



# Forms / Morphology

4.0

Romani-Project Graz / Dieter W. Halwachs

*As for many other dominated languages, whose bilingual speech communities experience great pressure to assimilate, morphology is the most stable structural area. It does, however, also show certain aspects of contact-induced language change.*

singular	masculine		feminine	
nominative	<b>manuš</b>	<b>khoro</b>	<b>rakli</b>	<b>jag</b>
oblique	accusative <b>manuš-es</b>	<b>khores</b>	<b>rakl'a</b>	<b>jag-a</b>
	dative <b>manuš-es-ke</b>	<b>khores-ke</b>	<b>rakl'a-ke</b>	<b>jag-a-ke</b>
	ablative <b>manuš-es-tar</b>	<b>khores-tar</b>	<b>rakl'a-tar</b>	<b>jag-a-tar</b>
	locative <b>manuš-es-te</b>	<b>khores-te</b>	<b>rakl'a-te</b>	<b>jag-a-te</b>
	instrumental/sociative <b>manuš-es-sa</b>	<b>khores-sa</b>	<b>rakl'a-sa</b>	<b>jag-a-sa</b>
	genitive <b>manuš-es-kero</b>	<b>khores-kero</b>	<b>rakl'a-kero</b>	<b>jag-a-kero</b>
vocative	<b>manuš-a</b>	<b>khoreja</b>	<b>rakl'ije</b>	<b>jag-e</b>
nominative	<b>manuš-a</b>	<b>khore</b>	<b>rakl'a</b>	<b>jag-a</b>
oblique	accusative <b>manuš-en</b>	<b>khoren</b>	<b>rakl'en</b>	<b>jag-en</b>
	dative <b>manuš-en-ge</b>	<b>khoren-ge</b>	<b>rakl'en-ge</b>	<b>jag-en-ge</b>
	ablative <b>manuš-en-dar</b>	<b>khoren-dar</b>	<b>rakl'en-dar</b>	<b>jag-en-dar</b>
	locative <b>manuš-en-de</b>	<b>khoren-de</b>	<b>rakl'en-de</b>	<b>jag-en-de</b>
	instrumental/sociative <b>manuš-en-ca</b>	<b>khoren-ca</b>	<b>rakl'en-ca</b>	<b>jag-en-ca</b>
	genitive <b>manuš-en-gero</b>	<b>khoren-gero</b>	<b>rakl'en-gero</b>	<b>jag-en-gero</b>
vocative	<b>manuš-ale(n)</b>	<b>khore-ale(n)</b>	<b>rakl'-ale(n)</b>	<b>jag-ale(n)</b>

III.1 *manuš* 'human/man' / *khoro* 'jug' / *rakli* 'girl' / *jag* 'fire'

## NOUNS AND PRONOUNS

Romani has two genders, masculine and feminine, two numbers, singular and plural, and eight cases, which are also found in many other European languages. The case system is therefore typically European. However, the way in which the cases are formed is typically Indian.

### Noun

The double-stage nominal inflection consists of three primary cases – nominative, oblique and vocative – as well as five secondary cases derived from the oblique: dative, ablative,

locative, instrumental/sociative, and genitive [III.1]. It is most often the same as the nominal form in varieties influenced by contact languages which lack a synthetic vocative.

The oblique functions as accusative with entities that have high referential status. Otherwise, the accusative has the same form as the nominative. Semantically, entities that have high referential status are generally characterised as animate. This has led to the dichotomy of accusative=nominative : accusative=oblique with the semantic feature of [ $\pm$  animate].

<b>Dikhav manušen.</b>	'I see people.'
<b>Dikhav jag.</b>	'I see fire.'

