelam, gelamo</i>	<i>džamne, džame, (džane)</i>	<i>džama (džana)</i>
2	<i>džan</i>	<i>gelete</i>	<i>džane, džanene</i>	<i>džana</i>
3	<i>džan</i>	<i>gele</i>	<i>džane</i>	<i>džana</i>
<i>Imp.: dža! džan, džanen!</i>				
<i>Inf.: džal</i>				
<i>Neg. inf.: nadži</i>				

- (7) *Late čhavora, mande čhavora, oj čhavenge del, mange*
 she-LOC kids I-LOC kids she kids-DAT gives I-DAT
nadi.
 not-give-3SG
 ‘She has children, I have children, she gives to the children, she doesn’t
 give to me.’
- (8) *Hav fige, a mange nadži.* Slovenian: . . . *a mi ne gre.*
 eat-1SG figs but I-DAT not-goes . . . but I-DAT NEG goes
 ‘I am eating figs, but I don’t enjoy it.’ The Slovenian idiomatic phrase is
 copied in the Romani version.

Whereas *nadi* could have an old source, see Middle Indian *demi, desi, dei* as a second inflection of ‘to give’, there is no such possibility for *nadži*. The negated forms are probably understood as disyllabic verbs like old *del-* compositions. Their infinitive usually ends in *-di*: *čumidi* ‘to kiss’, *čividi* ‘to throw in’ etc. Uhlik also notes *keludi* ‘to celebrate’ < *kelu+di* < inf. *del* (1973: 92); but this analogy does not apply to all *del-*compositions. Some modern formations with Slavic prefixes obviously inflect like solitary *del*, e.g. *izdel* ‘to betray’, which takes the place of the indigenous verb *phukavel*. Forms such as **izdu, izdi* don’t seem to exist. Solely the negative particle (*na*) produces the effect of levelling as described above.

The verb *hal* ‘to eat’ is an exception: Like in Arli dialect (Gnijale) and SCD, final *-s* in the second person singular present and intervocalic *-s-* in the second person singular future are preserved with this verb: *hav, has, hal* ‘I eat’, ‘you eat . . .’ as well as *hasa* ‘you will eat’. In the CD final *-s* is not omitted in the second person singular present and first person plural present: a form like *has* is nothing special, but the future form *hasa* ‘you will eat’ is irregular, as it should be **haha*. In some Arli dialects *-s-* elision occurs in the entire verbal paradigm. In this the dialect of the DR resembles the Arli rather than the CD, although the latter show the shortened present without *-a*. In DR and in Arli *has* and *hasa* appear unassimilated, unlike all other verbs.

Elšík, Hübschmannová and Šebková (1999) assume a dissimilatory process in some CDs, to avoid a form like **haha*. This dissimilation of *h > s* in morphological suffixes seems to have taken place also in the future and past tense of other one-syllabic verbs, at least in some CD. The present of polysyllabic verbs could have served as a model (Elšík, Hübschmannová and Šebková 1999: 300 ff.). If we assume such a late dissimilation also for DR, it must have started with a form like *haha/hasa*. The form *ha/haj* would be

nothing special compared to the other one-syllabic verbs. Also we would have to state that the dissimilation has affected not only the form *haha*, but the future tense, past and conditional of all verbs in the Italian subgroup. In DR there exists only one model for such a process $h > s$, that is the second person singular preterite in *-as*. All this makes the interpretation of the phenomenon difficult. The past form does not help either: 'you ate' is (rarely) *hahe*, mostly *havse*, corresponding to the variants *džahe* / *džavse*. The latter follows the two-syllabic verbs in *-av-*, such as *karavi* 'to cook': *karavave*, *karavse*, *karavle* in the past tense.

Preterite

There are hardly any old preterites with *-t* for verb stems with sibilants. Just the past participle *beštilo* from *beši* 'to sit' might be a remnant of a preterite in *-t*, as in SCD and in some SBD (*bešto* in Paspati, Erli and Arli, cf. Boretzky 1999b: 86). The normal preterite of *beši* is *bešla*.

Stem extensions with *-il-* occur with the preterite of *sovi* 'to sleep', *sutilo*. The other verbal stems in *-s* have preterites with *-l-*: *našla* 'he went away', *doresja* (< *do-reslja*) 'he met', *khosla* 'he wiped'.

The lack of old preterites in *-t* for verbal stems in *-s-* corresponds to Arli dialects rather than to SC ones, where preterites in *-t-* are more abundant. Among SCD the Burgenland-Roman has the same development; Boretzky regards this as a late innovation (probably influenced by Vlach dialects) and not as a historical relation between SB and SC dialects. In this case we would have to assume a coincidental late innovation also for DR.

The verb *kami* 'to want' is another similarity to Arli dialects, where *kamel* is disappearing as a full verb. In Kanižarica the verb is unknown, in Novo Mesto it is used spontaneously, but not produced when asked for. As in Arli dialects, *kami* is falling out of use. Its preterite stem has a long form with *-in-*. Extensions like these can also be found in the Italian variant, e.g. *prastindžum*. In SBD stems of this kind are, however, much more abundant than in DR.

Some of the intransitive verbs denoting movement still have the gender inflected participle in *-o*, *-i* for third person singular preterite: *avi-alo* 'to come', *peri-pelo* 'to fall', *džal-gelo* 'to go', *meri-mulo* 'to die', *sovi-sutilo* 'to sleep'. The verbs *ušti* 'to rise', *huti* 'to jump', *nakhi* 'to pass by' have the third person singular in *-a*: *nakhla* bzw. *načhla*. The forms *hikli* 'she saw' and *hiklo* 'he saw' in the Italian variant, as well as *astardi* 'she grabbed' for normal *astardža* in Novo Mesto seem rather innovative to us.

- (9) *Čhajori astardi košarica i džal oj dži su veš.*
 girl took-3SG basket and go-3SG she PREP PREP WOOD
 ‘The girl took the basket and walked into the wood.’ (B2: 1)
- (10) *Džoka joj men hikli (. . .), anke miri nona men*
 so she we-ACC looked-3SG also our granny we-ACC
hikli.
 looked-3SG.FEM
 ‘So she took care of us, also my grandmother took care of us.’

For motion verbs the termination *-a(s)* of all other verbs was not generalized. This is a conservative feature like in Vend dialects, Roman and Prekmurje, as well as in Arli and other SBD. At the same time there are participle forms in the third person singular preterite of verbs that never had them, such as in the examples above. Thus archaisms and innovations are combined within one single category. Some preterites are set out in Table 5; Table 6 list some characteristic verbs in comparison.

Apart from the absence of old preterites in *-t*, a parallel between DR and Arli, the preterite stems of other characteristic verbs do not correspond well to the ones in Arli or SBD. The third person plural is not adjusted to the other persons; the formant *-in-* appears with *del* ‘to give’, *lel* ‘to take’ and *kami* ‘to want’, but not with *kedi* ‘to read’ or *čidi* ‘to pull’: *-dj-* > *-dž-* resulted in two-syllabic preterites with a palatalized dental: *rodža* ‘he searched’ and *čidža* ‘he pulled’ rather remind us of the forms in Vend and Burgenland-Roman, with even further palatalization *-dinj-* > *-dij-* > *dž*. Both preterites have variants: *rodija* see Vend/Roman, *cidla* beside *cidža* cf. Gurbet. The preterite of *tromi* ‘may’, *trondža* or *tromdža*, is strange: an enlargement with *-an-* is missing. *dindžum* ‘I gave’ probably developed from *dindjum*; *lindžum* (‘I took’) may be an analogy; ‘to bring’ is *ligeri*, *legeri* or *ledži*, with the preterite *ligerdžum*, rather similar to CD.

Loan verbs

All borrowed verbs are suffixed with *-in-*: other affixes such as *-iz-* do not exist. Their participle stems end in *-ind-*, palatalized in all persons except the third person plural. The verb *dživel* ‘to live’ is replaced by a loan, *živini*, but there exists—as in Arli—an old participle *dživdo* ‘alive’. Others are *aščovi* ‘to stay’, *t(e)rdžovi* ‘to stand’, *harovi* ‘to scratch’, *saščovi* ‘to get well’—we have no information about *iklj-* ‘to walk out’ or *pašlj-* ‘to lie’. As in Arli, there is a tendency to use active-transitive verbs instead of passive-intransitive

TABLE 5. Some preterites

Stems in -č, -š, -s:					
<i>phuči</i>	<i>phučla</i>	‘to ask’	<i>pheni</i>	<i>phenla,</i>	‘to say’
<i>beši</i>	<i>bešla, bešlja:</i>			<i>phendža, pheja</i>	
	<i>beštilo</i>	‘to sit’	<i>grisini</i>	<i>grisindža</i>	‘to chew’
<i>baši</i>	<i>bašla</i>	‘to bark, to croak’	<i>sovi</i>	<i>sutilo</i>	‘to sleep’
<i>naši</i>	<i>našla</i>	‘to hurry’	Stems in -r, -v, -n, -l:		
<i>doresi</i>	<i>doresja</i>	‘to meet’	<i>dari pe</i>	<i>darandža,</i>	
Stems in -k, -g, -m and -d:					
<i>meki</i>	<i>mekla</i>	‘to let’		<i>darandilum</i>	‘to be afraid’
<i>phagi</i>	<i>phagla,</i>		<i>keri</i>	<i>kerdža</i>	‘to do’
	<i>phagijah</i>	‘to break’	<i>čhivi</i>	<i>čhidža</i>	‘to put’
<i>kami</i>	<i>kamindža,</i>		<i>khalavi</i>	<i>khaladža</i>	‘to lie’
	<i>kamla</i>	‘to want’	<i>mothavi</i>	<i>mothadža,</i>	
<i>tromi</i>	<i>trondža,</i>			<i>mothaja</i> (Ital.)	‘to tell’
	<i>tromdža</i>	‘to be allowed to’	<i>čhini</i>	<i>čhinla</i>	‘to cut’
<i>čidi</i>	<i>čidža, čidla</i>	‘to pull’	<i>hal</i>	<i>halja, haja</i>	‘to eat’
<i>kedi</i>	<i>kedža</i>	‘to collect, to read’	<i>kheli</i>	<i>kheldža</i>	‘to dance,’
<i>phandi</i>	<i>phand(l)a</i>	‘to shut’			‘to play’
<i>rodi</i>	<i>rodža</i>	‘to look for’	<i>del</i>	<i>dindža</i>	‘to give’
			<i>lel</i>	<i>lindža</i>	‘to take’

