ICRL15

15th International Conference of Romani Linguistics

BOOK OF ABSTRACT

State University of Milan, Italy
September 13-14, 2023

ICRL15
15th International Conference of Romani Linguistics

Dear Colleagues,

we are pleased to announce that the 15th International Conference on Romani Linguistics (ICRL15) will be hosted by the State University of Milan (Italy) on September 13-14, 2023.

ICRL is a conference organized every two years that seeks to provide a forum for researchers working on Romani Linguistics. This year the program Our program includes 18 presentations of researchers coming from various countries and two key-note speeches. The present volume contains the abstracts of the presentations, ordered alphabetically by their first author.

We gratefully acknowledge the support of the State University of Milan and the Department of Literary, Philological and Linguistic Studies.

Scientific committee

Svetlana Ćirković (Institute for Balkan Studies, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts), Yaron Matras (Aston Institute for Forensic Linguistics), Mirjana Mirić (Institute for Balkan Studies, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts), Andrea Scala (State University of Milan)

Organizing committee

Giulia Meli, Chiara Meluzzi, Andrea Scala, Chiara Tribulato

Old and new materials on Calon, the Iberian Para-Romani variety of Brasil

Ignasi-Xavier Adiego
Universitat de Barcelona
ignasi.adiego@ub.edu

Manuela Anelli
IULM University, Milan
manuela.anelli@iulm.it

This paper presents our current knowledge of Calon, a mixed Romani-Brazilian Portuguese language, together with an attempt to classify this dialect within the framework of the Romani languages, specifically in the group of Iberian Para-Romani varieties.

Until a few years ago our only source was the old compilation and analysis made by von Sowa (1888), based on the materials from the two books by the Brazilian writer Alexandre José de Melo Moraes Filho (1885, 1886). Now we have very interesting new materials from direct sources collected in two works published by Dantas do Melo in 2005 and 2008. These materials are of great interest not only for the knowledge of the recent situation of Calon, but also for the decisive improvement of the linguistic information provided by de Melo Moraes Filho more than a century ago.

We will offer an analysis of these old and new sources that allows us to better understand the lexicon and grammar of Calon, its evolution and its relationship with the other Iberian para-Romani varieties.

References

Dantas de Melo, F. J. 2005. *O romani dos calon da região de Mambaí: uma língua* obsolescente. Brasília.
Dantas de Melo, F. J. 2008. *A língua da comunidade calon da região norte-nordeste do Estado de Goiás*. Brasília.
de Melo Moraes Filho, A. J. 1885. *Cancioneiro dos ciganos*. Rio de Janeiro.
de Melo Moraes Filho, A. J. 1886. *Os ciganos no Brazil. Contribuição ethnographica*. Rio de Janeiro.
von Sowa, R. 1888. The dialect of the Gypsies of Brazil, *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 1, 2, 57-70.

In search of the traces of a heritage language: The case of Hungaro-Romani

Zuzana Bodnárová
Centre for Language, Plurilingualism and Didactics, University of Graz
zuzana.bodnarova@uni-graz.at

Márton A. Baló
Research Centre for Linguistics, Hungarian Research Network / Eötvös Loránd University
baloam@gmail.com

