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Abstract
Romani unidirectional multilingualism is especially important for illustrating the significance of social relations in structural change, e.g. different feature retentions, relative conservatism in some areas of grammar and relative openness in others. From a typological point of view, the Macedonian Arli dialect represents a dialect that has been spoken by a population that has been sedentary at the lower end of the social scale but thoroughly integrated into society for centuries, and it thus provides an example of a situation in which both social and internal linguistic boundary maintenance have taken place in a stable contact situation of considerable duration.

1. Introduction
Unlike the other Balkan languages, which were the objects of a bi-directional multilingualism resulting in the convergence area known as the Balkan linguistic league, Romani (and Judezmo) experienced, for the most part, unidirectional multilingualism. In other words, speakers of the “classic” Balkan languages (and also Balkan Turkish) learned other languages and heard their languages spoken by others. Owing to their socio-political marginalization, however, Romani-speakers were of necessity multilingual but their language was rarely learned by others. The occurrence of Romani words in slang and secret languages does not contradict this principle but rather is the exception that proves the rule, i.e. an indication of the relative rarity of bi-directional multilingualism affecting Romani. Romani unidirectional multilingualism is especially important for illustrating the significance of social relations in structural change, e.g. different rates and types of borrowing and feature retention (as boundary markers), relative conservatism in some areas of grammar (e.g. stress placement and nominal morphology) and relative openness in others (e.g. the treatment of affricates and modal categories). Romani code-switching both in nineteenth century texts and in modern radio programs likewise reflects the social context of Romani usage (see FRIEDMAN 1995a). Moreover, although the formative conditions of the Balkan linguistic league were eliminated with the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire into nation states and the rise of Balkan standard languages, Balkan multilingualism continues to be practiced at the local level, and especially among Roms. It is thus the case that speakers of majority languages in Balkan nation states are more likely to know English than a minority language, as was demonstrated in the case of Macedonia by the census figures from 1994 (ZAVOD ZA STATISTIKA NA REPUBLIKA MAKEDONIJA 1997). In some cases the same is true of speakers of minority languages vis-à-vis the majority language of the nation state, i.e. pressures of modern globalization motivate them to learn English rather than the majority language of the state (cf., e.g. ISMAJLI 1988:18). Roms, however, are likely to know both minority and majority languages of the Balkan states in which they live. Of all the modern Balkan nation-states, Macedonia has the largest number of officially recognized minority languages as demonstrated by the 1994 census, for which, in accordance with the census law, all official documentation was translated from Macedonian into Albanian, Turkish, Serbian, Aromanian, and Romani. (Albania and Greece have similar numbers of minority languages, but not similar levels of recognition.) Moreover, Macedonia is
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the only nation-state in the world that has taken the use of Romani to such a level of state bureaucracy. What follows is a case study based on Romani usage (mainly Skopje Arli) intended to provide typological implications for the nature of grammatical change that occurs or fails to occur in contact situations. In examining examples of both conservatism and contact-induced change, I shall argue that the difference between conservation and innovation constitutes a grammatically instantiated maintenance of boundary marking within a language’s grammatical system. The distribution of these features varies from the pan-Romani to the locally specific, but from both sociolinguistic and typological points of view Arli is a suitable choice. From the sociolinguistic point of view, Skopje Arli is significant as the base of the emerging norm in the Republic of Macedonia that is used in education, bureaucracy, and the media. From a typological point of view, this dialect represents one that has been spoken by a population that has been sedentary for centuries (cf. FRIEDMAN/DANKOFF 1991), and it thus provides an example of a situation in which both social and linguistic boundary maintenance have taken place in a stable contact situation of considerable duration.1

2. Phonology

For Romani in general, the retention of distinctively aspirated consonants is a linguistic boundary marker at the phonological level in all the dialects (VENTCEL/ČERENKOV 1976:293). It is a distinctive feature that does not occur any of Romani’s European contact languages,2 and moreover it constitutes a phonological dividing line between Romani and relexified contact languages such as Calo and Anglo-Romani (MATRAS 1998:1). The feature is distinctive within native vocabulary, e.g. ĉorel ‘steal’/ĉorel ‘spill, empty, etc.’, perel ‘fall’/pherel ‘fill’, te ‘modal subordinator’/the ‘and’, ker ‘do!’/kher ‘house’; at the same time, however, since aspiration is limited to native vocabulary items, the feature sometimes serves to distinguish non-native from native items: ĉaj ‘tea’/ĉhaj ‘girl’, kula ‘tower’/khula ‘nonsense’.3

