In this article I shall consider the place of the Romani (Rmi) subordinating conjunction te in relation to the equivalent words of the other Balkan languages: Bulg. Mac da. Alb te. Gk na. Rum sa.¹ I shall refer to these words collectively as the Dental Modal Subordinator (DMS), as they all begin with a dental or alveolar consonant, and all are used to subordinate verb forms in modal constructions. Following Golab (1964), Kuryłowicz (1956), Janakiev (1962), and others, I accept the definition of modal as referring to verbal constructions denoting ontologically nonreal events. Thus, for example, the act of going in Alb Dua te shkoj. Bulg Az iskam da xodja. Gk Theo na pa. Mac Sakam da odam. Rmi Me mangava te dz. Rum Vreau sa merg 'I want to go' is desired but not real. To this must be added the fact that the DMS will convey the aspectuality rather than the modality of the subordinated event when the main verb denotes a real beginning, middle, or end, e.g., Alb Po filloj te shkruaj. Bulg Az pocam da pisa. Gk Arkhin na grapho. Mac Pochnuvam da pisuvam. Rmi Me iay te hramonav. Rum Icep sa seri 'I am beginning to write.' This intersection of aspect and modality is found in many languages (cf., Aronson 1977), but the fact that the primary meaning of the DMS is modal can be seen from the fact that when it is used in isolation, the subordinated verb is invariably modal in meaning, either optative-imperative (directive)--English let, may, etc.--or conditional--English if. This can be seen from the phrase Alb Te ke kendoj. Bulg Da, pêa. Gk Na tragoudo. Mac Da pêam. Rmi Te giljav. Rum Sa cent 'Let me sing/If I sing...' which can be a simple directive statement or the protasis of a conditional sentence, depending on the context.² These four types of constructions, which can be called dependent modal, dependent aspectual, directive, and conditional, are the four basic types of constructions employing the DMS (Kramer 1983).³

The DMS is one of the so-called classic features said to contribute to the definition and distinction of the Balkan linguistic league. The use of DMS constructions as equivalents of infinitive constructions is considered typically Balkan, although, as Joseph (1983) has demonstrated, the degree of presence or absence of true infinitival constructions varies from one language to another. Nonetheless, despite the language-specific differences in the use of the DMS, it remains one of those features most characteristic of the Balkan languages proper. It is one which separates them from those languages which are spoken in the Balkans but are not truly members of the Balkan linguistic league, e.g., Armenian, Circassian, German, Hungarian. Even the Balkan dialects of Turkish, which, as I have argued elsewhere (Friedman 1982), contain significantly more Balkan features than Literary Turkish, can only calque DMS constructions by means of the synthetic optative, e.g., Lëzam gideyim (Mac Treba da odam Alb Duhet te shkoj) 'I need to go.' They thus lack the analyticity characteristic of the Balkan league. It can also be noted that the replacement of the infinitive with a subjunctive ke...
(que) construction in Judezmo does occur, but the infinitive is still more common (Joseph 1983:252-53). Romani, however, which is generally omitted from discussions of Balkan linguistics (but see Kostov 1973), displays DMS usage which is typically Balkan. In the remainder of this paper, I will take up two morphosyntactic considerations in the establishment of the position of Romani in a comparative Balkan context with regard to DMS usage.

The first of these considerations is that of the boundedness and markedness of finite forms and the existence of cooccurrence limitations. Albanian and Rumanian both lack the superordinate aspectual opposition perfective/imperfective but have morphologically marked forms occurring uniquely with the DMS, e.g., Alb _puth_ (2-3sg) vs _tē_ _puthēsh_ / _puthē_ (2sg/3sg). Rum _sārūa_ vs _sā_ _sārūa_ (3sg/pl), 'kiss'. Of the two languages' forms, the Albanian are more strictly bound than the Rumanian, as the the latter can occur by themselves in some contexts, while the former never occur without the DMS, e.g., Rum _Fie!_ 'Let it be [so]' but not Alb * _Jete_ *.

The three languages with a perfective/imperfective opposition—Bulgarian, Greek, and Macedonian—do not have special forms bound to the DMS (the DMS can occur with both aspects), but they do have limitations on the occurrence of the perfective present which involve the DMS. The perfective present in all three languages normally occurs only in subordination to a modal word or other subordinator, and one of the most common of these is the DMS; others include the future marker, words for 'if,' etc., e.g., Bulg _celuvam_ vs _ste_/ _da_ _celuna_ , Gk _filo_ vs _thá_/ _na_ _filéso_ , Mac _bacuvam_ vs _ke_/ _da_ _bacam_ 'kiss' (1sg imperfective vs future marker/DMS + 1sg perfective). The actual degree of limitation on unbound occurrences of the present perfective varies among the three languages. There is greatest freedom in Bulgarian, especially in the western dialects, least in Macedonian, likewise especially in the western dialects, with Greek in an intermediate position. Thus, for example, Bulgarian permits a variety of free-standing perfective presents, e.g., _Napravis_ _tova_ _i_ _vsičko_ _e_ _gotovo_ ' [If/When you] do this, and everything will be all set' (Aronson 1977:25). In Greek, independent perfective presents are limited to a few idiomatic expressions, e.g., _gyvē_ _dē_ _gyvē_ 'whether he goes or not' (from _ēite_ _gyvē_ _ēite_ _dē_ _gyvē_ ) (Kostas Kazazis: personal communication). In Literary Macedonian and the western dialects upon which it is based, unsubordinated perfective presents do not occur (Vidoeski 1962/63:92-94).