Mátyás Rosenberg
Eötvös Loránd University
matyas.rosenberg@gmail.com

Para-Romani varieties, which have a Romani vocabulary but use the grammatical frame of another language, typically that of the co-territorial majority language (Bakker 2020), are known to have existed as early as the seventeenth century (see e.g. Adiego 1998 and Bakker 2002). They are also referred to as Romani mixed dialects and thought to be secret languages in bilingual communities (Bakker & van der Voort 1991). Besides the better documented Angloromani, Caló, Basque Romani, Dortika and Scandinavian Romani varieties, the more recent literature on Romani (e.g. Réger 1995, Stewart 2002) reports on the existence of a Para-Romani variety in which a Romani lexicon combines with Hungarian and is used by Romungro musicians in Hungary. An early allusion to a Hungarian Para-Romani variety can be found in Hutterer 1963, who describes it as the remaining elements of a Romani vocabulary integrated into the new language system. Our research is a first attempt to collect data from this mixed variety. Primary data come from the observation of the digital communication (mostly written posts and comments) of Romungros in public Facebook groups and on the public Facebook profiles of Romani influencers and were analysed in a qualitative manner. In our talk, we will present the earliest reports on this variety, dug up in newspapers from the first half of the twentieth century to discover its formation and emergence, and the sources that may be considered the earliest written documentation of Hungaro-Romani (Bartos 1958, Kovalcsik & Kubínyi 2000). Based on these and the newly collected data from social media and through semi-structured interviews, we will identify its lexical and morphological features, its sociolinguistic functions and the situations in which it is activated, also comparing them with better known Para-Romani varieties.

References

Adiego, I.-X. (1998). The Spanish Gypsy vocabulary of manuscript 3929, Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid (18th Century): A rereading. Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society, 8(1), 1-18.

Bakker, P. (2002). An early vocabulary of British Romani (1616): A linguistic analysis. Romani Studies, 12(2), 75-101.

Bakker, P. (2020). Para-Romani Varieties. In Y. Matras & A. Tenser (Eds.), The Palgrave Handbook of Romani Language and Linguistics. (pp. 353-386). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bakker, P., & van der Voort, H. (1991). Para-Romani languages: an overview and some speculations on their genesis. In P. Bakker & M. Cortiade (Eds.), In the Margin of Romani: Gypsy languages in contact. Studies in Language Contact I. (pp. 16-44). Amsterdam: Publikaties van het Instituut voor Algemene Taalwetenschap 58.

Bartos, T. (1958). Sosemvolt cigányország. Budapest: Európa.

Hutterer, M. (1963). A romani (cigány) nyelvjárások magyar elemei. Nyelvtudományi értekezések (40), 139-147.

Kovalcsik, K., & Kubínyi, Zs. (2000). A csenyétei daloskert. Magyarcigány iskolai énekeskönyv. Pécs: Gandhi Közalapítványi Gimnázium és Kollégium.

Réger, Z. (1995). The language of Gypsies in Hungary: an overview of research. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 111, 79-91.

Stewart, M. (2002). Deprivation, the Roma and 'the underclass'. In C. M. Hann (Ed.), Postsocialism: Ideals, ideologies and practices in Eurasia. (pp. 133-155). London: Routledge.

Presenting LSDT: a Dependency Treebank of Lombard Sinti

Luca Brigada Villa
University of Bergamo/Pavia
luca.brigadavilla@unibg.it

Marco Forlano
University of Bergamo/Pavia
marco.forlano@unibg.it

In this paper, we present an ongoing endeavor to construct LSDT, a Dependency Treebank of Lombard Sinti (Forlano/Brigada Villa, 2023). In particular, we describe the annotation we performed and the current state of the resource.

Treebanks are collections of sentences with morphological and syntactic annotations. The annotation scheme follows the Universal Dependencies (UD) framework (de Marneffe et al., 2021), which has the goal to be cross-linguistically consistent in order to facilitate research from a typological perspective. To date, UD provides more than 200 treebanks for around 130 languages. However, minority languages are still rather underrepresented, and Romani varieties are totally absent.

Lombard Sinti is a variety of Romani spoken in Northern Italy, with a core area in the region of Lombardy (Soravia, 1977). The language lacks any recognition by Italian legislation; however, it is still quite vital, being learned by most children as L1 and maintaining strong identity functions in the community (Scala, 2012).