Some dialects also preserve a distinction between original /t/ and original retroflex /d/ as a distinction between two types of /t/ one flapped or tapped the other trilled (as is the case in Arli), uvular, or a retroflex tap, but this distinction is not shared by all dialects and in some cases may actually have been encouraged by contact with languages such as Albanian, which also distinguishes a tapped and a trilled /t/. It may thus function as a boundary marker locally,

---

1 Arli, whose name comes from Turkish yerli ‘local’ represents a dialect of long-settled Roms.
2 I am excluding here the indigenous languages of the Caucasus. Unlike the Ural mountains and the Aegean and Black seas with its connecting waterways, the border between Europe and Asia between the Black and Caspian Seas, is variably defined and geopolitically influenced, being variously placed at the Turko-Persian political border, the ridge of the Caucasus Range, or the limits of Russia proper (i.e., Russia itself as a constituent of the Russian Federation; cf. PROTHERO 1920:1, BETHEL 1949:74, 347).
3 It must be noted that there is variation in the consistency of the realization of the preservation of aspiration in individual lexical items. Both BOROTZKY/IGLA (1994) and PETROVSKI/VELIČKOVSKI (1998) have examples where both aspirated and unaspirated phonemes occur as variants in a given morpheme. In other instances, however, no such variation occurs. While the feature may have been weakened, it remains a vital part of the system. It should also be noted that in some dialects /čh/ has passed to /š/ and that the loanwords will be different in different dialects. The examples here are all form Macedonia. Citations in Romani employ the spelling system in use in Macedonia for both official and unofficial documents (cf. FRIEDMAN 1995b).
but not universally. Interestingly enough, in those regions where local Albanian dialects have merged the two types of /t/, so have local Romani dialects. In the Macedonian dialects of Romani, laterals behave as in Macedonian, i.e. clear before /j/ and front vowels, velarized elsewhere (see also CORTIADE 1988).

A particularly salient point of contact is the palatals, where Romani appears to be particularly open to contact-induced change. Thus, for example, dialects with Greek as the major contact language replace palatals with dentals, while those with Turkish as the major contact language lack dental affricates, as does Turkish. The fronting of velars before front vowels in the various Balkan dialects, especially in Macedonia, also looks contact induced.

The basic Romani five vowel system tends to be fairly open to additions from contact languages, especially in loan words. Thus, for example, front rounded vowels, schwa, back unrounded vowels, etc., are present in those dialects in contact with languages whose systems include such sounds (cf. VENTCEL’?ČERENKOV 1976:295-296 and BORETZKY 1991. In the context of Macedonia, however, the accentual system is another site of boundary maintenance. The western dialects of Macedonian all have stress fixed on the penultimate or antepenultimate syllable, whereas native Romani stress is oxytonic (albeit paroxytonic or even proparoxytonic if the word ends in an affix of clitic origin, e.g. dženéskoro ‘person’ GEN). In general, however, not only does Romani retain its stress on native words, but it avoids this same stress in European borrowings, although the difference is merged in the oblique, e.g. džépo ‘pocket’ (Turkish ceb), DAT džépóské vs džéno ‘person’, DAT dženéské; sfírí ‘hammer’ (Gk. sfýrí), DAT sfíríské vs vogí ‘soul, belly, etc.’ DAT vogéské.

Intonation is another area of distinctiveness. In the case of the dialects of Macedonia, instrumental studies have yet to be conducted, and so my conclusions are based on unstructured observation rather than systematic study. Nonetheless, it is clear and corroborated by numerous native informants that native speakers of Romani in Macedonia have different patterns of sentence intonation than native speakers of Macedonian, and the Romani intonation patterns can carry over from Romani to Macedonian when Roms speak Macedonian. Thus, for example, an ethnic Romani announcer on a Macedonian-language radio program is immediately recognizable to Macedonians as a Rom from his intonational

---

Note that trilled /r/ can also occur in loans, even where it is not etymologically justified, e.g. korro ‘blind’ < Persian kór. The Persian is also the source of Turkish kór, which, however cannot be the source of the Romani form owing to the vocalism and consonantism.

It should be noted, however, that dental affricates are etymologically quite marginal in Romani except in dialects in contact with systems where they are prominent or where /t/ and /d/ have undergone affrication, as in the Bugurdží dialect of Macedonia and Kosovo/Kosova.

The tendency to shift the stress away from the final syllable in the main dialect areas of Southern West South Slavic (the former Serbo-Croatian) known as the neo-štokavian acute is a similar phenomenon, albeit historically independent of the Macedonian insofar as the two are separated by the Zeta-Lovćen and Prizren-Timok dialects, which do not have this shift. In all these regions, Romani retains its distinctive accentual pattern.