		NOM SG	NOM PL	OBL SG	OBL PL	etymology	
pre-European	“zero” masc.	<b>kher</b>	<b>kher-a</b>	<b>kher-es-</b>	<b>kher-en-</b>	< inc. ghara	‘house’
	masc. in -o	<b>šer-o</b>	<b>šer-e</b>	<b>šer-es-</b>	<b>šer-en-</b>	< inc. širas	‘head’
	masc. in -i	<b>pan-i</b>	<b>pañ-a</b>	<b>pañ-es-</b>	<b>pañ-en-</b>	< inc. pāñiya	‘water’
	abstracts	<b>čačipen</b>	<b>čačipen-a</b>	<b>čačipen-as-</b>	<b>čačipen-en-</b>	< inc. satya	‘truth’
	“zero” fem.	<b>phen</b>	<b>pheñ-a</b>	<b>pheñ-a-</b>	<b>pheñ-en-</b>	< inc. bhaginī	‘sister’
European	fem. in -i	<b>kun-i</b>	<b>kuñ-a</b>	<b>kuñ-a-</b>	<b>kuñ-en-</b>	< inc. koṇā	‘elbow’
	masc. in -o	<b>sokr-o(s)</b>	<b>sokr-i</b>	<b>sokr-os-</b>	<b>sokr-en-</b>	< ron. socru	‘father-in-law’
	masc. in -u	<b>pap-u(s)</b>	<b>pap-i</b>	<b>pap-us-</b>	<b>pap-en-</b>	< grc. pappoús	‘grandfather’
	masc. in -i	<b>polgar-i</b>	<b>polgar-a</b>	<b>polgar-is-</b>	<b>polgar-en-</b>	< hun. polgár	‘citizen’
	fem. in -a	<b>vil-a</b>	<b>vil-i</b>	<b>vil-a-</b>	<b>vil-en-</b>	< sla. vile	‘fork’

III.2 Nouns of pre-European origin differ from European loans in their declension

This correlation is not fundamentally wrong, but it does not go far enough, because the independent oblique also has further functions. In possessive construction, for instance, the possessor, whether animate or inanimate, is always marked by the oblique, while the possession is expressed by the nominative.

<b>La rak'la si šukar bal.</b>	‘The girl has beautiful hair.’
<b>Khoren si jek desto.</b>	‘Jars have a handle.’

The oblique forms the basis for the five secondary cases: dative, ablative, locative, instrumental/sociative and genitive. Additionally, many varieties have developed analytic case formation, often replacing the locative. The ablative (case of descent and origin) is also affected by this development. In the course of this development triggered by contact with languages of the Balkans, “old” synthetic forms are replaced by “more recent” analytic formations.

<b>gavestar : katar gav</b>	‘from a village’
<b>gaveste : ande gav</b>	‘in a village’

Nouns of pre-European origin differ from European loans in their declension [III.2]. The declension of articles and adjectives is characterised by the dichotomy of nominative : oblique. The noun phrase is always governed by the head noun.

<b>o lačho raklo</b>	‘the good boy’
<b>le lačhe raklesa</b>	‘with the good boy’
<b>i terni džuvli</b>	‘the young woman’
<b>la terna džuv'atar</b>	‘from the young woman’
<b>e tikne čhave</b>	‘the little sons’
<b>le tikne čhavage</b>	‘for the little sons’

In the case of a noun phrase with a genitive functioning as attribute, government deviates from this rule: here, the article correlates with the attribute, which in turn correlates with the head noun.

<b>le vurdon-es-ker-i rota</b>	‘the wagon's wheel’
<b>le vurdon-es-ker-e rot-a-ke</b>	‘for the wagon's wheel’

### Article

The forms of the definite article show variety-specific variation. The article forms used in the above examples are marked in the following illustration. Generally, however, a tendency of reduction and coincidence of forms is observed primarily for the oblique. Only the differentiation between nominative singular masculine and nominative singular feminine shows some stability.

	SG MASC	SG FEM	PL
NOM	<b>o</b>	<b>i / e</b>	<b>e / le / o</b>
OBL	<b>le / e</b>	<b>la / le / e</b>	<b>le / e</b>

### Adjective

This tendency of formal reduction also affects adjective endings. Frequently, there are three distinct forms for six functions, with a fourth form for the oblique feminine singular in cases where gender is obvious or stressed.