LSDT, which is scheduled for release in May 2023, currently comprises 100 sentences extracted from the Lombard Sinti sample of the Romani Morpho-Syntax Database[1] (Matras et al., 2009). To annotate the data, we used UD-Annotatrix (Tyers et al., 2017), a tool that allows uploading files formatted in CoNLLU and annotating them. The annotation involved the following steps: tokenization, lemmatization, POS tagging, morphological annotation, and syntactic annotation. The tokenization was first accomplished by considering the spaces between words in the sentences as we took them from the Romani Moprho-Syntax Database; in a second phase, some manual corrections were applied in order to adhere to the UD conventions on tokenization[2]. The tokenization task resulted in 990 tokens overall. To carry out the lemmatization, we supplemented the conventions informing the lexicographic material available on Lombard Sinti

---

[1] https://romani.humanities.manchester.ac.uk//rms/browse/phrases/phraselist
[2] https://universaldependencies.org/u/overview/tokenization.html

(cf. e.g. the *Dizionario Sinottico delle Parlate Zingare in Italia*[3], Soravia/Fochi 1995) with those widespread in the field of Romani Linguistics. Finally, to annotate the syntactic dependencies, the UD annotation scheme was adapted to some language-specific constructions, many of which will be discussed in detail in a comparative, cross-linguistic perspective.

To sum up, in this paper we will present the status of LSDT by describing the annotation process we followed, the methodological problems it has posed, and the choices we made to overcome them. In addition, we will explore future developments and practical uses of the resource, which include: (i) expanding the treebank with other sentences from different types of texts (both written and oral), and (ii) training a parser to automatically annotate other texts in Lombard Sinti and to build models useful for transferring information and annotating texts in other Romani varieties.

References

Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Christopher D. Manning, Joakim Nivre, and Daniel Zeman. 2021. Universal Dependencies. *Computational Linguistics*, 47(2):255–308.

Marco Forlano and Luca Brigada Villa. 2023. LSDT: a Dependency Treebank of Lombard Sinti. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Workshop on the Use of Computational Methods in the Study of Endangered Languages*, pages 104–111, Remote. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Andrea Scala. 2012. Purché la lingua non sia una sola. Trasformazione dei repertori e conservazione del plurilinguismo presso i sinti italiani dall'Unità ad oggi. In *Coesistenze linguistiche nell'Italia pre- e postunitaria, Congresso Internazionale di Studi della Società di Linguistica Italiana (SLI)*, pages 437–448, Rome. Bulzoni.

Giulio Soravia. 1977. *Dialetti degli zingari italiani*. Pacini, Pisa.

Giulio Soravia and Camillo Fochi. 1995. *Vocabolario sinottico delle lingue zingare parlate in Italia*. Centro Studi Zingari, Rome.

Francis M. Tyers, Mariya Sheyanova, and Jonathan North Washington. 2017. UD annotatrix: An annotation tool for Universal Dependencies. In P*roceedings of the 16th International Workshop on Treebanks and Linguistic Theories*, pages 10–17, Prague, Czech Republic.

---

[3] Synoptic Dictionary of Gypsy Speeches in Italy.

Non-argumental use of the dative of personal and reflexive pronouns in Gurbet Romani (eastern serbia)

Svetlana Ćirković

Institute for Balkan Studies, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts
svetlana.cirkovic@bi.sanu.ac.rs

This study aims at exploring the non-argumental use of the dative of personal and reflexive pronouns (PPs and RP, respectively) in the Gurbet Romani variety spoken in Eastern Serbia (e.g., (1) *phenav ka bešav amije*$_{dat}$ 'I say I will be sitting'; (2) *vov džaltar pese*$_{dat}$ 'He is going').

The non-argumental use of the of PPs and RP is a feature present in many European and non-European languages (cf. Janda 1993, Arsenijević 2013, Petrova&Sokolov 2016, Ćirković 2021), including Romani. It refers to the speaker's evaluation of the eventuality in which it takes part (Uhlik 1973, Arsenijević 2013), or subjective perception of the event (Janda 1993), and its use is neither related to the verb arguments nor to the nominal phrase. Previous research on Romani lacks a detailed analysis of this feature. It has been typically marked as a 'pseudo-constituent with an evaluative reading' (Matras 2002: 101, Leggio 2011: 75). However, several Romani varieties, such as Serbian Kalderaš, Kosovan Bugurdži, Arli in Macedonia, Kosovo, and Southern Serbia (cf. Boretzky's 1993–1996) employ the 'reflexive dative' (Meyer 2020: 275), which is also called the 'dative of inner involvement' (Boretzky 1994: 167). Meyer (2020) considers it as a feature induced by the contact between Romani and Balkan Slavic varieties.