BORETZKY/IGLA (1994:370) record šukáripe ‘beauty’, attributing it to Macedonian influence, but it could be just a loss of shift from šukár ‘pretty’ to the nominalizer -ipe rather than a retraction. In any case, there is considerable variation (e.g., sfírí is feminine in BORETZKY/IGLA 1994 and PETROSKI/VELIČKOVSKI 1998 but masculine in JUSUF 1974).

For the sake of convenience, I am including all such suprasegmental features as pitch, tone, timbre, etc.) under the term intonation.
patterns, in particular rises in pitch occurring where they would not in Macedonian.\(^9\) A difference has been demonstrated instrumentally for question intonation in Bulgarian Erli (GRIGOROVA 1998:52, cf. LEHISTE/IVIĆ 1980). According to several scholars, however, the intonational patterns of speakers of Sinti sound just like those of German (Yaron Matras, Norbert Boretzky, Birgit Iгла, P.C.). It is worth noting also, however, that in terms of language attitudes Sinti-speakers are much more endonormative than Arli speakers in Macedonia, i.e. there is a traditional value against outsiders speaking or learning Sinti whereas a non-Romani speaker of Romani is considered unusual but acceptable in the multilingual context of the Balkans. To this we can add the fact that in regions of east-central Europe where the main contact languages have fixed initial stress (Czech, Hungarian, Slovak), local Romani dialects adopt this stress pattern. This may have to do with other types of boundary marking (either linguistic or social) among those groups.

3. Morphology

In the area of morphology, the best known boundary marker is the distinction between what HANCOCK (1995:54) calls thematic and athematic in the declensional system, i.e. Romani substantives of Indic origin and those borrowed into the language up to the time of the initial contacts with Greek generally have a stem vowel /e/ before oblique formants, while later borrowings, i.e. those that took place after the presumed dispersal of Roms throughout Europe, do not. This can be seen in the examples cited earlier and re-cited here, e.g. džépo ‘pocket’ (Turkish ceb), DAT džepoške vs dženo ‘person’, DAT dženéske; sfýr ‘hammer’ (Greek sfýrî), DAT sfýrisko vs vogí ‘soul, belly, etc.’ DAT vogéske.\(^{10}\) Although the pattern itself may be borrowed, nonetheless, it is significant that it appears to have been adopted precisely before the diaspora (BAKKER 1997, cf. also CORTIADE 1991).

The adaptation of verbs into Balkan Romani dialects is usually carried out by means of a derivational affix (cf. BORETZKY 1993a:66) or compounding with verbs such as ker ‘do’, e.g. Skopje Arli mislinel (Macedonian misli + Greek present -in-), kerel sabri ‘endure’ (Turkish sabr ‘patience’), kerel komentari ‘comment on’, but also kerel buti ‘work’ (using native material). These methods are paralleled in the other Balkan languages, e.g. Macedonian kalajisa (Turkish kalay ‘tin’ + Greek aorist -is-), deflorisa ‘deflower’, stori aber ‘inform’ (Macedonian stori ‘do’ + Turkish haber ‘news’). In the case of the analytic adaptation pattern using ‘do’, similar patterns are found throughout the area in contact with Turkish (FRIEDMAN 1996:107) but may in fact be an inherited South Asian feature (cf. MASICA 1976:141-58). A

---

\(^9\)This type of boundary marking is attested in the United States. Certain intonational patterns are characteristic of African-American Vernacular English (AAVE) such that even in the Southeast, whose dialects are the basis for AAVE, it is usually possible for a native speaker of US English to tell from the beginning of the telephone conversation the race of the interlocutor. It is important to note, however, that while such patterns are associated with ethnic dialects in the US, many African-Americans are bi-dialectal while others, especially those who are from old northern families, do not speak AAVE. On the other hand, LABOV (1996:88-93) has shown that teenage whites whose main associations are with speakers of AAVE will adopt the same intonational patterns, although certain less salient phonological features (e.g. the change of velar nasal sonorant to dental in final position) may be lacking.