TABLE 6. Some characteristic verbs

DR	SCD	SBD (Arli)
<i>dindžum</i>	<i>dinjom/dijom/din'om</i>	<i>dinum</i> ‘I gave’
<i>rodžum, rodijum</i>	<i>rodinjom/rodijom</i>	<i>rodindum</i> ‘I searched’
[no information]	<i>tradinjom/tradijom</i>	<i>tradindum</i> ‘I drove’
<i>trondžum</i>	<i>tromanjom</i>	<i>tromandum</i> ‘I dared’
<i>ligerdžum</i>	<i>ligedžas, ledžindja</i>	<i>ingerdum/igerdum</i> ‘I brought’
<i>(ligeri, ledži)</i>	<i>(lidžel, ledžal)</i>	<i>(ingerell/igerel)</i>
<i>lindžum</i>	<i>linjom, li(l)jom</i>	<i>leljum</i> ‘I took’

ones: instead of *sičuvi* ‘to learn’, the reflexive *pe sikavi* is used, corresponding to Slovenian *učiti se*. A similar intransitive–reflexive pair is *thabovi* (*thabljovi*)–*pe thari* ‘to burn’.

- (11) *Pomuzin leske, da saščovi.*
 help-IMP.SG he-DAT COMP get well-3SG
 ‘Help him to get well.’ (RK)

TABLE 7. Passive/intransitive verbs *barjovi* ‘to become big, to grow’

	Present	Preterite	Past	Future
<i>Singular</i>				
1	<i>barjovu</i>	<i>barilum</i>	<i>barjovave</i>	<i>barjovava</i>
2	<i>barjove</i>	<i>barilas</i>	<i>barjovse</i>	<i>barjoveha</i>
3	<i>ov barjovo (ov barjovi)</i> <i>oj barjovi (oj barjovi)</i>	<i>barilo</i> <i>barili</i>	<i>barjovle</i>	<i>barjovela</i>
<i>Plural</i>				
1	<i>barjovam (barjovan)</i>	<i>barilumo</i>	<i>barjova(m)ne</i>	<i>barjovama (barjovana)</i>
2	<i>barjovent</i>	<i>barilate</i>	<i>barjovene</i>	<i>barjovena</i>
3	<i>barjovent</i>	<i>barile</i>	<i>barjovene</i>	<i>barjovena</i>

- (12) *So pe sikave tu?*
 what REFL learn-2SG you
 ‘What are you learning?’

Passive in general is formed analytically with the copula verb followed by the participle:

- (13) *Hinas hak bijandi.*
 be-2SG here born-FEM
 ‘You were born here.’ (DROM: 25)
- (14) *Kana pa hinjaš astardo.*
 now but be-2SG caught-MASC
 ‘Now you are caught.’ (B2: 20)

4. Nominal inflection

The nominal paradigm differs only little from the forms generally known—contrary to the verbal inflection. Therefore we present only those items which we consider important for the classification of the dialect.

Pronouns

The dialect can most easily be identified by its personal pronouns *meni*, *tuni* ‘I’, ‘you’ in the nominative (see Table 8).

TABLE 8.

	Sg	Acc.	Obl.	Refl.	Plural	Acc., Obl. Pl.
1	<i>me, meni</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>man-</i>		<i>amen, ame, me-ame</i>	<i>(a)men, (a)men-</i>
2	<i>tu, tuni</i>	<i>tu</i>	<i>tu (tuh-)</i>		<i>tume</i>	<i>tumen, tumen-</i>
3	<i>ov</i>	<i>le</i>	<i>les- (leh-)</i>	<i>pe</i>	<i>on (ind.), oni (Slavic)</i>	<i>len, len-</i>
	<i>oj</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>la (lah-)</i>			

Soravia mentions the obliqui *man, tut, les*, remarking that the final consonant has been dropped. He also notes *joul/jov, joj* and *joni* instead of *ov, oj* and *on/oni*, with yotation as in NCD. The Slavic loan for the third person plural, *oni*, apparently exists with both subgroups, but the optional yotation is limited to the Italian Rom Sloveni. In our recordings from Italy *jo, joj, jon* appear.

For the first and second person plural Soravia notes only *meamen* and *tuaamen*. The latter form is missing with the Slovenian group, *me-ame* as (emphatic?) variant to *ame* is rare, whereas it appears as the only form in our Italian recordings. The clitics are masculine *lo* 'he', feminine *li* 'she' and plural *le* 'they'. Forms with initial *o-*, such as *olen* and *ola* are missing.

The dichotomy *(a)me, tume* for nominative vs. *(a)men, tumen* for the accusative is restricted to the DR. In some Arli dialects the situation is contrary to that in DR: the short forms *ame, tume* can be used only for accusative, the long ones for both cases. As it seems there is a (natural) tendency to create an opposition: nominative vs. accusative in analogy to nouns. The Dolenjski Roma probably adapt the pronouns to the nominative plural *-e* of masculine nouns in *-C*, whereas in Arli the elision of the final consonant (as in accusative singular *man > ma, tut > tu*) produced the short forms for nominative. The pronouns *meni, tuni* slightly remind us of the forms in Hindi. Examples in written texts are rare (see (15)–(16)), but in spontaneous speech they appear more often (see (18)–(19)):

- (15) *MENI vajk puspravinu pu kher i okalo gulu kher.*
 I always clean-1SG PREP house and PREP PREP house
 'I always do the cleaning inside and around the house.' (B1: 24)
- (16) *Odkada tuni gejas, ternipe tuni mro!*
 since when you went-2SG youth you my
 'Since when have you been gone, oh my youth!' (DROM: 15)

- (17) *Tuni sa hike, Devloro.*
 you everything see-2SG God-DIM
 'You see everything, God!' (DROM: 27)
- (18) *Tuni kere (buti)? Aj, kaj kere? Hinjas tuni barvalo?*
 you work-2SG Aj, where work-2SG are-2SG you rich
 'You work? Hej, where do you work? Are you rich?'
- (19) *(Mro Rom) na mari. Meni da, me maru, me, ov na!*
 my husband NEG beat-3SG I but I beat-1SG I he NEG
 '(My husband) does not beat. But I beat, I, not he!'

In all other persons there are no counterparts of *meni, tuni*. It should be noticed, however, that the first and second persons plural *me-ame, meamen, tuamen* represent at least an extension of the normal pronouns. In the texts an emphatic aspect of *meni, tuni* is detectable. We therefore believe that these forms were emphatic, at least originally. This may also be the case with *me-ame*. The morphological origin of *meni, tuni* is not clear to us. Boretzky records similar forms from Erli (*medani, tudani*) and Zargari (*min*) (1999b: 59).

The possessive pronouns are interesting: the first and second persons singular are short, as in CD, Arli and Erli: *mro, tro* (with the long form *miro* in the Italian recordings). For the first person plural possessives 'our' there are two sets: either *maro, mari, mare* as short forms of well-known *amaro* etc.: *mare čhaja* 'our daughters'. Corresponding ones for the second person plural such as *tumaro* are missing: there are only *tumengro*, etc., see below.

The second set of first person plural-possessives are the full genitive forms of the personal pronouns which are either short (*mengro, -i, -e*) or have a vowel: *meng(V)ro, -i, -e*. This vowel is either the original *-e-* (*mengero, -eri, -ere*) or assimilated to the following suffix (*mengoro, -iri, -ere: mengoro naselje* 'our village' (B1: 18)). Some speakers of Novo Mesto even have *mengaro*. The same applies to the second person plural and third person singular and plural: there are forms with and without assimilation. In CD conservative *-e-* is preserved, Arli has assimilation in the genitive masculine: *leskoro* masculine, but *leskeri* feminine. DR shows a mixture. The reflexive possessive pronouns 'his/her own' have a strong secondary aspiration: *phro* (masc.), *phri* (fem.), *phre* (pl.). There are no forms such as *pumen* and *pumaro*. Thus, one of the most important common features of SCD and SBD is missing in this dialect.