baro ‘big’	SG MASC	SG FEM	PL
NOM	<b>bar-o</b>	<b>bar-i</b>	<b>bar-e</b>
OBL	<b>bar-e</b>	<b>bar-e / -a</b>	<b>bar-e</b>

	personal pronouns		possessive pronouns	
	nominative	oblique		
1 <sup>st</sup> singular	<b>me</b>	<b>man-</b>	<b>mindřo / mindro / mundřo / mundro / miřo / miro / muřo / muro / mřo / mro</b>	‘I’
1 <sup>st</sup> plural	<b>amen / ame</b>	<b>amen-</b>	<b>amaro</b>	‘we’
2 <sup>nd</sup> singular	<b>tu</b>	<b>tut-</b>	<b>tiro / tro</b>	‘you’
2 <sup>nd</sup> plural	<b>tumen / tume</b>	<b>tumen-</b>	<b>tumaro</b>	‘you’
3 <sup>rd</sup> sg. masc.	<b>ov / vov / jov</b>	<b>les-</b>	<b>leskero / leskro / lesko</b>	‘he’
3 <sup>rd</sup> sg. fem.	<b>oj / voj / joj</b>	<b>la-</b>	<b>lakero / lakro / lako</b>	‘she’
3 <sup>rd</sup> plural	<b>on / von / jon / ol</b>	<b>len-</b>	<b>lengero / lengro / lengo</b>	‘they’

III. 3 Overview of the personal and possessive pronouns of Romani with variations specific to individual varieties.

There are only a few indeclinable adjectives, e.g. *řukar* ‘beautiful’, *godřar* ‘intelligent’.

Comparison of adjectives is variety-specific. Besides the inherited suffix *-eder*, borrowed particles and affixes are used to form both comparative and superlative.

Burgen- land R.:	<b>baro</b>	<b>: bar-eder</b>	<b>: lek bar-eder</b>	<b>lek</b>	< hun
	<b>řukar</b>	<b>: řukar-eder</b>	<b>: lek řukar-eder</b>		
Bugurdži Romani:	<b>baro</b>	<b>: po-baro</b>	<b>: naj baro</b>	<b>po-, naj</b>	< sla
	<b>řukar</b>	<b>. po-řukar</b>	<b>: naj řukar</b>		
Kalderař Romani:	<b>baro</b>	<b>: maj baro</b>	<b>: maj baro</b>	<b>maj</b>	< ron
	<b>řukar</b>	<b>: maj řukar</b>	<b>: maj řukar</b>		

Adjectives of European origin are characterised by an even smaller stock of forms than those of pre-European origin, or else are indeclinable, as in the case of Burgenland Romani:

*lungo* < ron. *lung* ‘long’ / *dlgo* < srb. dial. *dlgo* ‘long’ / *brauni* < deu. dial. *brauni* ‘brown’.

### Pronouns

The table above [III.3] presents an overview of the personal and possessive pronouns of Romani with variations specific to individual varieties.

Most Romani varieties have clitic personal pronouns for the third person in anaphoric function. These are the regular nominal forms of the oblique forms of personal pronouns listed above.

<b>baro si lo</b>	‘he is tall’
<b>khamni si li</b>	‘she is pregnant’
<b>phure si le</b>	‘they are old’

As a rule, Romani has four demonstrative pronouns, from which articles and personal pronouns of the third person are also derived. Along with relative distance [ $\pm$  near], the demonstratives also encode specificity [ $\pm$  specific]. This makes it possible to choose an intended referent from a group of possible referents: the feature of [ $\pm$  specific] thus serves to disambiguate or explicitly contrast.

	NOM SG MASC	NOM SG FEM	NOM PL	
[+ near] [– specific]	<b>adava</b>	<b>adaja</b>	<b>adala</b>	‘this’ ...
[+ near] [+ specific]	<b>akava</b>	<b>akaja</b>	<b>akala</b>	‘this specific’ ...
[– near] [– specific]	<b>odova</b>	<b>odoja</b>	<b>odola</b>	‘that’ ...
[– near] [+ specific]	<b>okova</b>	<b>okoja</b>	<b>okola</b>	‘that specific’ ...
pronoun 3 <sup>rd</sup> person	<b>ov</b>	<b>oj</b>	<b>ol</b>	‘he/she//they’
article	<b>o (&lt; ov)</b>	<b>i (&lt; oj)</b>	<b>o (&lt; ol)</b>	‘the’

The interrogative pronouns *so* ‘what’, and *ko(n)* ‘who’ are pronominal nouns and thus decline in the same way as nouns.

The inherited negative pronouns *khoni(k)* ‘nobody’, and *khanči* ‘nothing’ are among others conserved in Vlax varieties. Many other dialects have replaced them by more recent loans, such as the Slavic *ništa* ‘nothing’. The same is true for indefinite pronouns, which also for the most part originate from European contact languages and display a great range of variation.