\(^{10}\)Some dialects distinguish proper names ending in unstressed /i/ from borrowed common nouns in unstressed /i/ such that the later are assimilated to the native pattern, e.g. Ajia Varvara askerî ‘soldier’ (Turkish asker), dative askerêshe but Jáni dative Janîshe (IGLA 1996:34-35, cf. also BORETZKY 1993a:33), but Sepečides dêrti ‘pain’, (Turkish dert) DAT dertske (CECH/HEINSCHINK 1999:21).
specific feature of the dialect of Ajia Varvara as well as some of the dialects of East Bulgaria is the conjugation of verbs of Turkish origin using person markers of Turkish origin, e.g. 
\texttt{beklerim, beklerdum, beklerimas, beklerdumas} ‘wait 1SG - PR, AOR, IMP, PLU vs., e.g., native \texttt{kerav, kerdem, keravas, kerdemas} ‘do’ (same categories). This is a relatively isolated phenomenon that seems to be an arrested development of language shift (cf. MESSING 1987:27-28; IGLA 1996:3, 61-65), but it is worth noting as a morphologically instantiated boundary marker in the morphology of the verbal system. Dialects in contact with Slavic can incorporate elements of Slavic verbal prefixation by borrowing prefixes that can carry lexico-aspectual meaning, e.g. \texttt{kinel/pokinel} ‘buy/pay for’. The distinction is a lexical adaptation of the Slavic imperfective/perfective grammatical distinction. In Romani, the opposition is not part of the grammar, although the lexical effect is difficult to translate: Here, the form with po-focuses somehow more on the completion of the act, on its telos, as in the following example:

\begin{verbatim}
(1) Avdive alo nesavo barvalo džambazi ko Muto thaj
vakergja kaj ka avel taja te kinel tut
say-3SG.AOR that FUT come-3SG.PR tomorrow SUB buy-3SG.PR you te dade star! Ka pokinel tut firojenca!
your father-ABL FUT pay.for-3SG.PR you-ACC gold.coins-INS
Today some rich Džambaz came to Muto’s and said that he will come tomorrow to buy you from your father. He will pay for you with gold (florins)! (JUSUF 1974)
\end{verbatim}

In any case, it is arguable that Romani does not differ significantly from its contact languages in the realm of adapting verbs to its lexicon insofar as it uses the same types of borrowed affixes and analytic constructions for purposes of adaptation. At the same time, phenomena such as the Turkish conjugation of Ajia Varvara or the borrowing of Slavic prefixes do not seem to be so much a matter of boundary maintenance as a matter of potential sources for shift -- to Turkish in the former case and to the development of grammaticalized aktionsart in the latter (cf. also the concept of \textit{fusion} discussed in Matras in this volume) -- which is unlike the situation in the noun, where Romani has developed a marker of differentiation specific to its grammatical system.

3. Morphosyntax - contact

When we move to the realm of morphosyntax -- the part of grammar that is most important in defining the Balkan linguistic league -- we find that the adjectival system and modal categories of the verb are sites of contact-induced change while categories pertaining to the substantival, pronominal, and tense-aspect systems are more resistant.

The synthetic comparison of adjectives, e.g. the suffix -\texttt{eder}, is lost or highly restricted in Balkan Romani and replaced by analytic comparative and superlative markers borrowed from Balkan Romance (\texttt{maj}), Balkan Slavic (\texttt{po}, \texttt{naj}), Turkish (da[h]a, en), etc., e.g. \texttt{baro} ‘big’ \texttt{pobaro}, \texttt{majbaro}, da[h]a baro ‘bigger’, \texttt{najbaro}, \texttt{embaro}, \texttt{majbaro} ‘biggest’. This loss of synthetic inflection and replacement with borrowed analytic morphology is a salient post-Byzantine Balkanism, i.e. one that developed after the first wave of Romani speakers left the Balkans for northern Europe. Those dialects that did not remain in the Balkans either maintain

\footnote{The prefix \texttt{po-} is one of the most common for marking perfectivity throughout the Slavic languages. Cf. in this respect also \texttt{lel} ‘take’ \texttt{dolel} ‘get’ using the Macedonian preverb \texttt{do-}.}
the old synthetic comparative in -eder with greater consistency, or devise other means to express comparison.

Borrowing even penetrates adjectival gender/number agreement in Macedonian Arli. Thus, for example, Macedonian adjectives are usually borrowed into Romani as invariants using their unmarked (neuter) form in -o, which corresponds to the Romani masculine, e.g. socijalno buti 'social work', socijalno arka 'social support' (Romano Sumnal, Vol. 1, No 3, 94.04.01). Both buti and arka are feminine (the former native, the latter borrowed), and so should take agreeing adjectives in -i or -e depending on syntactic position. Consider, however, the following examples -- both colloquial and written -- that display interference: buti normalni 'a normal job' (radio talk show, July 1994), kvalitetna evidentija 'qualified documentation', privatikani karane 'private reasons' (instructions to census takers, June 1994). The first example shows a Romani feminine singular ending, the second a Macedonian feminine ending (the phrase is feminine in Macedonian), while in the third example the ending looks on the surface as if it is a Romani feminine singular, but in fact it is a Macedonian plural, influenced by the ending of the language from which the document was translated.