Case

All cases are still in use, with different degrees of productivity: instrumental and especially locative are very frequent. Even accusative as the case of direct objects (*phuči la* ‘he asks her’) is mostly replaced by locative. This is also stated by Zatta. As Soravia remarks: ‘Il locativo sembra essere poco usato’ (1977: 69–70), we cannot rule out that the excessive use of locative with pronouns is an innovation: *ma mar leste* ‘don’t beat him’, *dav leste* ‘I give him something’, *oni mende hiken* ‘they see us’, *čumido tute* ‘I kiss you’, *rešin leste* ‘free him’, *hi lo mande*, *hi li late* ‘I have, she has’, etc.; compare also Sinti from Linz with *dikhloḿ lat* ‘I saw her’ and some speakers from Priština (*dikhloḿ leste*). Accusative is also possible, but unpopular: *tu hi lo dar* ‘you are afraid’. This example is noteworthy, since the clitic is apparently adapted to the semantic subject *tu* and not to the gender of *dar* ‘fear’, which is a normal feminine noun as in other dialects.

The verb *del* governs dative beside locative, but rarely accusative: . . . *dindža dajake va* ‘she gave her hand to her mother’ (B2: 1). In order to express locative meaning in a narrow sense, the locative must be combined with a preposition.

Dative as a frequently used case replaces the genitive; compare Arli for this (Boretzky 1996: 12).

- (20) *Hulja gadženge čorne sa.*
 potatoes Gadže-DAT stole-3PL all
 ‘They stole the Gadže all the potatoes.’

The derivation with the free or possessive genitive, frequent in Sinti and some Balkan dialects (cf. *thudeskoro* ‘milkman’, *phavengro ruk* ‘apple tree’ (Holzinger 1993: 59) is not productive. For derivation of nouns the suffix *-ano* is used. In Rajko Šajnovič’s glossary we find numerous examples: *dar-amno* ‘coward’, *hikano* ‘spectator’, *phabijano kašt* ‘apple tree’ and many more.

The ablative is often replaced by the prepositions *od* and *zuro*, but is still in use, e.g. in comparison (see further below).

- (21) *Premislino phrestar romestar.*
 think-1SG REFL-ABL husband-ABL
 ‘I am thinking of my husband.’

Vocative has almost disappeared in DR. Nobody could form a vocative of *daj* ‘mother’. Examples of vocative plural are rare, whereas in the Italian

subgroup they appear frequently, e.g. as an expression *ah, čhavale, Romale!* ‘hej, friends, Roma!’ (Zatta, pers. comm.). For vocative singular Zatta notes *dade!* ‘father!’ as an example. In DR this forms functions as nominative instead of *dad*.

- (22) *Šukar khosen, čhavale!*
 well wipe-IMP.PL boys-VOC
 ‘Wipe well, children!’

Note the nominal inflection of adjectives and numerals preceding a noun as in Northern Russian Romani: *poraneste dadeste* ‘at grandfather’s’ (locative), *barvalaha romnjaha* ‘with a rich woman’ (instr.). Pronouns are also fully inflected:

- (23) *Mreske dadeske pe pheni Dragan (...).*
 my-DAT.MASC father-DAT REFL call-3SG Dragan (...)
 ‘My father is called Dragan.’
- (24) *Mengerenge džuklenge pe pheni Ben, Džina, Piko (...)*
 our-DAT dogs-DAT REFL call-3SG Ben, Džina, Piko (...)
 ‘Our dogs are called Ben, Džina, Piko (...)’ (B1: 20)

Adaptation of borrowed nouns

Loanwords are inflected as masculines in *-o* like Slavic neuters, but with plural *-i* and not with *-a* as in Slovenian, or with *-ja* as loan nouns in *-o* would be in Arli (or Prilep): *miseco–miseći* ‘month’, *hrasto–hrasti* ‘oak’, also *kokalo–kokali* of Greek origin. A few exceptions are adopted without a suffix: *pomlad* f. ↓ *spomlad* ‘spring’, *obrv* f. ↓ *obrav* ‘brow’, *poldan* m. ↓ *poldan* ‘noon’, *znak* m. ↓ *znak* ‘sign’. The noun ‘sand’ in R. Šajnovič’s glossary is *pisek* (< *pesek*), but appears as *pisko* in school materials and is properly inflected there: *piskoha* ‘with sand’.

In rare cases Slavic loans in *-C* end in *-i* in DR. In contrast to many other, especially SB, dialects this type of loanword adaptation is hardly found: there are three dubious German nouns which may have penetrated from the Slovenian dialect; their German bases end in *-er*: *štekeri* ‘plug’, *ajmari* ‘bucket’ and *taljari* ‘plate’. They are adapted like German nouns in the Roman of Burgenland. Apart from these we found two Slavic lexemes: Slovenian *more* ↓ DR *mori* m.: *baro mori* ‘the large sea’, and Slovenian *kol* ↓ *koli* m.: *baro koli* ‘the big stake’. Surprisingly, this kind of adaptation is rare. There

are also masculines in *-e*, plural *-a*, like their Slavic counterparts: *mro naselje* 'my settlement'. These seem to be rare too.

Feminine loanwords in *-a* have the plural *-e*, as in Slovenian: *zvizda-zvizde* 'star(s)', *letrika-letrike* 'car(s)'. As in Slovenian, some of them are feminines that inflect like masculines: *mro kolega, mre kolege* 'my friend', 'my friends'.

Two masculine classes, and one feminine class representing most of the borrowed nouns, are given in Table 9. Masculine nouns in *-u(s)*, *-a(s)* have been excluded, as we have hardly any information about them in DR. One candidate for this class, *papu*, was used in one utterance only, inflecting within the class in *-o*. As we can see for the classes compared below, Arli differs from the SCD mostly in the plurals: masculines in *-o* have plurals in *-a*, feminines in *-a* have plurals in *-e*. The DR has loanword classes without final *-s*, like SCD and Arli. On the one hand the plural of masculine words in *-o* represents the SCD and not the Arli type, although there is the class of neuters in *-o*, pl. *-a* in both Croatian and Slovenian. The plurals of feminines end in *-e* like the Arli ones and the Slavic feminines, but not like the SC ones. A difference to Arli is the frequency of masculines in *-i*: These are much more frequent than the masc. in *-o* in Arli, but extremely rare in the dialect of the Dolenjski Roma.

There exist abstract nouns in *-ipe*. In the dialects of some Arli, of Prilep, of Erli and Ursari there is a differentiation of 'deverbal = *-ibe*, deadjectival = *-ipe*'. In DR this is rather strict: *čumidibe* 'kissing', *khelibe* 'dance, play', *rovibe* 'crying', *našibe* 'flight' - *šilibe* 'cold' - *bokhalipe* 'hunger', *čikalipe* 'dirt', *nahalipe* (cf. *nasulipe*) 'wickedness', *nasvalipe* 'illness', *parnipe* 'whiteness', *sas-tipe* 'health', *ternipe* 'youth', *dilinipe* 'madness'. Some of them replace original simple one-syllabic nouns such as *šil*, *bokh*, *čik*. Deadverbal *duribe* 'distance' (< *dur* 'far') is an exception.

There are no plurals. Final *-n* is reduced as in SBD and SCD. The strict differentiation of deadjectival vs. deverbal abstract nouns hints rather at Arli.

TABLE 9.

	DR	SCD	Arli
Masc.	<i>-o/-i</i> <i>-i/-ja</i> rare	<i>-o/-i</i> <i>-i/-ja</i>	<i>-o/-ja</i> <i>-i/-ja</i> frequent
Fem.	<i>-a/-e</i>	<i>-a/-i</i>	<i>-a/-e</i>

TABLE 10. Other pronouns

	DR	SCD	Arli
'such a . . .'	<i>savo, disavo</i>	<i>as(av)o, aso, asaj</i>	<i>asavko</i>
'so much'	<i>dečhi</i>	<i>ači,at'i,katt'i, adeci</i> (Moravia)	<i>azom, dozom</i>
'every(one)'	<i>sakon (sa+kon?)</i>	<i>sako</i>	<i>svako, sveko</i>
'all'	<i>sa, soro (<savoro)</i>	<i>sa, sa + so</i> (Vend)	<i>sa,sare, sarine</i>
'nothing'	<i>ništo, nič</i>	<i>ništa</i> (NCD: <i>nič</i>)	<i>ništo</i>
'how much?'	<i>keči</i>	<i>kiči, kit'i</i>	<i>kobor, kozom</i>
'when?'	<i>kada</i>	<i>kana, kada</i> (Vend)	<i>kada</i>
'who?'	<i>kon, kun</i>	<i>kon</i>	<i>ko, koj</i>

For demonstrative pronouns there exist only the basic types without initial vowel, *dava* (*daja*), *kava* (*kaja*) 'this', *dova* (*doja*) and *kova* (*koja*) 'that'. *kava* is used for 'it', *vaso dova* 'therefore'.

The form *savo* corresponds both to *asavo* in SBD and to Arli *asavko*. The form *keči* 'how much' might indicate that *keti/kiti* in Arli was lost rather late indeed, as Boretzky assumes. There are no forms as *kobor, kozom* in DR.

Kada 'when' might have been borrowed independently from Serbo-Croatian. An earlier substitution becomes more probable, the more single dialects (Vend, Prekmurje, Roman) show this particular form. Romungro has indigenous *kana* for 'when'.

Kon is interesting since all CD except for a few Romungro variants have *ko*. Boretzky (1999a: 226) mentions the possibility that *ko* goes back to a rather early common Serbo-Croatian influence, because the Romungro variants were not under the later influence of west-Slavic *kto*. The Dolenjski Roma show the uninfluenced form *kon*, partly found in Arli, so this early innovation must have passed by this dialect. Its obliquus is unabridged *kone(h)*- as in northern (Baltic, Polish and Russian) dialects as well as in the Drindari of Bulgaria.