The corpus for the research consists of transcripts of conversation with 12 adult speakers and 20 elementary school children, all bilingual in Gurbet Romani and Serbian, recorded from 2016 to 2018. The corpus contains approximately 16,000 word tokens (8,380 in the adults' sample and 7,895 in the children's sample). The corpus is manually annotated for person and number of the PPs, RPs, verb transitivity and the semantic class of the verbs.

In the corpus, 87 examples of the 'reflexive dative' were attested. The most frequent forms of dative of PPs used in a 'reflexive function' are 1sg/1pl (59 examples), whereas 2sg is attested in only 5 examples. The 3sg/3pl use the same form *pese* (RP) registered in 23 examples. The 'reflexive dative' is used in the juxtaposition of 20 different verbs, which belong to different semantic classes.

The results will be discussed in relation to the following points of the qualitative analysis:

1) Can the use of the reflexive dative contribute to establishing the exact meaning of some verbs in the context, e.g. *ćhelel* 'to play' or 'to dance' (e.g., (3) *I ondak amen <u>ćhelas amije</u> po drom* 'And then we <u>play</u> with each other in the street'; (4) *I djilabel celo djive, amen <u>ćhelas</u>* 'And (s/he) sings the whole day, we <u>dance</u>' or (5) *Me kana džav uvek me <u>ćhelas fudbal</u>* 'When I go, I always <u>play football</u>')?

2) Can the dative of PPs and RP be interpreted as the reflexive dative, given the more frequent use of ditransitive verbs (e.g., *lel* 'to take', among others) without the dative of PPs and RP (e.g, (6) *Sose Rroma uvek borin pe te <u>lel</u> mruš bakro* 'Why does the Roma always struggle to <u>take</u> male lamb')?

3) Can the dative reflexive be interpreted as a pseudo-constituent, given its low frequency and the more frequent use of the same verb (regardless of their semantic class) without the reflexive dative?

References

Arsenijević, Boban. 2013. "Evaluative reflexions: evaluative dative reflexive in southeast Serbo-Croatian". In B. Fernandez and R. Etxepare (eds.). *Variations in datives: a microcomparative perspective*. Oxford: Oxford university press, 1–21.

Boretzky, Norbert. 1993. *Bugurdži. Deskriptiver und historischer Abriß eines Romani-Dialekts*. Berlin: Harrassowitz.

Boretzky, Norbert. 1994. *Romani. Grammatik des Kalderaš-Dialekts mit Texten und Glossar*. Berlin: Harrassowitz.

Boretzky, Norbert. 1996. "Arli. Materialen zu einem südbalkanischen Romani-Dialekt". *grazer linguistische studien* 46: 1–30.

Ćirković, Svetlana. 2021. "Nezamenička upotreba enklitičkog oblika dativa refleksivne zamenice *si* u timočkim govorima: sintaksički obrasci". Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku LXIV/1: 97–114.

Janda, Laura A. 1993. *A Geography of Case Semantics. The Czech Dative and the Russian Instrumental*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Leggio, Daniele Viktor. 2011. "The Dialect of Mitrovica Roma". *Romani Studies* 5, vol. 21, no. 1: 57–114.

Matras, Yaron. 2002. *Romani. A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Meyer, Anna-Maria. 2020. "The Impact of Slavic Languages on Romani". In Y. Matras and A. Tenser (eds.). *The Palgrave Handbook of Romani Language and Linguistics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Petrova, Galina, Ivan Sokolov. 2016. "Bulgarian-English Parallels in the Translations of Structures with the Modal Particle *cu* (*si*)". *Годишник на Университет „Проф. д-р Асен Златаров"* XLV/2: 90–94.