Aside from the adjective, the modal component of the verbal system -- sensu largo -- is particularly open to Balkan or Macedonian influence. I am basing my definition of modality on KUJRTOVIC (1956:26), which takes 'ontological irrealis' as the meaning of the non-indicative. By this definition, both the future and the infinitive are types of modals, since the actions they describe are ontologically potential rather than real (cf. also Matras in this volume).

The development of an analytic future using an invariant particle derived from the verb meaning 'want' is one of the earliest identified shared morphosyntactic features of the Balkan languages, and the Romani dialects of the Balkans are included in this development. In the Romani dialects of the Balkans this future marker is usually the particle ka, which is derived from the root kam- (3SG kameh) 'want', e.g. ka kerav 'I will do'. This type of future formation occurs in both Vlax and non-Vlax dialects, but was lost or never developed in some non-Balkan dialects. It is interesting to note that in some dialects the opposition between long and short presents, e.g. kerav/kerava 'do 1SG' is reinterpreted as a present/future opposition (HANCOCK 1995:99, VENTCEL/CERENKO 1976:315). The dialects in which this reinterpretation occurs have been in contact with North Slavic, where the perfective present has evolved into a future, i.e. where there are two morphological presents, one of which has the value 'future'. Thus, in both Balkan and post-Balkan Romani, calques on futures in contact languages appears to have occurred.

The use of a possessive construction to express necessity and negated futurity is a Balkanism that has been calqued into both Balkan Romani and Balkan Turkish, despite the absence of a lexical verb meaning 'have' in many dialects of the former and all of the latter. Thus, for example, Romani si man te avav 'I have to come' calques exactly the Macedonian imam da odam, Albanian kam te vij (Geg Albanian kam me ardhë functions as the unmarked future). Similarly, a non-agreeing construction that is used for both negated existence and

---

12Romani does have non-inflecting native adjectives, but these end in consonants, e.g. šukar 'good, beautiful'.

13In some dialects, the particle occurs as kam, and in some the lexical verb itself preserves an old 1SG ending -- kamam vs regular kamav -- but none of these facts change the basic parallel with the classic Balkan languages (Cf. also BORETZKY 1998, 1999)

14In Balkan Romani, the long present in -a generally does not occur after modal subordinators such as ka 'future' and te 'subjunctive', but these are tendencies rather than absolute rules, especially in conditional clauses or when a progressive meaning is implied (see FRIEDMAN 1997b). Moreover, the long form is normal with the conditional marker bi.
negated possession is used for negated futurity in, e.g. *nae man te avav* ‘I shall not come’ cf. Macedonian *nema da odam*, (Balkan Turkish *yoktur gideyim*, FRIEDMAN 1982), etc.

All of Romani shows the elimination of earlier infinitival constructions and replacement with a particle (modal subordinator) plus finite verb form. This is a classic Balkanism, e.g. *mangav te sovav* ‘I want to sleep’ parallels exactly the same construction in the other Balkan languages. At the same time, the development of new infinitive-like constructions in dialects spoken outside the Balkans and in contact with languages that have infinitives (cf. BORTEZKY 1996a) is a further example of the permeability of Romani with regard to modal verbal constructions (*sensu largo*). A related Balkan calque is the use of *te* plus finite verbs to mark optatives and the protasis of conditional clauses:

\[(2a) \quad O \quad beng \quad te \quad hal \quad tumaro \quad šoro! \]
\[
\text{the devil} \quad \text{SUB} \quad \text{he-3SG.PR} \quad \text{your head}
\]
\[
\text{‘May the devil eat your head’ (JUSUF 1974)}
\]

\[(2b) \quad Te \quad si \quad tut \quad nieci \quad bori \quad mangibaske, \quad mang. \]
\[
\text{if} \quad \text{is} \quad \text{you-ACC} \quad \text{intent bride} \quad \text{taking-DAT} \quad \text{take-IMV}
\]
\[
\text{‘If you have the intention of seeking a bride, seek!’ (JUSUF 1974)}
\]

Conditional expressions involve combinations of calqued or borrowed markers in the protasis (calqued use of the subjunctive marker *te* or the adverb *kana* ‘when’, Macedonian *ako* ‘if’, Turkish *eger* ‘if’ with or without *te*) with calqued constructions or borrowed markers in the apodosis (borrowed Macedonian conditional marker *bi*, calqued use of the future marker *ka* with various tenses including present, imperfect, and pluperfect). Owing to its multiplicity of markers and calques, Macedonian *Arli* reflects the quadripartite conditional division of Macedonian (see KRAMER 1986): hypothetical (i.e. potential) vs expectative (i.e. future) and within each of these fulfillable vs unfulfillable (similar to realis/irrealis), although there appears to be some variation in the use of *bi* for hypothetical conditionals (see also BORTEZKY 1993b:88-89).15