### VERB

As with the nouns, a morphological distinction between elements of pre-European and European origin can also be observed with Romani verbs. Unlike the pre-European verb

pre-European	European			
	Kalderaš Romani	Bugurđži Romani	Sepečides Romani	Burgenland Romani
<b>ker-</b> < inc. karoti 'to make/do'	<b>gind-isar-</b> < ron. a gîndi 'to think'	<b>izbir-iz-</b> < sla. izbirati 'to choose'	<b>jazd-in-</b> < tur. yazmak 'to write'	<b>pis-in-</b> < sla. pisati 'to write'
<b>phen-</b> < inc. bhanati 'to say'	<b>traj-isar-</b> < ron. a trăi 'to live'	<b>trešt-iz-</b> < sla. treštati 'to tremble'	<b>anlat-în-</b> < tur. anlatmak 'to explain'	<b>gondol-in-</b> < hun. gondol 'to think'

III. 4 The verb stem, with or without an added integration marker, functions as the imperative, for example: *phen!* 'say!', *pisin!* 'write!'.

stems, the verbs that have been more recently adopted from European languages are characterised by morphemes of adaptation and integration [III.4].

### Derivation and Valency

The synthetic coding of valency in Romani is identifiable as an Indo-Aryan inheritance. While the intransitive forms are formally uniform and display only functional variation, transitive inflections vary both formally and functionally:

bar-o	'big'	> <b>bar-ar-</b>	'to raise, to make big'	[factive]
dand	'tooth'	> <b>dand-ar-</b>	'to bite'	[factive]
ač-	'to stay'	> <b>ač-av-</b>	'to stop sb./sth.'	[causative]
ker-	'to make/do'	> <b>ker-av-</b>	'to cause, to make/do'	[causative]

Intransitivity is expressed by means of the suffix {ov}, which is often accompanied by palatalization of the stem's terminal consonant:

bar-o	'big'	> <b>bar-ov-</b>	'to grow, to become tall'	[inchoative]
rat	'night'	> <b>rat'-ov-</b>	'to dawn, to become night'	[inchoative]
dikh-	'to see'	> <b>dikhl'-ov-</b>	'to appear'	[intransitive]
ker-	'to made / do'	> <b>kerd'-ov-</b>	'to be made / done'	[passive]

### Conjugation

Verb conjugation is based on the present stem, which is identical with the verb stem: *ker-* 'make/do-', *phuč-* 'ask', *pisin-* 'write', *trajisar-* 'live-', *dandar-* 'bite-'. The so-called perfective stem is formed by extending the present stem with a perfective marker – *ker-d-* 'make/do-PFV-', *phuč-l-* 'ask-PFV-', *pisin-č-* 'write-PFV-', *trajisar-d-* 'live-PFV-', *dandar-d-* 'bite-PFV-'. The intransitive verbs usually use the suffix {il/in/}, with the addition of the same gender-specific forms used with the adjectives in the third person singular:

<b>bar-il-o / bar-il-i</b>	'he / she grew'
<b>ačh-il-o / ačh-il-i</b>	'he / she stayed'

The use of different present and perfective stems corresponds to the aspectual differentiation [ $\pm$  perfective]. States and actions that are completed from the perspective of the speaker are [+ perfective]; states and actions that are not completed, or whose state of completion or non-completion the speaker does not intend to specify, are marked [– perfective]. Similarly, the categories of number (singular, plural) and person (first, second, third) are also expressed by two different morpheme sets:

	1sg	2sg	3sg	1pl	2pl	3pl
[– perfective]	<b>-av/-au/-ap</b>	<b>-es/-eh/-e</b>	<b>-el</b>	<b>-as/-ah/-a</b>	<b>-en</b>	<b>-en</b>
[+ perfective]	<b>-om/-um/-em</b>	<b>-an/-al</b>	<b>-as/-a</b>	<b>-am</b>	<b>-en/-an</b>	<b>-e</b>

The morpheme sets exhibit variety-specific variation. The non-perfective endings additionally vary within varieties with respect to their vocalism: when the verb stem ends in a vowel, the vowel of the ending is assimilated to it.