5. Numbers

There are no numbers of Greek origin, as in the Italian variant, but different from the latter (where *pandž* '5' and *šo* '6' are still in use), many indigenous ones are also missing: 1–10, 20, 30: *Jek, duj, trin, štar, pet, šes, sedam, osam, devet, deset, dvaset, triset* etc. Units and tens are connected with Slavic *-i*:

jekh-i-dvaset, štar-i-trideset ‘twenty-one’, ‘thirty-four’, etc. Cardinal numbers are formed with *-to*. Note the full inflection:

- (25) *Tritonaha romnjaha najhede.*
 third-INST wife-INST SUP.better
 ‘It is best with the third wife.’

Trdina (1957/X: 9) lists the numbers in his Chapter 33 ‘Cigani Brajdiči’ as an example of the dialect of the DR (Brajdič is still one of the most frequent family names in this group). The notes date from the first half of the nineteenth century. Here we still find both, the inherited and the Greek etyma. *ek, duj, trin, štar, panč, šuj, epta, ogdo, ene, des* (. . .). ‘20’ and ‘100’ are not listed. It shows that the replacement of Greek lexemes is a development of the last 150 years. The indigenous numbers 5–9, 10, 20, 100 were most probably lost much later: they are still in use in the Italian variant.

6. Prepositions

Important prepositions are *bruzu, brzu* ‘without’ (< Slovenian *brez*), *dži* ‘until’ (*zuru . . . dži* ‘from . . . to’), *korig/karigo* ‘at’; Uhlik (1973) notes *korik*, in the Italian recordings we have *koriga*. Furthermore *ku* ‘to’, ‘at’, *nu* or *du* (both < *an(d)-*) ‘inside’, ‘in’, *po/pu* ‘to’, ‘on’, ‘at’, *stulo/stilo* ‘under’; *zu* ‘for’, ‘to’; *uzo* (*zu, zuro, zuru, uzar*) ‘from’, *vaso* (*vasu, baš, vaš, vašu, vušu*) ‘at’, ‘due to’, ‘for’. Most of them govern locative with pronouns (and sometimes nouns) and nominative with nouns: *ku mande* ‘with me’, *zu mande* ‘for me’, *zu mri daj, zu mro dad* ‘from my mother, from my father’, *pu račate* ‘at night’.

Uzo and its variants and derivations might be used for a comparison of dialects: its origin is Slavic *uz*. It is a preposition typical of both, the SCD and Arli. In SCD as *uze, uz-o/-i*, sometimes shortened to *zu*, with *uz-ar* as a derivation in analogy to *and-ar*, as Boretzky (1999a: 218) points out. Arli has *uz-o/-i* and sometimes a generalized form *uzi*. In DR we find a wide variety of forms: *uzo*, or shortened *zu, zuro, zuro* (cf. *zaru/-i* in Prekmurje), and apart from *uzar* also *uzal* ‘out of’, which is either *uz* plus the Romani ablative *-al* or a variant of *uzar*.

Bruzu, brzo and variants ‘without’ do not occur in CD except for Prekmurje with *bri*. Arli has the form *bizo*, Priština beside old *bi* also *bizi*, from Slavic *bez*, whereas DR and Prekmurje obviously adopted Slovenian *brez* (Croatian would also be *bez*). The only connection to Arli in this respect seems to be that both dialects borrowed the preposition ‘without’ from their

contact languages, as did the dialect of Prekmurje. *Vaš* ‘at’, ‘to’, ‘due to’, ‘for’ can be found in CD and in Arli (Priština: *baš*). In DR there is again a wide variety of forms: *vasu*, *vaso*, *vašu*, *vušu* and *vaš* and *baš*.

A preposition common to many SCD is *pedar/peder* ‘above’, cf. *upar* in Romungro and others. There might be a connection to Arli, which has *upeder* (for details see Boretzky 1999a: 218). For the Dolenjski Roma we only found *uprjal* and *upari*, resembling the form in Romungro.

7. Comparison

The comparative is formed conservatively with old *-eder*; final *-r* is reduced. For ‘better’ *hede* or the double form *hederede* is used. These forms represent the widespread suppletive of *lačho*-COMP, *feder*, with an aspiration replacing the initial *f*-.

The superlative involves a borrowed particle, as in many SB dialects. In this case Slavic *naj*, preceding the comparative, functions as a superlative formant: *naj-hederede* ‘the best’, *naj-tiknede* ‘the smallest’. *naj* can be found in other SC dialects too, e.g. the ones with Slovak as a contact language. Slavic *rado* ‘gladly’ has a superlative *najrajš* ‘most gladly’, < *naj+rad*. The object of comparison has ablative. Slavic *nego* ‘than’ may also be used, followed by the object in the nominative or ablative:

- (26) *Mri romni hede kolatar romnjatar.*
 my wife better that-ABL.FEM wife-ABL
 ‘My wife is better than that wife.’
- (27) ... *heder-pani neg’ mri romni!*
 ... COMP-white than my wife-NOM
 ‘... whiter than my wife!’
- (28) *Mri romni kaleder nego kolatar romnjatar.*
 my wife black-COMP than that-ABL.FEM wife-ABL
 ‘My wife is darker than that wife!’

In Arli the old comparison with *-eder* is declining, as the borrowed Slavic particles (*po*, *naj*) are pushing aside the inherited suffix. In contrast to SBD, the CD still use the suffigating comparison. The DR appears conservative in this respect, yet innovations can be observed. These are, however, not the spread of a borrowed comparative formant, as one would expect, but the application of the inherited suffix as a preposed analytical formant (see

example (27)). The Slovenian influence is easily detectable: where Slovenian forms the comparative analytically with *bolj*, some speakers (e.g. Rajko Šajnovič) use the inherited suffix *hede* as a preceding particle. Those adjectives suffixed with *-(ej)ši/ -ji* for comparative in Slovenian still have *-ede* as a suffix in DR (see Table 11). Rather conservative features can be observed synchronically alongside considerable innovations.

TABLE 11.

‘sweet’		‘red’	
Slovenian	DR	Slovenian	DR
<i>sladko</i>	<i>gudlo</i>	<i>rdeč</i>	<i>lolo</i>
<i>sladkeje</i>	<i>gudlede</i>	<i>bolj rdeč</i>	<i>hede(r)-lolo</i>

8. Causatives

Boretzky (1999a: 233 ff.) presents the verbal suffixation with *-ker* ‘to do’ as a derivation with different functions in SBD and SCD. Whereas in Arli verbs suffixed with *-ker* (also *-av-ker-*, *-arker-*) are transitives/causatives, in CD (*-ker-*, Vend *-ger-*, *-inger-*) they denote features such as iterative, intensive or emphatic. DR has some verbs (see below) with *-ker* and very few ones with *-inger-*: apart from *pe čingari* ‘to become tired’ in the Italian variant (< *čino* ‘tired’?) there is only *čingeri* ‘to cut up’. The examples show a slight intensive aspect in comparison to normal *čini* ‘to cut’:

- (29) *Bakre peku, kan čingerava. Balstaha čingerava,*
 sheep-ACC grill-1SG now will cut-1SG axe-INST will cut-1SG
čurikaha.
 knife-INST
 ‘I am grilling a sheep, now I want to cut it in pieces. I’ll cut it up with the hatchet, with the knife.’
- (30) *Česno čingeramo pa po bakro.*
 garlic cut up-1PL but PREP sheep
 ‘We are cutting up garlic, for the sheep.’
- (31) *Jek dive, ka čingerle kašta andu veš . . .*
 one day when cut-3SG.PAST tree-PL PREP -wood
 ‘One day, when he was cutting trees in the wood . . .’

Compare the (unintensive) verb *čini* ‘to cut off’:

- (32) *Onda činle rakljake čučija.*
 then cutt off-3SG.PAST girl-DAT breast-PL
 'Then he cut the breasts off the girl.'

Causativation is rare and obviously not very productive. There are some old transitives in *-av-*, such as *šunavi pe* 'to make oneself heard' (DROM: 55; in Uhlik (1973: 91) *šunavi* 'to sue'). Several verbs have *-av-ker-* or *-(ar?)ker-*: *ladžakeri* 'to bring shame upon' (< *ladži* 'to be ashamed'), *sapnjakeri* 'to make wet' (< *sapnjovi?* < *sapano* 'wet'), *saščakeri* 'to cure' (< *saščovi* 'to get well'), *šiljakeri* 'to cool' (< *šiljovi* 'to freeze').

- (33) *Saščakerdža pe ko špitali.*
 healthy-CAUS-3SG.PRET REF PREP hospital
 'He had himself cured in the hospital.' (*-ar-ker*)

There are some verbs that are obviously derived from nouns or adjectives, such as *riljakeri* 'to fart' (< *ril* 'fart'), and *dilinakeri* 'to make mad' (< *dilino* 'mad'):

- (34) *Dilinakerde ma tre jača.*
 silly-made-3PL I-ACC your-PL eyes.
 'Your eyes have made me crazy!' (*-av-ker*, cf. Arli)

All of these are, however, closer to the causatives in SBD than to the intensive/emphatic/iterative verbs in CD.

9. Participles, gerunds

Gerunds with *-indos-* are unknown, whereas in Arli at least single examples can be found. In the Northern branch of SCD they are common. Normal perfect participles in DR are frequently used, as predicatives, adjectives or, in combination with the copula, as passives.