Romani, like Albanian and Rumanian, lacks a fully developed perfective/imperfective opposition. In the Balkan dialects, however, there are two present tense paradigms, a long form with final -a and a short form without it. Table 1 gives the present tense paradigms of the verb meaning 'do'.
In general, long forms occur in independent clauses, and short forms are used after the DMS and other particles. The short form also occurs sometimes in independent position, but the long form is almost never encountered in dependent position, as in the following examples:

1. Me kerava buti.
   'I am working.'
2. Me ka kerav buti.
   'I will work.'
3. So te derav?
   'What am I to do?'
4. Mi bori khelel.
   'My bride is dancing.'

Romani thus occupies an intermediate position between Albanian and Rumanian on the one hand and Bulgarian, Greek, and Macedonian on the other. In the case of Albanian and Romanian, there is a special limited form (hereafter, LF) which is uniquely bound to the DMS and vice versa. In Romani, as in Balkan Slavic and Greek, the LF is more or less bound to a set of words including the DMS, but as in Albanian and Rumanian, the DMS is restricted in its occurrence to the LF. Romani is also in an intermediate position with regard to the strictness with which these conditions are realized. Albanian and Macedonian are the strictest, since they do not allow the LF to occur entirely independently. Greek and Romanian are less strict, since such occurrences are permissible but rare, while Romani and Bulgarian are the least strict, since the independent LF is a normal, albeit contextually restricted, occurrence. Table 2 is a graphic illustration of these facts in the form of a continuum. In this table, the plus sign means 'is uniquely limited to/occurs only with'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LONG</th>
<th>SHORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
<td>pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
<td>pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kerava</td>
<td>kera[s]a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kerav</td>
<td>kera[s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kere[s]a</td>
<td>Kerena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kere[s]</td>
<td>Keren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kere[s]</td>
<td>Keren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1: ROMANI 'DO'?**
The second of the two morphosyntactic considerations is the divergences in the rules governing the use of the DMS. Taking the DMS as the point of orientation, there are four possible types of noncorresponding constructions: (1) nonfinite form, (2) zero, (3) other subordinator, (4) other subordinator with DMS. As an example, Balkan translations of the expression meaning 'before + verb', e.g., 'before I go' can be cited. Balkan Slavic and Romani all have simple DMS constructions: Bulg predi da otida, Mac pred da otdam. Rmi angial te dəav. Rumanian, however, has a nonfinite form (type 1); Greek has the option of omitting the DMS (type 2); and Albanian uses another subordinator (re 'that') with the DMS (type 4): Rum inait te de a merge, GK prin [na] fjogá, Alb para se tç zhkoj. As was already seen, all of the Balkan languages use the DMS alone in directive expressions of the type meaning 'let/may it be,' but these languages differ in the variant expressions used in this same meaning. Rumanian permits omission of the DMS (type 2); Bulgarian, Greek, Macedonian, and Romani have particles which can substitute for the DMS (type 3): Bulg, Mac, Rmi ned[a], GK är, Albanian, Bulgarian, and Rumanian permit collocations of other words with the DMS (type 4): Alb le tç, Bulg neka da, Rum hai sá. Similarly, Bulgarian and Greek permit the use of the DMS with verbs of perception, whereas the other languages do not (type 3): Bulg vidja da/de, GK side na/pou, but Alb pashe re, Mac vidov ka’ko, Rmi dikhiš ka, Rum am văzut ca 'I saw that.' Another difference is to be found in expressions of ability, i.e., after verbs meaning 'be able.' Rumanian (poate), Romani (șa!), and, marginally, Bulgarian (moșe) can omit the DMS, in which case Bulgarian and Rumanian use a nonfinite construction (type 1) while Romani uses a finite one (type 2). Albanian (mund), Greek (mπορε) and Macedonian (moșe) only have DMS constructions. In expressions meaning 'without + verb' (cf. 'before + verb' above), Albanian must use a nonfinite construction (type 1: pa + participle), while the remaining languages have a DMS construction (Bulg, Mac bez da, GK xoris na, Rmi bi (te, Rum șăra să), although Rumanian has the option of using a nonfinite construction, and some dialects of Balkan Romani (e.g., Maķkara and kaburdjije) follow the Albanian model (Marcel Coritade: personal communication), i.e., these languages have possible type 1 constructions. All of the Balkan languages have the option of a plain DMS or a type 4 construction to render the meaning 'in order to': Alb që te, Bulg, Mac za da, GK gia na, Rmi dëi te, Rum ca sá.