**EXPECTATIVE FULfillable**

\[(3a) \quad Eger \quad o \quad manuš \quad te \quad na \quad džanglia... \]
\[
\text{if SUB the person not know-3SG.AOR}
\]
\[
\text{esapi ka kerel pe...}
\]
\[
\text{account FUT make-3SG self}
\]
\[
\text{‘If the person does not know’ ... one counts...’ (1994 census instructions)}
\]

\[(3b) \quad Ako \quad e \quad manušeske \quad isi \; = \; Eger \quad tejsi \; e \; manušeske... \]
\[
\text{if the person-DAT is = if SUB+is the person-DAT}
\]
\[
\text{‘If the person has...’(1994 census instructions)}
\]

\[(3c) \quad Te \quad gelem \quad ničeja, \quad ka \quad džana \quad kaj... \]
\[
\text{SUB go-1SG.AOR order-INS FUT know-1PL.PR that}
\]
\[
\text{‘If we go in order, we will discover that ...’ (Romano Sumnal, Vol. 1, No 3, 94.04.01)}
\]

\[(3d) \quad kana \; šaj \; ov, \; soske \; našti \; me? = kana \; šaj \; ov, \; soske \; me \]
\[
\text{when be.able he why not.be.able I = when be.able he why I}
\]
\[
\text{te našti?}
\]
\[
\text{SUB not.be.able}
\]
\[
\text{‘If he can, why not me/why can’t I?’ (Romano Sumnal, Vol. 1, No 3, 94.04.01)}
\]

**EXPECTATIVE UNFULfillable**

---

15Bugurdži also has postposed *bi* after the imperfect (BORTEZKY 1993b:90).
The expression of expectative unfulfillable (irreal) conditionals by means of the future-marking particle plus a conjugated past tense (usually the imperfect, cf. GOJAB 1964) is another classic Balkanism found in Balkan Romani that also survives sporadically in the Vlax dialects, e.g. ka sovava sine ~ ka sovavas ~ kamas sovav ‘I would have slept’. Moreover, in Macedonian Arli theSouth Slavic conditional marker bi has been borrowed. The use of the aorist in conditional constructions, however, argues in favor of Matras’ (this volume) interpretation of the traditional present/aorist opposition as aspectual rather than temporal.

The formation of the Arli imperfect by means of the long present plus the invariant third person imperfect of ‘be’, which seems to recapitulate the original morphology of the imperfect (long present plus /s/ -- see below) also seems to calque the use of Macedonian third singular imperfect beše as a generalized emphatic past marker, e.g. beše sum bil ‘I was’. Other examples of calquing such as the use of pe[s] ‘self’ as an invariant intransitive marker on the model of Macedonian se ‘ibid.’ also involve the verb phrase.

4. Morphosyntax - resistance

In the substantival and pronominal systems, Macedonian Arli and Romani dialects in general have been strongly resistant to change, while the tense-aspect system has shown morphological innovation that preserves semantic distinctions. In the substantival, despite the Balkan tendency toward analytic declension and merger of the genitive-dative opposition, Romani has been conservative in its maintenance of case markers and keeps a strict genitive-dative distinction.16 While the Balkan languages use dative clitics to indicate possession, Romani uses only possessive pronouns in nominal constructions.17 Insofar as Romani has

---

16 This is not to say that the nominal system is impervious to interference, but I would argue that in morphosyntactic terms it is nonetheless more resistant. This is especially true in Macedonian dialects, where, e.g., the old locative in -te is still in everyday use (e.g. JUSUF 1974). Similarly, the survival of the complex system of Romani deictics in various forms in various dialects is a distinctively boundary marker (see MATRAS 1994 for a coherent analysis). While the grammatical marking of definiteness via an article may be a contact phenomenon, the material used for the marking is arguably native (see SAMPSON 1926/1868:152), and is in any case not postposed as in Slavic, Romance, and Albanian.

17 Macedonian Arli is also among the conservative Romani dialects in its lack of a lexical verb meaning ‘have’. While dative pronouns can occur in constructions with ‘be’ to indicate possession, these are in variation with accusative and locative pronouns, e.g. si mange ~ si
clitic pronouns, they occur only in the accusative case. Romani thus lacks the accusative-
dative clitic pronominal distinction found in all the Balkan languages.