<b>ker-el</b>		'he makes/does'	Kalderaš Romani
<b>pača-s</b>	< *pača-es	'you believe'	Kalderaš Romani
<b>traji-v</b>	< *traji-av	'I live'	Kalderaš Romani

The morpheme {/as/ahi/a/e/ys/s/} expresses remoteness in time and thus it functions as a tense marker in the form of the characteristic [ $\pm$  remote]:

<b>ker-av-as, ker-es-as, etc.</b>	[– perfective] [– remote]
<b>kerd-om-as, kerd-an-as, etc.</b>	[– perfective] [+ remote]
<b>kerd-om, kerd-an, etc.</b>	[– perfective] [– remote]
<b>kerd-om-as, kerd-an-as, etc.</b>	[– perfective] [+ remote]

formation	present stem			perfective stem	
aspect	[- perfective]			[+ perfective]	
tense	[- remote]		[+ remote]	[- remote]	[+ remote]
function	present / future		imperfect	perfect	pluperfect
1 <sup>st</sup> singular	<b>ker-av</b>	<b>ker-av-a</b>	<b>ker-av-as</b>	<b>kerd-om</b>	<b>kerd-om-as</b>
2 <sup>nd</sup> singular	<b>ker-es</b>	<b>ker-es-a</b>	<b>ker-es-as</b>	<b>kerd-an</b>	<b>kerd-an-as</b>
3 <sup>rd</sup> singular	<b>ker-el</b>	<b>ker-el-a</b>	<b>ker-el-as</b>	<b>kerd-a(s)</b>	<b>kerd-as-as</b>
1 <sup>st</sup> plural	<b>ker-as</b>	<b>ker-as-a</b>	<b>ker-as-as</b>	<b>kerd-am</b>	<b>kerd-am-as</b>
2 <sup>nd</sup> plural	<b>ker-en</b>	<b>ker-en-a</b>	<b>ker-en-as</b>	<b>kerd-an</b>	<b>kerd-an-as</b>
3 <sup>rd</sup> plural	<b>ker-en</b>	<b>ker-en-a</b>	<b>ker-en-as</b>	<b>kerd-e</b>	<b>kerd-an-as</b>

III. 5  
Overview  
of the  
conjugation  
and  
the verbal  
suffixes of  
Romani

The [- perfective] [- remote] forms have so-called long forms; these are the short forms extended by the morpheme {a}. The functions of the short and long forms are variety-specific: in Kalderaš Romani the short form is used as the present indicative, the long form for the subjunctive. In Arlije and Bugurdži Romani, the long forms are generally used for the present indicative, and the short forms are used for the subjunctive or as alternative present indicative forms. In Burgenland Romani the short forms are used for the present and the long forms for the future. In contrast, the Balkan varieties form the future analytically, by combining the particle {/ka/kam/kama/}, derived from the verb *kamel* ‘love, want, wish’ and the present: *ka ker-av* ‘I will make’. This is a contact phenomenon: analytic future formation is a regional characteristic of the Balkan languages.

The table above [III.5] presents an overview of the conjugation and the verbal suffixes of Romani.

### Mood as an Analytical Category

The modal categories of ‘being able’, ‘needing (to)’ and ‘wanting (to)’ are generally formed analytically and are partly variety-specific. ‘Wanting (to)’ is the most conservative and consistent modal expression in Romani and is usually expressed using the verb *kamel* ‘he/she wants (to)’, In the Balkans, *kamel* is often replaced by the verb *mangel* ‘he/she desires/asks for’.

<b>kamav te džal</b>	‘I want to go’
<b>mangav te xal</b>	‘I want to eat’

The modal particle *šaj* ‘be allowed to’ expresses permission. Its negative counterpart *naštig* ‘cannot’ serves as the negation both of being allowed (to) and of being able.

<b>šaj khelas</b>	‘we are allowed to dance’
<b>naštig lades</b>	‘you are not allowed/not able to drive’

The positive sense of being able can be expressed by verbs such as *džanel* ‘can/be able’ < ‘know’ or, as in Sinti Romani, *hajevel* ‘can/be able’ < ‘understand’.

<b>džanas te khelel</b>	‘we can dance’	Burgenland Romani
<b>hajevel te gijevel</b>	‘he/she can sing’	Sinti Romani

‘Needing (to)’ is expressed in several varieties by a particle that has developed from *si te* ‘it is, that’ by lexicalisation.