- (35) *Mande hi-le trihalja pharade.*
 I-LOC be-3PL shoes torn-3PL
 'I have torn shoes.'
- (36) *Mri gurudi vodži.*
 my hidden-SG.FEM soul
 'My hidden soul.' (DROM: 51)

-imbe (other dialects: *-ime*) is productive for borrowed verbs. In contrast

to Arli, where these participles sometimes may be inflected, in DR they are indeclinable: *prekl-imbe* ‘cursed’, < Slavic *prekl-iti*; *prehladimbe* ‘having a cold’ < Slavic *prehladiti se*; *znu cimbe* ‘sweating’, < Slavic *znojiti se* and many more.

10. Modal verbs, infinitive

The dialect of the Dolenjski Roma has two striking characteristics. One is the total absence of a definite article. The other is the existence of a ‘real’ infinitive in *-i*, that is, a generalized verbal form following the governing verb without a linking device. Both Uhlik and Soravia noticed the infinitive. Uhlik (1973) regarded it as an ancient feature, lost in other Romani dialects. The infinitive is used very frequently in DR, e.g. instead of a subjunctive in modal constructions. Some modal verbs, especially indeclinable ones, may be combined with the inflected forms of the dependent verb. Pure infinitive follows *astari* ‘to start to’, *ladži* ‘to be ashamed to’, etc.

(37) *Astarde phudini.*
 began-3PL breathe-INF
 ‘They started to breathe.’

(38) *Me ladžu vakeri!*
 I be ashamed-1SG say-INF
 ‘I am ashamed to tell!’

Modal verbs with infinitive include *džani* ‘to be able to’, *murini/morini* ‘to have to’, *mangi/kami* ‘to want to’, *tromi* ‘may, to be allowed to’—sometimes also the indeclinable *nek* ‘should’. A modal expression *is te*, *si te* ‘have to’ or *naj te*, *nane te* ‘must not’ is missing.

(39) *Džane vakeri pu Romane?*
 know-2SG say-INF PREP Romani-ADVERB
 ‘Can you say this in Romani?’

(40) *Na trome pe dotaknini po roža smrti.*
 NEG may-2SG REF touch-INF PREP flower dead
 ‘You must not touch the dead flower.’ (DROM: 55)

(41) *Morinave lake del love.*
 had to-1SG she-DAT give-INF money
 ‘I had to give her money.’

As we can see from the last example, the ‘infinitive’ of the one syllable verbs is formally identical to the third person singular present. A new form in *-i* as with the other verbs appears only in the negation of these verbs (*nadi*, see above).

Most of the indeclinable modal expressions have to be combined with an inflected form: *našti* ‘cannot’, *triba* ‘must’ (< Slovenian *treba*) and *lako* ‘possible’ (< Slovenian *lahko*):

(42) *I brzo lende lako živinamo.*
and without they-LOC possible live-1PL
‘And we can live without them.’ (B2: 27)

(43) *Našti živinu.*
impossible live-1SG
‘I cannot live.’

(44) *Triba da leske dav love.*
must COMPL he-DAT give-1SG money
‘I must give him money.’

Uhlik notes *našti* as a declinable modal verb with infinitive (*me naštu . . . mari* ‘I can’t write’), similar to the dialect of the Kalderaš, but notes also uninflected *tu našti džoka beši* ‘you can’t stay like that’ (both: 1973: 90). There is also an example for *šaj* ‘possible’ in Uhlik (1973: 90 ff.). Mostly it is used as an adverb ‘maybe’. The Rom Sloveni in Italy have mostly *saj* for *šaj*.

The verb *hoči* ‘to want’ mostly governs an inflected dependent verb, sometimes with, sometimes without a conjunction:

With the usual complementizer *da* and an inflected verb:

(45) *Hoču da čumidu tro muj, tre vošta.*
want-1SG COMPL kiss-1SG your mouth your-PL lips
‘I want to kiss your mouth, your lips.’

Without complementizer (this is the most frequent construction in the Italian variant, see below):

(46) *Me hoču hav.*
I want-1SG eat-1SG
‘I want to eat.’

In neither construction—with infinitive or the inflected form—does the old complementizer *te/ti* appear as in other Romani dialects, including those

that have established a secondary infinitive by generalizing an individual inflected form. The latter development is a characteristic of CD, not of Arli or SBD. Mostly the third persons are used as infinitives.

There are, however, clauses in DR where a complementizer such as *te/ti* would be used. These are subordinate clauses and conditional irrealis. In these cases only *da* functions as a conjunction, which is the corresponding Slovenian particle for both factual (47) and non-factual (48) clauses.

- (47) *Bog ve, da resničo govorim.*
 God knows COMPL truth I speak
 ‘God knows that I speak the truth.’ (RK)
- (48) *Te prosim, da me ne pozabiš.*
 you-ACC I ask COMPL me NEG you forget
 ‘I ask from you that you do not forget me.’ (RK)

11. Subjunctive, conditional

In most European Romani dialects the subjunctive is formed with the old particle *te (ti)* plus an inflected verbal form. In DR *te/ti* is almost entirely missing. The Slavic pattern of subjunctive clauses is copied instead, in a mixed construction of Romani plus Slavic elements. In Croatian and Slovenian the copula *bi* is combined with the inflected participle of the verb to express conditional clauses. In DR *bi* appears as a marker of non-real conditions. We find similarities in some Gurbet variants of Serbia (cf. Boretzky 1989: 336): *bi* is combined with inflected verbs. In DR, however, the particle is followed by the truncated Romani verb—its stem or imperative singular, respectively. Due to the indeclinable *bi* and the truncation of the verb, only context can assign the right person, as a pronoun is applied only occasionally. All our examples are taken from written texts. In isolated sentences without a context speakers cannot determine the subject, as in:

- (49) *Rado bi hik, da leske den phra čhaja*
 gladly PART see-STEM COMPL he-DAT give-3PL their daughter-ACC
vaso romnja.
 PREP wife-ACC
 ‘... would like to see that they give him their daughter as a wife.’

In the following examples we assume first person singular for the subject, as it is unmarked.

- (50) *Vaso tute, romni, zvizde bi gasnin.*
 PREP you-LOC woman stars PART extinguish-STEM
 'For you, lady, I would extinguish the stars.' (DROM: 11)
- (51) *Rado bi pe khel tuha.*
 gladly PART REFL play-STEM you-INST
 'I would like to play with you.' (B1: 10)
- (52) *Diso bi tu rado phuč.*
 something PART you-ACC gladly ask-STEM
 'I would like to ask you something.' (B2: 27)

The third person singular is identifiable through a demonstrative pronoun:

- (53) *Kaja sploh nije džan, so bi lake sa dot.*
 this-FEM not-at-all NEG know-STEM what PART she-DAT all give-???
 'She had no idea what else she should give her.' (B2: 1)

In the Slovenian translation: *bi ji vsega dala*, that is, the inflected participle of *dati* 'to give'. *dot* as the 'truncated' form of *del* is noteworthy. In standard Croatian and Slovenian this form is unknown: if Slavic, it must be of some dialectal origin. It is a peculiarity shared by Dolenjski Roma and Italian Rom Sloveni, as Zatta's texts show. She lists *dot* as the imperative singular of *del* (which is *de!* in DR). If at all, it must be an earlier Slavic influence that affected the group as a whole before it split up after the war.

- (54) *'Ma dot lenge — pheni— savi 50.000, dot.*
 but give-IMP.SG they-DAT.PL say-3SG REL give-IMP.SG
 'But give them—he says—some 50,000, give.' (Zatta 1991: 50)

The expression of subjunctive with a past tense form is also possible, but rather unusual. Maybe it is a remnant of a once productive process:

- (55) *Na tromene pe koši.*
 NEG must-3PL REFL quarrel-INF
 'They should not quarrel.' (B1: 24)

The Slovenian translation with the subjunctive excludes an indicative interpretation such as 'they were not allowed to quarrel': *Nebi se smeli prepirati*.

Improbable conditional clauses have *ako* 'if' or *da* as complementizers. Again the subject of the clause is ambiguous, if a personal pronoun is missing:

- (56) *Ako bi ma ov love, me bi av but pute.*
 if PART I-ACC be-STEM money I PART come-STEM many times
 'If I had money, I would come often.'
- (57) *Da ma bi ov tsigarete, vi tuke dot.*
 if I-ACC PART be-STEM cigarettes also you-DAT give
 'If I had any cigarettes, I would give some to you too.'

Conditional irrealis involves at least one past tense form, and *da, bi* + truncated verb:

- (58) *Da me džanave, da hijas tu hak, bi av*
 if I knew-1SG COMPL be-2SG you here PART come-STEM
več prvo.
 more early
 'If I had known that you were here, I would have come earlier.'
- (59) *Da bi džan, kon hi li doja romni, phenave tuke.*
 if PART know-STEM REL is-FEM that woman told-1SG you-DAT
 'If I had known who this woman was, I would have told you.'

13. The negation of the preterite

The preterite is negated with the Slavic negative copula *nije* 'is not', followed by the stem of the Romani verb. The Slavic construction is copied, but instead of the participle the truncated verb is used here too:

- (60) *Nije Rajko nič mothav.*
 NEG.COP Rajko nothing tell-STEM
 'Rajko did not tell anything.'
- (61) *Ov nije but pi mol.*
 he NEG.COP much drink-STEM wine
 'He did not drink much wine.'