These various types of noncorrespondence are summarized in Table 3, where dashes indicate the exclusive use of a DMS construction and parentheses are used to indicate types which occur in addition to a DMS construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALB</th>
<th>RUM</th>
<th>RMI</th>
<th>BULG</th>
<th>GK</th>
<th>MAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMS</td>
<td>DMS/O</td>
<td>DMS&amp;c./o</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>DMS&amp;c./o</td>
<td>DMS&amp;c.(o)</td>
<td>DMS&amp;c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: DMS Continuum**
The data summarized in Table 3 is not intended to be exhaustive, but only to indicate the range of possibilities which must be taken into account in writing rules for a comparative Balkan grammar (cf. Kazazis 1968). Thus, although the same rules can account for DMS usage up to a point, there will also have to be a set of interconnected branching rules to account for dialectal variation and the different possibilities of noncorrespondence. The precise pattern of these rules is beyond the scope of this article, but it should be clear from what has been said that the Romani DMS occupies a central place in this Balkan phenomenon.
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1 The Romani data for this article are taken from dialects of the southern Balkan peninsula belonging to the group known as Balkan Romani (see note 8 for further details). These dialects are spoken in parts of Albania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey and, among other things, display Turkish lexical influence where some other dialects reflect Romanian influence, e.g., lafi vs vorba 'word,' dunja vs sumija 'world.' The other major Romani dialect group spoken in the Balkans (and also elsewhere) is often called the Vlah group, a name which alludes to the significant Romanian influence just mentioned. The phenomena described in this article are found in both Balkan and non-Balkan Romani dialects both in and beyond the Balkans, and they have been ascribed to the influence of other Balkan languages (see Ventcel' and Čerenkov 1976:314). The extent to which these phenomena occur in various dialects of Romani and the question of influence vs convergence are beyond the scope of this paper and require further investigation.

2 The use of Rum. sa in a conditional protasis is extremely limited in Literary Romanian and is generally dialectal.

3 By basic I mean common to all the Balkan languages.

4 In dialectal and some colloquial Albanian, sa can be omitted in certain contexts:

   (1) Mej, do na sjelšk gotat...? (Laco 1983:27)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALB</th>
<th>RUM</th>
<th>RMI</th>
<th>BULG</th>
<th>GK</th>
<th>MAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>without</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be able to</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>list/may</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2/4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3/4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see that</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[3]1</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in order to</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3: NONCORRESPONDENCE TYPES**
Hey, are ya gonna bring us the glasses?

This usage is not, strictly speaking, literary, however, and is nevertheless quite different from the Rumanian phenomenon, since some sort of modal marker must still be present. Unless otherwise stated, the data presented here are from the literary standards, as it would be impossible to give a complete account of dialectal variation in the space of this article. With regard to the fact that the Albanian subjunctive cannot stand alone, it can also be pointed out that Albanian is unique among the Balkan languages in that it has a synthetic optative, e.g., Qofsh! 'Let it be [so]!' The single slash indicates that the two words can occur separately or together; the double slash indicates that they only occur separately. It can also be noted here that some Greek dialects permit the future marker and DMS to occur together, as does Romani.

6 The Sop dialects permit an especially wide range of occurrences of free-standing present perfectives; for further details see Maslov (1959:242).

7 Unsubordinated perfective presents do occur in the eastern dialects, and the negator ne can function as a sort of subordinator permitting perfective presents even in the west, e.g., Zošto ne sednes?' 'Why don't you sit down?', but not *Zošto sednes?' Interrogation may also be a factor here, and in any case these examples are extremely limited, as they are in Greek (see Kramer 1983).

8 Some dialects of Romani have developed a type of prefixal aktionsart similar to that which is found in Slavic or German, but this does not appear to constitute a true superordinate aspectual system. It is possible that a nascent aspectual opposition is developing in southern Yugoslavia, but this process requires further investigation (see Jusuf and Kepeski 1980:114-15).

9 The treatment of intervocalic /s/ in certain forms is a question which remains to be settled for Literary Romani. The Arlija dialects preserve it, whereas the Dzambaz dialects eliminate it in, e.g., the 2 sg and 1 pl, and as a result also from the corresponding short forms.

10 Long forms can occur with a borrowed Macedonian modal marker, bi, which is used to form conditionals. The precise use and meaning, however, require further investigation (see Jusuf and Kepeski 1980:120-23).

11 There are dialects of Romani which permit the DMS with verbs of perception, but they are not among those being considered here, hence the use of square brackets for this particular case.

REFERENCES


Janakiev, M. 1962. "Za gramemite naric ∞an ivb u ≠lgarska gramatika 'segas ∞no vreme' i 'bude ∞te vreme'." Izvestija na Instituta za bu ≠lgarski ezik. 8:420-32.

Cambridge: Cambridge.