<b>iste džav</b>	‘I have to go’	Burgenland Romani
<b>hunte džanau</b>	‘I have to know’	Sinti Romani

In many other varieties, ‘needing (to)’ is expressed by more recent loans – including fully inflected verbs, impersonal verbs and modal particles – and sometimes also by functional extension of inherited verbs:

<b>mora</b>	< sla. <i>mora</i> / <i>Mora te džanav</i> .	‘I must know’	Arlije R.
<b>trubul</b>	< sla. <i>trebuje</i> / <i>Trubul te džas</i> .	‘you must go’	Gurbet R.
<b>mostula</b>	< deu. <i>müssen</i>	‘he/she must’	Finnish R.
<b>kamla pe</b>	< <i>kamela</i> ‘to love’	‘it is necessary’	Sofia Erli R.

### TMA-System

The traditional description of the verb system of an Indo-European language is centred around the category of tense. The subcategories used in this type of scheme are listed in the row “function” in table above. Usually, the main differentiation is between present and past, with imperfect, perfect and pluperfect being grouped under the general heading of “past”. However, in Romani verbs are organised primarily by aspectual differentiation, something which has generated a good deal of discussion and controversy. This was resolved by Matras

## TMA SYSTEM

Aspect is represented by the characteristic [± perfective]: the perfective aspect, which signals the completeness of an action at a time before the reference time or at the reference time, is expressed by means of a perfective marker, which is suffixed to the verb stem. ker-d-om 'I made/did' = completed action = perfective ≈ past, in contrast to ker-av(-a) 'I make/do' = non-completed action = non-perfective ≈ present or future.

Tense is represented by the characteristic [± remote], which is expressed by the suffix {/as/ahi/a/e/ys/s/} ker-d-om-as 'I had made/done' = [+ remote] [+ perfective] = action completed before a reference time in the past ≈ pluperfect; ker-av-as 'I was doing' = [+ remote] [- perfective] = action not completed at a reference time in the past ≈ imperfect.

It does not appear justified to postulate a true category of modality in Romani (which would be represented by [± intentional]),

because the only non-indicative form inherited from pre-European varieties is the unmarked subjunctive ker-el in Early Romani, which contrasts with the present indicative/future ker-el-a. In many varieties, this distinction can no longer be found. Non-indicative mood is usually expressed by means of a particle te, which means not-factual/conditional/subjunctive, and simultaneously has the role of a subordinating conjunction: te kerdomas ... 'if I had made/done...'

III. 6

(2002: 151ff.), who provided a cogent explanation in terms of the TMA system (TMA = Tense, Modality, Aspect). The next table and the notes appended to it [III.6] summarize the functional arrangement of the TMA categories in Romani.

	[- perfective]	[+ perfective]	[+ intentional]
[- remote]	present / future	perfect	subjunctive
[+ remote]	imperfect	pluperfect	

## Infinite Forms

The “inherited” infinitive of Romani has probably been lost under the strong influence of Byzantine Greek in which use of infinitives had almost died out by the time they came into contact and of the reduction of infinitives in the southern Slavic languages. Present forms are used as “new” infinitive in analytic formations of modal verbs by adding the non-factive particle, without inflexion for person or number.

kamen te xal	'They want to eat.'
džanav te khelel	'I can dance.'

The examples show the commonest form, which is the third person singular of the short forms. Participles in Romani are a [+ perfective] participle and a gerund, which functions as its [- perfective] counterpart.

Verbs of pre-European origin form the perfective participle with the perfective stem and the adjective endings -o / -i // -e.

ker-d-o / -i // -e	'made/done'
phuč-l-o / -i // -e	'asked'
beš-t-o / -i // -e	'sat'

In contrast, the perfective participles of loan verbs from European languages are formed using the suffix {/ime(n)/ome(n)/ame(n)/}:

hram-ime	< grc. gramma	'written'	Kalderaš Romani
----------	---------------	-----------	-----------------

The counterpart of the perfective participle is an uninflected [- perfective] gerund. Bugurdži Romani:

gele bašal-indož	'They walked while playing.'
------------------	------------------------------