The use of verb stems unsuffixed for subjunctive, conditional and negated preterite is not very widespread in Romani dialects. On the contrary, it is quite a unique feature. Again in Latvian Romani there are truncations figuring as a kind of infinitive, e.g. *kamel te rakir* (truncation) apart from normally inflected *kamel te rakirel* 'he wants to talk'. There are also Siberian dialects, where a conditional irrealis of a quite similar type as in DR can

be found occasionally: *kamavas bi te khel* ‘I would have liked to dance’, compare DR *rado bi khel*.

Zatta lists verbal forms for conditional irrealis in a table. These are (for *čini/čhini* ‘to cut’/‘to buy’): *čin-jome*, *čin-jese*, *čin-jele*, *čin-jeme*, *čin-jene*, *čin-jene* (2000: 198). They are in regular use. Truncated forms never appear in her texts. One example:

- (62) *Ni letrika na le astardželle!*
 not even car NEG he-ACC caught-3SG.IRR
 ‘Not even a car could have caught him!’ (1986: 131) (In DR this would be: *Nije letrika bi le astar.*)

The Rom Sloveni left Slovenia in 1942. As it is unlikely that they borrowed a whole paradigm for conditional irrealis, which they had already lost, from another Romani dialect, we assume that these verbal forms are older and have not yet disappeared from the Italian subgroup. It must have been replaced by a partly Slavic construction in DR within the last 50 years. Obviously the pattern of Croatian/Slovenian conditional irrealis was copied in parts (Slavic copula). It is noteworthy that other occurrences of truncations, especially with conditional irrealis, are only found in Romani dialects with (among others) Slavic contact languages. In the dialect of Latvian Roma this could be influenced by the Latvian optative which involves truncated verbs (Kalinin, pers. comm.). Why the new analytical construction with *bi* does not involve participles as in the contact language, but the verb stems only, is difficult to say.

Usually the morphological pluperfect is used for conditional irrealis in Romani dialects. Therefore the conditional noted by Zatta could be a kind of pluperfect form with the participle stems of the verb as a base. An original past tense form, suffixed with *-e*, can be seen in the first person singular *činjome*; the rest of the paradigm, however, is blurred.

A pluperfect as a ‘tense’ is lacking in DR and, according to Zatta, also in the Italian variant. Preterite or past tense is used instead:

- (63) *Ka la haja, zasotilo nazad po postelja.*
 when she-ACC ate-3SG fell asleep-3SG finally PREP bed
 ‘When he had eaten her, he finally fell asleep on the bed.’ (B2: 2)
- (64) *Hopek pa žalastno mothavle, da nije alačh spomlad.*
 Hopek but sad told-3SG COMPL NEG.COP find-STEM spring
 ‘But Hopek told sadly that he had not found spring.’ (B2: 7)

14. What happened to *te/ti*?

The Slovenian particle *da* is the common complementizer for factual and non-factual clauses in DR. Old factual *ka* is not or hardly in use:

- (65) *Džanu, da mro čhavo ma rado imini.*
 know-1SG that my son I-ACC like hold-3SG
 'I know that my son loves me.'
- (66) *Ov vakerdža, da hi-lo kher drago.*
 he told-3SG that is-MASC house expensive
 'He said that the house was expensive.'

The complementizer *sarta* 'as if' could be *sar* + old *te*, or the particle *ta* is just an intensifying element. No subjunctive (i.e. truncated) forms appear in this context.

- (67) *Džoka šukar phire po drom, sar-ta džaj do šola.*
 so well go-2SG PREP path as if go-2SG PREP school
 'You are walking along the path so nicely as if you were going to school.' (B2: 2)
- (68) *Džaj avri, sarta hinas po britafo.*
 go-2SG out as if be-2SG PREP cemetery
 'You are leaving as if you were at the cemetery.' (DROM: 25)

Matras (pers. comm.) suggests a process of loss in several steps: First the conjunction for factual complements *kaj* merged with non-factual *te/ti*; later the complementizer was replaced by Slavic *da*. The loss of the particle in infinitive constructions must have been a different development before general *te* was replaced by *da*. As to the time of loss we can only guess, but there are a few items worth considering:

Constructions with *te* apart from pure infinitives are found in Uhlik (1973). The complementizer is followed by the inflected verb, as in other dialects.

- (69) *Džav te pe šalinu i vakeru.*
 go-1SG COMPL REF flirt-1SG and talk-1SG
 'I'm going out to flirt and to chat.'
 But: *Gelo šunavi . . .* (both: Uhlik 1973: 91)
 went-3SG hear-CAUS-INF
 'He went to court.'

In Trdina's examples *te* also appears (1957/X: 9; segmentation of word clusters slightly altered): *benk te tu le* 'go to the devil!', *sap te tu hal* 'the viper shall bite you', showing that *te* must have been in use, already alternating with constructions without the particle. Unfortunately no mixed constructions can be found, that is, examples combining *bi* and *te*, such as in dialects of Siberian Roma (*kamavas bi te khel* 'I wanted to dance', see above).

In our own recordings we have *te* in songs and very rarely in spontaneous speech:

- (70) *Na tromi te šuni:*
 NEG may-3SG COMPL hear-3SG
 'He must not hear (it).'

A closer look at Zatta's texts from the Italian group reveals an abundance of *ti*-constructions, both for factual and non-factual complements. Conservative *ka* for factual clauses is rare, but it can be found—in contrast to DR. The spelling in the following examples has been adapted slightly where Zatta transcribed [j] or [—] for /dž/. Occurrences of factual *ka*:

- (71) *Onni hiken ka prasti tele pu tseta.*
 they see-3PL that run-3SG down PREP road
 'They see that he is running down towards the road.' (1986: 131)
- (72) *Onni hikle ka mro dat gelo pu doa avar drom.*
 they saw-3PL that my father went-3SG PREP that other road
 'They saw that my father went by the other road.' (1986: 131)

Examples of *ti*:

- (73) *Oi na džandža ti hilo mulo.*
 she NEG knew-3SG COMPL is-MASC dead-MASC
 'She did not know that he was dead.' (2000: 200)
- (74) *Oni mislinde ti hili mača.*
 they thought-3PL COMPL is-FEM fish
 'They thought that it was a fish.' (2000: 200)
- (75) *Dela, peja, ti den, kada anla (. . .)*
 will give-3SG said-3SG COMPL give-3PL when will bring-3SG
džukle (. . .)
 dog-ACC
 'He will give it, he said that they would give it, when he will bring the dog (. . .)' (1991: 50)

- (76) (...) *te le hiku* (...), *avu tuke mothavu, na?*
 if he-ACC see-1SG come-1SG you-DAT tell-1SG NEG
 ‘If I see him, I come to tell you, won’t I?’ (1991: 50)
- (77) *Te le mange den, džoka meni le tuke dao.*
 if he-ACC I-DAT give-3PL so I he-ACC you-DAT give-1SG
 ‘If they give me that, then I’ll give him to them.’ (1991: 50)
- (78) *Me na le kamu dikeru džukle, anche te hilo suzo.*
 I NEG he-ACC want-1SG keep-1SG dog-ACC also if is-MASC pretty
 ‘I don’t want to keep him, the dog, even if it is pretty.’ (1991: 50)

The examples show a dichotomy of *ti* as the normal complementizer or introducing the subjunctive in fossilized ejaculations (*ti muli Monia mri* . . . ‘my Monia shall die . . .’; Zatta, pers. comm.) on the one hand, and *te* for conditional ‘if’ on the other. The next example combines the two:

- (79) *Te khalavu, ti meru!*
 if lie-1SG COMPL die-1SG
 ‘May I die if I am lying!’ (2000: 201)

A few counterexamples can be found where *ti* functions for conditional ‘if’, such as:

- (80) *Ti doa na keru, maren le oko.*
 if that NEG do-3SG beat-1PL he-ACC there
 ‘If he does not do that, they’ll kill him there!’ (1986: 132)

Infinitives, on the other hand, alternate with inflected forms more frequently in Zatta’s texts than in DR. Sentences lack the particle *ti*, and often the inflected form of the verb follows the governing verb directly, as in DR with the modal verbs *hoči*, *triba* and *našti*, but rarely with non-modal verbs:

- (81) (...) *aven mande hiken.*
 come-3PL I-LOC see-3PL
 ‘They came to see me.’ (2000: 199)
- (82) *Onda gele graste pu njive čarakeren.*
 then went-3PL horse-ACC PREP field graze-3PL
 ‘So they took the horse to the field to graze.’ (1985: 40)

- (83) (. . .) *i džoka le dikerle pe čija.*
 (. . .) and like that he-ACC held-3SG REF cut-3SG.PAST
 '(. . .) and he held it like this to cut with.' (1985: 40)

The infinitive appears regularly with *džal* 'to go', and, according to Zatta (pers. comm.), with the modal verb *kami*. Where *kami* is combined with the particle *ti*, it has an ingressive meaning: *kami ti džal* 'he is about to go'.

In conclusion we may say that in both groups the linking particle has vanished from subjunctive and modal constructions. Apart from inflected forms following the modal verbs, an infinitive with a generalized third person singular is well established. When a complementizer is used in DR, it is Slavic *da*; *te/ti* is rare. This situation shows that the establishment of a generalized personal form and the loss of the complementizer in infinitive sentences are two separate phenomena. The linking particle can be lost without generalization of a personal form, as frequently with the Italian Rom Sloveni (*kamu hiku* 'I want [that] I see'). It can be lost, but the generalization takes place as in DR (*avu hiki* 'I come to see'). Or a single personal form may be generalized for all persons as an infinitive, but the particle *te/ti* remains. This happened in CD and also in some Vlach dialects with the third person singular or plural (. . . *či delas khanči te xan*. 'She did not give . . . anything to eat': third person plural, Austrian Lovari), and with the second person singular in some Ukrainian and South Russian dialects (generalized *te ave* or *te aves* 'to come'; Barannikov 1934).