Another area of resistant syntax is in clitic order. In the Balkan languages pronominal
clitics precede finite verbs (although Bulgarian follows Wackernagel’s law). In Romani,
however, full form pronouns can precede the verb, but clitic pronouns must follow:

(4a) *Ola me ka lav*
    her I will take-1SG.PR
    ‘She is the one I will get

(4b) *Me ka lav la*
    I will take-1SG.PR her-ACC.CL
    ‘I will get her

One of the most striking morphosyntactic boundaries between Romani and the classic
Balkan languages is in the phenomenon of object reduplication. Although object reduplication
does occur in Romani, it is weakly grammaticalized and, e.g., in Skopje does not correspond to
the strong grammaticalization of the Macedonian system with which it is in intimate contact.
This is clearly illustrated in examples (5a and b), which I recorded in July 1994 from a single
broadcast of a Skopje Romani radio music-request program (*Gili pali gili* ‘Song after song’) in
which the announcer switched freely back and forth between Romani (5a) and Macedonian (5b):

(5a) *O Ajnuri thaj o Džemo tari i Švedska bahtaren e*
    the Ajnur and the Džemo from the Sweden congratulate-3SG.PR the
    pranden e Ramijeske thaj e Mirsadake aj e
    marriage-ACC the Rami-DAT and the Mirsada-DAT and the
    Safeteske thaj e Sadijake bahtarena o bijav...
    Safet-DAT and the Sadija-DAT congratulate-3SG.PR the wedding...
    “Ajnur and Džemo from Sweden congratulate Rami and Mirsada on their
    marriage, and they congratulate Safet and Sadija on their wedding.”

(5b) *Naza i Oli od Švedska im go chestitat brakot*
    Naza and Oli from Sweden them it congratulate-3SG.PR marriage-DEF
    na Rami i Mirsada a na Safet i Sadija im ja
    to Rami and Mirsada and to Safet and Sadija them it
    chestitat svadbata...
    congratulate-3SG.PR wedding-DEF...
    “Naza and Oli from Sweden congratulate Rami and Mirsada on their
    marriage, and they congratulate Safet and Sadija on their wedding.”

The obligatory object reduplication of Macedonian illustrated by (5b) was not reproduced in the
Romani as illustrated by (5a).

Romani object reduplication, while it resembles that found in the classic Balkan
languages in certain respects, also differs from them in fundamental ways that are related to
the preservation of the declensional system not only grammatically but socially. While it is true,

*mande ~ si man* ‘I have’ (literally ‘it is to me ~ on me ~ me). In any case, these count as verbal
rather than nominal possessive constructions, i.e. possession is indicated by means of a verb
phrase not a noun phrase.
as observed in many sources (FRIEDMAN 1997a, IGLA 1999, and MATRAS 1997), that the Romani case system is undergoing simplification under contact conditions in many Balkan dialects, the case system retains its vitality in all of them. Similarly, while object reduplication of the type found in the classic Balkan languages occurs in Romani, it does so either in completely facultative discourse-bound dislocations (as in 6a) or in imitations that can be taken as nonce syntactic borrowings rather than part of the grammatical structure (as in 6b; cf. also IGLA 1996:161).

(6a) O melalo pani na piena le ni o džungale ruva.
the dirty water not drink-3SG.PR it-ACC nor the bad wolves
“Even wicked wolves do not drink dirty water.” (JUSUF 1996:125)

(6b) E Rifatos pendžarav, e čhaja da pendžarav, ama man
the Rifat-ACC know-1SG.PR the daughter-ACC and know-1SG.PR but me
ma axmize man kidisave bucende ridžaj kerav tuke.
don’t embroil me this work-PL.LOC request make-1SG.PR you-DAT
“I know Rifat and I know his daughter, but don’t mix me up in this business, I beg of you.” (JUSUF 1974:14)18

Note especially that (6b) contains the same type of pre-posed direct objects as (6a), but without reduplication.19 Romani object reduplication is thus not the type of grammaticalized requisite characteristic of the classic Balkan languages. The one type of obligatory object reduplication involves possessive contractions of a type not found in any of the Balkan languages, as illustrated in (7):

(7) I daj sija duj čhave
the mother is her-ACC two children
‘The mother has two children’.