## Passive

The intransitive derivation is also used to construct a synthetic passive, in the form perfective stem + {ov}. Varieties with unproductive intransitive derivation mostly have only a few lexicalized forms – e.g. maťojav 'I am drunk' in Burgenland Romani – and form the passive analytically by using the perfective participle with the verb 'become': av- or ov-

mard'-ov-el	'he/she is beaten'	synthetic
mardo ovel / avel	'he is beaten'	analytic

Another possible way of making the passive is to use reflexive forms. For example, Kalderaš does this, with recent loans:

obzervir-il pe	'he/she is observed'	reflexive/passive
----------------	----------------------	-------------------

## Special Formations

Special formations of verbs are common enough in Indo-European languages, and Romani is no exception in this respect. There are a number of irregular constructions and suppletive forms such as, for example, the verb 'to go'. The verb stem,

	Sinti R.	Bgld. R.	Kald. R.	Bug. R.	Sep. R.	Sanskrit	
1 <sup>st</sup> singular	<b>hom</b>	<b>som</b>	<b>sîm</b>	<b>s(i)jom</b>	<b>isinom</b>	<b>asmi</b>	‘I am’
2 <sup>nd</sup> singular	<b>hal</b>	<b>sal</b>	<b>san</b>	<b>sjan</b>	<b>isinin</b>	<b>asi</b>	‘you are’
3 <sup>rd</sup> singular	<b>hi</b>	<b>hi</b>	<b>sî</b>	<b>si</b>	<b>isi</b>	<b>asti</b>	‘he/she is’
1 <sup>st</sup> plural	<b>ham</b>	<b>sam</b>	<b>sam</b>	<b>sjam</b>	<b>isinam</b>	<b>smas(i)</b>	‘we are’
2 <sup>nd</sup> plural	<b>han</b>	<b>san</b>	<b>san</b>	<b>sjen</b>	<b>isinin</b>	<b>stha</b>	‘you are’
3 <sup>rd</sup> plural	<b>hi</b>	<b>hi</b>	<b>sî</b>	<b>si</b>	<b>isi</b>	<b>santi</b>	‘they are’

Bgld. = Burgenland; Kald. = Kalderaš; Bug. = Bugurđzi; Sep. = Sepečides

III. 7 Some of the variety-specific present tense forms and their Sanskrit equivalents

which ends on a vowel, *dža-* ‘go-’ assimilates the vowel of the ending. On the other hand, the perfective stem is a suppletive formation, *gel-* ‘go-PFV-’, and takes the gender-specific adjective endings in the third person singular, as is usual for the intransitive verbs.

<b>džav</b>	< *dža+av	‘I go’
<b>džal</b>	< *dža+el	‘he/she goes’
<b>gel-om</b>		‘I went’
<b>gel-o / gel-i</b>		‘he/she went’

Other special formations cannot be discussed in detail here, because they exhibit a lot of variety-specific variations.

Similar rules apply to the special form and functions of the verb ‘to be’. Some of the variety-specific present tense forms and their Sanskrit equivalents are listed in the table above [III.7].

With regard to synthetic forms, the verb ‘to be’, only has a present and past form which formally correspond to perfect and pluperfect:

<b>som : somahi</b>	‘I am’ : ‘I was’	Burgenland Romani
<b>sam : samas</b>	‘we are’ : ‘we were’	Kalderaš Romani

As a suppletive form for the future tense and/or conjunctive, the verbs *ovel* ‘to become’ and *avel* ‘to come’ are used depending on the variety. Balkan varieties form the future analytically, as shown above.

### Particles

In this section we will describe the core set of particles that is conserved in most Romani varieties. However, a complete treatment of all adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and other

non-inflected words in Romani cannot be undertaken in this article because of the high incidence of variety-specific variation. Some particles are explained in the section on syntax.

### Adverb

Adverbs can be subdivided into the derived modal adverbs on the one hand, and “inherited” or loan adverbs of time and place on the other.

Modal adverbs are derived from adjectives by adding the morpheme {/es/eh/e/} as a suffix: *bar-es* ‘big’, *šukar-es* ‘beautiful’.