Complements

In the Italian variant we still find *ka* for factual clauses, but in the majority of examples it is already replaced by *ti*. Both contact languages, the former Slovenian and the current one, Italian, have no differentiation of factual and non-factual conjunctions. Even in Croatian, the second latest contact language, non-factual *da* can be used for factual complements: *znam da si ovdje* 'I know that you are here'. The differentiation of factual vs. non-factual conjunctions is not obligatory. This might have reinforced the tendency mentioned above. In DR there are only traces of a differentiation factual vs. non-factual. But as can be seen from the examples by Uhlik and Trdina, *te* was still in use not long ago. Some rare occurrences can even be found in recent utterances and songs.

In the Italian variant there seems to be a tendency to use *ti* as a factual/non-factual complementizer and *te* for conditional 'if'. We have not

observed this phenomenon in the other dialects we know. As only six or seven texts have been checked for this distinction, it might be accidental. If it is a real tendency, there is obviously a need for the distinction between conditional clauses and subjunctive rather than for a distinction of factual vs. non factual complements (cf. Italian *che* ‘that’, but *se* ‘if’). In DR there is mostly Slavic *da* for both types of clauses, and another borrowed element, Slavic *ako*, for conditional ‘if’. This reflects the situation in Slovenian closely (see Table 12). Obviously the Dolenjski group has more innovations than the Italian variant—just like in its verbal paradigm with borrowed suffixes for the first and second persons plural. In the latter we still find a distinction factual vs. non-factual complementation and the old conjunction *ti*. There are still morphological forms for conditional irrealis and a normal negated preterite. In DR factual and non-factual complements have merged; moreover, they have been replaced by Slavic elements. Conditional clauses are expressed by analogy to Slavic constructions, and verbs appear in their truncated form. Morphological forms for conditional irrealis are lost. Even the negated preterite widely copies the Slavic pattern. The infinitive is used rather consistently.

15. Summary

To demonstrate the connections of DR to both the Arli and the SCD, we present a list of most of the features mentioned in this article. In phonology DR shares features with both groups. Where Arli has one development and SCD the other, DR often has both, as can be seen with the palataliza-

TABLE 12.

	Rom Sloveni (Ital.)	Dolenjski Roma
subjunctive <i>te/ti</i>	disappeared	disappeared
factual <i>ka</i>	declining; <i>ti</i>	disappeared; <i>da</i>
non-factual <i>te/ti</i>	<i>ti</i> ‘that’	(<i>te</i>) almost disappeared; <i>da</i>
cond. irrealis	<i>te</i> ‘if’ (<i>ti</i>)	<i>ako</i> ‘if’; <i>bi</i> +truncated verb; past
cond. irrealis	morphol. forms	truncations
negated preterite	<i>na</i> + preterite	<i>nije</i> + truncated verb
<i>dot</i> (subjunctive <i>del</i>)	existing (imp.sing.)	existing

tions. In its verbal paradigm (especially the copula) the dialect resembles Arli rather than the SCD. Exceptions are the non-extended present, the future suffixation with *-a*, the secondary infinitive and the form of the clitics. These are all characteristics of the CD (and Vlach dialects). The negations of the copula are not uniform and cannot easily be related to a certain dialect group.

Inflectional classes of borrowed nouns are partly as in Arli (feminines), partly as in SCD (masculines), especially concerning the plural suffixes and the frequency of declension types.

As for pronouns and prepositions, the connections to SCD seem to be stronger than to Arli—sometimes, as with *dečhi* ‘so much’ and *kada* ‘when’, only to single dialects of the Central group. The same applies to some lexical characteristics listed in Table 13. It must be stated that influences by other Romani dialects, especially Prekmurje, are probable. The birth lists of 1884 (Štrukelj 1980: 40) already show intermarriages of the families *Brajdič* with Prekmurksi Roma *Šarkezi* and *Hold*. Some connections to the Prekmurje dialect and vice versa can be expected. The end of the list names three features linking SCD to SBD that are totally missing in DR.

Apart from its peculiar status with connections to both Southern Central and Southern Balkan dialects, DR combines conservative features on the one hand with rather striking innovations on the other. It could therefore be called an innovating dialect with some archaisms, rather than an archaic dialect with many innovations in the lexicon and in all parts of morphology, especially in mood and tenses. In phonology there are single innovations, such as the secondary aspirations.

Those features which look oldest at first sight are, however, most probably late acquisitions or losses: the absence of many Greek lexemes, such as the numbers; the infinitive in *-i* without a linking particle; and maybe, although there is no evidence of its former existence, the absence, that is, most probably loss of definite articles at an unknown time.

For an easier perception of the status of the dialect we give short lists of features that can be considered either as conservative, as definitely innovative or as probably innovative. As innovations we regard phenomena based on late Slavic or Italian influences. Some characteristics we can not call either ‘old’ or ‘new’ (peculiarities).

TABLE 13.

	Dolenjski Roma	SCD	Arli
<i>Phonology:</i>			
stress	penultimate	penultimate (>initial)	oxytonic
/x/ > /h/	/h/	/h/	/x/
old cerebral <i>ŋd</i>	> <i>r</i>	> <i>r</i> , partly <i>ř</i>	> <i>r</i>
-s elision nominal	in general	acc. sg. masc.	in general
<i>pe/pes</i>	<i>pe</i>	<i>pe</i>	<i>pes</i>
-s elision verbal	not 2.sg. pret., <i>has</i>	not 2 sg. + 1 pl. pres.	in general (except <i>xas</i>)
V-s-V > V-h-V	in general (Ital.dissim.)	in general, . +dissim	in general (except <i>xasa</i>)
- <i>lj-</i>	- <i>lj-</i> , - <i>j-</i> , partly - <i>l-</i>	mostly > - <i>j-</i>	weak - <i>lj-</i> , > - <i>l-</i>
- <i>nj-</i>	- <i>nj-</i> , - <i>n-</i>	mostly - <i>nj-</i>	> - <i>n-</i> , Gnijale - <i>nj-</i>
<i>Verbal morphology:</i>			
present tense	short	short	partly - <i>a</i>
future tense	- <i>a</i>	- <i>a</i>	<i>ka-</i>
3 sg. pres.	- <i>i</i>	- <i>el</i>	- <i>el(a)</i> , - <i>i</i>
old preterite - <i>t</i>	decreasing	existing (except Roman)	decreasing
past in - <i>as</i>	missing	existing	missing
other past	in - <i>e</i> (< <i>hine</i> ?)	missing	+ <i>hine</i>
pluperf. - <i>omas</i> etc.	missing (Ital.- <i>ome</i>)	existing	missing
'I am'	<i>hinjum, hinu, hino</i>	<i>som</i>	<i>hinjum</i>
'you are'	<i>hinjas, hinjaš</i>	<i>sal</i>	<i>hinjan</i>
'was'	<i>hine</i>	<i>sin, sina, sine</i>	<i>hine</i>
'was not'	<i>nahine</i> ; Ital. <i>nane</i>	<i>nana, nasja</i>	<i>nahine</i>
'is'	<i>hi lo, li, le</i>	<i>si, hi (lo, li, le)</i>	<i>hi</i>
'is not'	<i>nane, naj</i> ; Ital. <i>naj</i>	<i>nan, nane</i>	<i>nane</i>
infinitive	existing	partly existing	missing
<i>Nominal morphology:</i>			
nouns masc. in - <i>o</i>	- <i>o/-i</i> abundant	- <i>o/-i</i>	- <i>o/-ja</i> rare
nouns masc. in - <i>i</i>	- <i>i/-ja</i> rare	- <i>i/-ja</i>	- <i>i/-ja</i> abundant
nouns fem.	- <i>a/-e</i>	- <i>a/-i</i>	- <i>a/-e</i>

TABLE 13. (cont.)

	Dolenjski Roma	SCD	Arli
<i>Derivation:</i>			
-ibe deverb., -ipe denom.	strict	blurred	strict
function of -(a)ker	causative	iterative/intensive	causative
comparison -eder	existing	existing	declining
<i>Prepositions and pronouns:</i>			
'such a . . .'	savo, disavo	aso, asavo	asavko
'so much'	deči	ači, at'i, katt'i, Moravia adeči	azom, dozom
'every(one)'	sakon (sa+kon?)	sako	svako, sveko
'how much?'	keči	kiči, kit'i	kobor, kozom
'who?'	kon, kun	kon	ko, koj
'when?'	kada	kana (Vend: kada)	kada
'nothing'	ništo, nič, (niso)	ništa, NCD nič	ništo
pedar/upar	upari, uprjal	pedar/peder/upar	upreder
Slavic uz	uzo, uz, zu, zuro, uzar	uz(e), uz-ol-i, zaru, uzar	uz-ol-i, uzi
bi 'without'	brzo, bruzu < brez	bi, Prekmurje bri < brez	bizo < bez
<i>Lexicon:</i>			
kamel as a full verb	rather declining	existing	declining
dživel 'to live'	pp only	existing (e.g. Roman)	pp only
arakhel 'to find'	alači	lakhel (exc. Romungro)	arakhel
'to lift'	azdi	azdel (exc. Romungro)	vazdel
'to run away'	pret. našigelo, -i	džal naši	našel
'to ascend'	ukeli	Prekmurje ukjela	uklel
'to open'	izpo-p(h)ravi, poravi	phravel (Vend), poravel	p(h)ravel
<i>Missing in DR:</i>			
pumen/pumaro	missing	existing	existing
modal kampil	missing	kampil	kampil pe
si te 'must'	missing	existing	existing

Conservativisms

- Plural possessive pronouns (genitives of personal pronouns);
- Comparison with old *-eder*;
- Gender inflected third person preterite of intransitive motion verbs.