In general, the Romani nominal system has been more resistant to change than the verbal, if we start from the fusion of Middle Indic postpositions. As Matras (this volume) has shown, Romani is conservative in its synthetic verbal morphology and tense-aspect system. The modal system, however, is the site of contact induced change. In Arli, the loss of the synthetic imperfect and pluperfect (probably connected with the loss of final /s/ which led to homonymy between the long present and the imperfect) resulted in a new form of the type present + sine ‘be-3SG.AOR’, which appears to have exactly recapitulated the original process of using an agglutinated copula as a marker of pastness (or remoteness in Matras’ terms). It is also worth noting here that the agglutination of Middle Indic postpositions in Romani has resulted in a case system whose semantics recapitulate those of Old Indic (FRIEDMAN 1991).20

---

18 The speaker here is using Macedonian Burgudži pronunciation, but the construction also occurs in Arli.
19 Neither example involves potential confusion between subject and object, since the subject marking on the verb is unambiguous in both instances.
20 These recapitulations are reminiscent of the situation in the Korča-Kostur dialects of Macedonian in the extreme southwestern periphery, where the loss of the inherited resultative participle in -l- and t expansion of a new perfect using ‘have’ plus an invariant neuter verbal adjective -- on an Aromanian (GOĻAB 1984:135) -- has resulted in a restructuring of the verbal system the result of which, in terms of
It should also be noted, however, that unlike the marker -as of most of Romani, the position of sine is still in progress not entirely fixed, as can be seen from examples (8a) and (8b) as well as (3e):  \footnote{Cf. also BORETZKY (1996b:23).}

\begin{align*}
(8a) & \text{So bi vakerela pes sine kaj to dad thaj me sijam} \\
& \text{what CON say-3SG self-ACC PA that your father and I are-1SG.PL} \\
& \text{dembelija} \\
& \text{laz} \text{y} \\
& \text{‘That would be to say that your father and I were lazy’ (JUSUF 1996:148)}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(8b) & \text{Emen so rakilo sine, a o vaki kerela sine} \\
& \text{at.once what become.night.PR PA and the time do-3SG.PR PA} \\
& \text{pes te rumungjol.} \\
& \text{self-ACC SUB be.spoiled-3SG.PR} \\
& \text{‘As soon as it got dark, the weather looked like it was going to get bad’ (JUSUF 1996:150)}
\end{align*}

5. Conclusion

From a typological point of view, the various system-internal boundaries in Romani between areas of the grammar amenable to contact-induced change and areas of resistance to such change suggest that the use of grammar for boundary maintenance in contact situations favors different parts of the system at different times and in different geopolitical and social situations. Moreover, it would appear that in situations of unidirectional multilingualism set in an historically bi-directional multilingual environment the social situation plays a significant role. Thus, for example, at the phonological level the preservation of distinctive aspirates is found throughout Romani, whereas conservatism is stress and distinctiveness in intonational patterns appears to be more likely precisely in those dialects whose speakers are culturally closer to and better integrated with the contact environment, as is the case for Roms in the southern Balkans as opposed to central Europe. The relative openness of palatal and the vocalic system to shift or modification suggests a lesser degree of salience in the correspondence of language to identity maintenance.

It is in the realm of morphosyntax -- which is the locus of the classic Balkanisms that define the \textit{Sprachbund} -- that Balkan Romani as represented by Skopje Arli suggests that \textit{Sprachbund} phenomena are subjected to grammatical filtering in languages that experience unidirectional multilingualism. Thus, there is a clear opposition between the relatively open systems of adjectival comparison and modality on the one hand to the conservative nominal, pronominal, and tense-aspect systems on the other. Both object reduplication and clitic ordering are distinctive, while voice marking is also more open to contact influence. Matras (this volume) makes the point that the current tense-aspect system may well have evolved as a contact phenomenon on Iranian territory. However, this was a period both of mass migration (as opposed to the sedentarism and local peripatetic practices that came with the European diaspora) and of contact with more closely related languages. It is even possible that there was bi-directional multilingualism. Thus, in terms of the typology of contact-induced change, Balkan Romani suggests that, like social practices, specific areas of grammar serve as sites of either adaptation or boundary maintenance with considerable stability over time.

\footnotetext[21]{Cf. also BORETZKY (1996b:23).}

verbal categories, is closer to Common Slavic than it is to neighboring Macedonian dialects (FRIEDMA\textsc{\textperiodcentered}1988).
Abbreviations

ABL ablative
ACC accusative
AOR aorist
CL clitic
CON conditional
DAT dative
DEF definite
FUT future
GEN genitive
IMP imperfect
IMV imperative
INS Instrumental
LOC locative
PA 3SG/PL preterit of ‘be’ used as an invariant past (remoteness) marker
PL plural
PLU pluperfect
PR present
SG singular
SUB subjunctive

References