The large majority of the adverbs of place belong to the Indo-Aryan core vocabulary. The deictics of place ‘here’ and ‘there’, like the demonstrative pronouns, have a set of forms that express the permutations of the characteristics [± near] and [± specific]:

[+ near]	[- specific]	<b>adaj</b>	‘here’
[+ near]	[+ specific]	<b>akaj</b>	‘exactly here’
[- near]	[- specific]	<b>odoj</b>	‘there’
[- near]	[+ specific]	<b>okoj</b>	‘exactly there’

In the Romani varieties spoken in the Balkans, often only the locative versions of the specific forms have survived, but they no longer have their original specifying function, and also exhibit wide variation:

<b>akate, kate, katka, ...</b>	‘here’
<b>okote, kote kotka, ...</b>	‘there’

Many varieties have ablative forms as well as locative forms:

<b>adaj, akate, ... : adatar, akatar</b>	‘here’ : ‘from here’
<b>odoj, okote, ... : odotar, okotar, ...</b>	‘there’ : ‘from there’

Similar locative-ablative pairs are also found with other adverbs of place. In contrast to the deictics of place, these have ancient locative and ablative suffixes inherited from Old Indo-Aryan:

<b>angl-e : angl-al</b>	‘ahead’ : ‘from ahead’
<b>maškar-e : maškar-al</b>	‘in the middle’ : ‘from the middle’
<b>tel-e : tel-al</b>	‘below’ : ‘from below’
<b>upr-e : upr-al</b>	‘above’ : ‘from above’

These adverbs of place often also serve as prepositions. If the preposition ends in a vowel and is followed by a definite article, they are fused:

<b>telo bař</b>	< *tele o bar	‘underneath the stone’
<b>upri bar</b>	< *upre i bar	‘on the fence’

If the particle ends in a consonant, it can act as a preposition without changing:

<b>maškar i len</b>	‘in the middle of the river’
---------------------	------------------------------

Romani has preserved only a few adverbs of time from Indo-Aryan. Some adverbs of time have arisen endogenously in Romani, but the majority are loans from European languages:

<b>akana/akan ...</b>	< inc. kṣaṇa-	‘now’	
<b>tehara, taha, tašja, ...</b>	< grc. tachiá	‘tomorrow’	
<b>dumu(l)t</b>	< ron. demult	‘a long time ago’	Kalderaš R.
<b>mindig</b>	< hun. mindig	‘always’	Burgenland R.
<b>artík</b>	< tur. artık	‘now, immediately’	Sepečides R.
<b>araći, arati, ...</b>	< adava rat	‘yesterday’	< ‘this night’

### Negation

The negative particles *na* (< inc. *na*) and *ma* (< inc. *mā*), which are inherited from Indo-Aryan, have different functions based on the characteristic [ $\pm$  indicative]:

<b>na kerava</b>	‘I do not do’	[+ indicative]
<b>ma te keres</b>	‘you should not do’	[– indicative]
<b>ma ker!</b>	‘don’t do!’	[– indicative]

In several varieties, including Kalderaš Romani, this functional separation is fundamentally modified by the loan *či* (< rom. *nici*):

<b>či džanav</b>	‘I don’t know’	[+ indicative]
<b>te na kheles</b>	‘you shall not dance’	[– indicative]
<b>ma av!</b>	‘don’t come!’	[– indicative]

An additional particle of negation inherited from Indo-Aryan is the prefix *bi-* (< inc. *vi-*), which is found in almost all varieties:

<b>bibaxt : baxt</b>	‘misfortune’ : ‘fortune’
<b>bilačo : lačo</b>	‘bad’ : ‘good’
<b>bilondo : londo</b>	‘unsalted’ : ‘salty’

### Conjunctions

The general coordinating conjunctions are *thaj* ‘and’ (< inc. *tathāpi*) and *vaj* (< inc. *va*) ‘or’:

<b>kalo thaj parno</b>	‘black and white’
<b>kalo vaj lolo</b>	‘black or red’

The subordinating conjunctions *kaj* (< inc. *kasmin*) and *te* (< inc. *tad*) are also inherited from Indo-Aryan. They differ in the characteristic [ $\pm$  factual]:

<b>Džanav, kaj aves baxtalo.</b>	‘I know that you will be lucky.’	[+ factual]
<b>Kamav, te aves baxtalo.</b>	‘I wish that you will be lucky.’	[– factual]

### Bibliography

An extended description of the morphology of Romani is presented in:

**Yaron Matras (2002)** *Romani. A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.