Definite innovations

- Suffixes of the first and second persons plural present, preterite, future, past;
- Analytical conditional irrealis with Slavic elements+truncated verbs. Analytical negated preterite with Slavic *nije*+truncated verbs;
- Loss of morphological forms for conditional irrealis (pluperfect?);
- Analogical levelling of monosyllabic verbs (*davu, lavu, nadi, nadži*);
- Generalization of the third person reflexive personal pronoun for all persons;
- Analytical comparison with *hede(r)* as a particle preceding the adjective;
- Loss of the factual complementizer *ka* in DR, dominance of *te* in Italy;
- Substitution of particle *te* by Slavic *da*;
- Substitution of old numerals.

Probable innovations

- Yotation of personal pronouns in Italian subgroups (*jou, joj, jomi*);
- Loss of the definite article in all subgroups;
- Gender-inflected third person preterite with transitive verbs;
- Loss of a linking particle in subjunctive and infinitive sentences;
- Distinction *te* 'that' vs. *ti* 'if' in Italian subgroups;
- Reduction of early loanwords to seven Armenian, seventeen Iranian and fourteen Greek lexemes.

Peculiarities

- Suffix *-i* for third person singular present;
- Past tense suffixes *-ave, -ehe, -ele*, etc.;
- (Pluperfect?) suffixes for conditional in Italian subgroups *-ome, -jese, -jele*, etc.;
- Second person singular preterite *-as/-aš*;
- Obligatory clitics with the copula (present);
- Secondary aspirations of reflexive personal pronouns;

- (Emphatic?) personal pronouns *me-ame* (Ital: *meamen, tuamen*), *meni, tuni*;
- *dot* as the imperative singular or 'truncated' verb of *del*.

The dialect also sheds some light on the mechanisms of borrowing: The transition from suffixational to analytical comparative is not connected with the loss of the old suffix and the borrowing of the Slavic particle as one would expect, but involves the old suffix as a preceding particle.

Acknowledgements

An earlier German version of this article is being published in Iгла and Stolz (2001) and was presented at the Fifth International Conference on Romani Linguistics, Sofia, 2000. We would like to thank Norbert Boretzky and all listeners who contributed to this version with a vivid discussion. We are especially indebted to Peter Bakker for his help with literature and to Jane Zatta for comments and material from Italy. We are also very grateful to Yaron Matras for explanations and suggestions, to Vit Bubenik for his notes on truncated verbs in Romani and the forms of *del*, to Valdemar Kalinin for information about the dialect of the Latvian Roma and to Lev Čerenkov for his comments about Siberian and Russian Roma groups. Elisabeth Cech helped with the translation. In Novo Mesto Duška Balažek's cooperation was of great value to us. Rajko Šajnovič provided us with many unpublished poems and with the glossary which he compiled.

References

- Balažek, Duška, and Magdalena Jazbec, eds. 1994/95. *Pravlice za Romske Otroke*: Novo Mesto.
- Barannikov, A. P. 1934. *The Ukrainian and South Russian Gypsy dialects*. Leningrad: Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
- Boretzky, Norbert. 1989. Zum Interferenzverhalten des Romani. *ZPSK* 42(3): 357–76.
- 1995. Die Entwicklung der Kopula im Romani. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 43: 1–50.
- 1996. Arli. *Materialien zu einem südbalkanischen Romani-Dialekt*. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 46: 1–30.

- 1998. Erli. Eine Bestandsaufnahme nach den Texten von Gilliat-Smith. *Studii Romani* 5: 122–70.
- 1999a. Die Gliederung der Zentralen Dialekte und die Beziehungen zwischen Südlichen Zentralen Dialekten (Romungro) und Südbalkanischen Romani-Dialekten. In *Die Sprache der Roma. Perspektiven der Romani-Forschung in Österreich im interdisziplinären und internationalen Kontext*. Dieter W. Halwachs and F. Menz, eds. Pp. 210–76. Klagenfurt: Drava.
- Boretzky, Norbert. 1999b. Die Verwandtschaftsbeziehungen zwischen den Südbalkanischen Romani-Dialekten. *Studien zur Tsiganologie und Folkloristik* 27. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
- Elšík, Viktor, Milena Hübschmannová and Anna Šebková. 1999. The Southern Central Romani dialects. In *Die Sprache der Roma*. Dieter W. Halwachs and F. Menz, eds. Pp. 277–390. Klagenfurt: Drava.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. 1998. Amaro vakeripe Roman hi. [Unsere Sprache ist Roman]. Klagenfurt: Drava.
- Heinschink, Mozes. 1978. La langue tsigane parlée en Autriche et en Yougoslavie. *Études Tsiganés* 24(1): 8–20.
- Holzinger, Daniel. 1993. Das Rómanes. Grammatik und Diskursanalyse der Sprache der Sinte. *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Pflege der Geisteswissenschaften, Sonderheft 85*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Igla, Birgit and Thomas Stolz. 2001. Was ich noch sagen wollte. *Festschrift für Norbert Boretzky*. Munich: Akademie Verlag.
- Konec, Fanika, Jelenka Kovačič and Davorin Kovačič. 1998/99. Za soncem — šu kham, Glasilo romskih učencev. Novo Mesto.
- Lípa, Jiří. 1965. Cikánština v jazykovém prostředí slovenském a českém. *Rozpravy Československé Akademie* Vol. 75/11.
- Sampson, John. 1926 [1968]. *The dialect of the Gypsies of Wales*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Soravia, Giulio. 1977. *Dialetti degli Zingari Italiani. Profilo dei Dialetti Italiani* 22. Pisa: Pacini Editore.
- 1979. L'infinitivo in Romanes. *Rendiconti Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere* 113: 35–54.
- 1981. Un racconto di spettri in Sinto istriano. *Lacio Drom* 17(3): 2–3.
- 1988. Dialetti zingari: Atlanti linguistici e nomadismo. In *Atlanti regionali: aspetti metodologici, linguistici e etnografici*. *Proceedings of the fifteenth congress of the C.S.D.I.* Pp. 539–48. Palermo.

- Soravia, Giulio, and Fochi, Camillo. 1995. *Vocabulario Sinnotico delle Lingue Zingare Parlate in Italia*. Rome: Centro Studii Zingari.
- Šajnovič, Rajko. 1995. *Pot/Drom*. Literarna zbirka Siga 21, Novo Mesto: Dolenjska Založba.
- Štrukelj, Pavla. 1980. *Romi na Slovenskem*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva Založba.
- Trdina, Janez. 1957. *Črtice in povesti iz narodnega življenja*. Zbrano Delo X. Ljubljana.
- Uhlik, Rade. 1947. *Srpskohrvatsko-ciganski rečnik*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- 1973. *Govori jugoslovenskih Cigana u okviru balkanskog jezičkog saveza*. Godišnjak X, Centar za Balkonološka ispitivanja 8. Sarajevo.
- 1978. *Infinitiv u romskom jeziku*. Godišnjak XVII, Centar za Balkonološka ispitivanja 15. Sarajevo.
- Zatta, Jane Dick. 1985. The metonymic role of language and the referential function in Rom Sloveni tradition. *Lacio Drom* 21(6 suppl.): 32–41.
- 1986. Narrative structure in the Rom Sloveni oral tradition. *In Papers from the 6th and 7th Annual Meetings Gypsy Lore Society, North American Chapter*. Joanne Grumet, ed. Pp. 124–34. New York: Gypsy Lore Society.
- 1988. *Gli zingari, i Roma. Una cultura ai confini*. Tćaini/Dossier April 1988. Padova: Cidi Triveneto.
- 1991. Čordi Čhip. Come i 'Roma' hanno rubato la propria lingua. *In Europa zingara. La Ricerca Folklorica* 22: Contributi allo studio della cultura delle classi popolari. Leonardo Piasere, ed. Pp. 47–54. Brescia: Grafo Edizioni.
- 2000. The use of Romanes in an Italian school. *In Language, Blacks and Gypsies*. Thomas Acton and Morgan Dalphinis, ed. Pp 187–21. London: Whiting & Birch.

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
B1	text from Fanika Konec and Jelenka and Davorin Kovačić 1998/99
B2	text from Duška Balažek and Magdalena Jazbec 1994/95
C	consonant
CD	Central Dialects

COMP	comparative
COMPL	complementizer
COND	conditional
COP	copula
DAT	dative
DIM	diminutive
DISS	dissimilated
DR	Dolenjska Romani
FEM	feminine
IMP	imperative
INF	infinitive
INST	instrumental
Ital.	Italian group
LOC	locative
MASC	masculine
NCD	Northern Central Dialects
NEG	negation
PART	particles
PL	plural
PP	past participle
PRE.	preposition
PRES	present tense
PRET	preterite
PROH	prohibitive
REFL	reflexive pronoun
REL	relative pronoun
RK	unpublished texts by Rajko Šajnovič
SBD	Southern Balkan Dialects
SCD	Southern Central Dialects
SG	singular
SUP	superlative
V	vowel