Uhlik, Rade. 1973. "Govori jugoslovenskih Cigana u okviru Balkanskog jezičkog saveza". *Godišnjak*, knjiga 10, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, knjiga 8: 53–108. Sarajevo: akademija nauka Bosne i Herzegovine.

Sibilant shifts in Northern Gemer Romani

Viktor Elšík
Department of Linguistics, Charles University, Prague
viktor.elsik@ff.cuni.cz

The Northern Gemer dialect is a cluster of closely related local varieties of North Central Romani spoken in the northeast of the Gemer region of Slovakia (Elšík 2020). The dialect stands out in having undergone a perceptively salient series of shifts in the place of articulation of sibilants, which clearly delimit the dialect against neighbouring dialect regions and, at the same time, result in a phonologically uneconomical and typologically rare (if not unique) system of sibilants (cf. e.g. Gordon 2016, Kümmel 2007, Melikischwili 1970, Narty 1979). The previous description of the sibilant shifts was based on relatively limited data from two local varieties of the dialect (Elšík *et al.* 1999: 302–303; cf. also Matras 2002: 52–53 and Baló 2020: 141). In this paper, I will provide a more detailed description of the dialect's sibilant system, drawing on newly acquired fieldwork data and discussing both developments within the sibilant system and developments of sibilants from non-sibilant consonants. While some of the changes may be motivated by phonological convergence due to the speakers' bilingualism in a contact language, other changes require an internal explanation and a reference to universal tendencies of sound change and to structural phonological parameters (Elšík 2020).

References

Baló, Márton A. 2020. Romani phonology. In: Matras, Yaron – Tenser, Anton (eds.). *The Palgrave handbook of Romani language and linguistics*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. 199–153.

Elšík, Viktor. 2020. Severogemerský (tzv. šoškárský) dialekt romštiny a jeho fonologická specifika. *Romano džaniben* 27 (1): 91–134.

Elšík, Viktor – Hübschmannová, Milena – Šebková, Hana. 1999. The Southern Central (*ahi*-imperfect) Romani dialects of Slovakia and northern Hungary. In: Halwachs, Dieter W. – Menz, Florian (eds.). *Die Sprache der Roma: Perspektiven der Romani-Forschung in Österreich im interdisziplinären und internationalen Kontext*. Klagenfurt: Drava. 277–390.

Gordon, Matthew K. 2016. *Phonological typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kümmel, Martin J. 2007. *Konsonantenwandel: Bausteine zu einer Typologie des Lautwandels und ihre Konsequenzen für die vergleichende Rekonstruktion*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Matras, Yaron. 2002. *Romani: a linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Melikischwili, I. G. 1970. Einige universale Gesetzmässigkeiten in dem System der Affrikaten. In: Dezsö, László – Hajdú, Peter (eds.) *Theoretical problems of typology and the Northern Eurasian languages*. Amsterdam: Grüner. 65–73.

Narty, Jonas N. A. 1979. *A study in phonetic universals – especially concerning fricatives and stops*. (= UCLA Working Papers in Phonetics, 46.) Los Angeles: University of California.

Discourse markers in Italian-Lombard Sinti bilingual speech: a corpus-based analysis

Marco Forlano
University of Bergamo/Pavia
marco.forlano@unibg.it

Ilaria Fiorentini
University of Pavia
ilaria.fiorentini@unipv.it

This paper focuses on discourse markers (henceforth DMs) in Lombard Sinti, a variety of Romani spoken in Northern Italy by Italian-Romani bilinguals. The goal is to analyze DM forms, functions, and distribution by language in an Italian-Lombard Sinti bilingual speech corpus.

DMs are a formally heterogeneous class that includes items from different parts of speech, such as conjunctions, adverbs, verbs, or longer phrases. Their function is eminently procedural, in that they give instructions on how to interpret the utterances in which they are inserted (cf. e.g. Fraser 1998, 2009). DMs show an interesting behaviour in situations of language contact, as they appear among the items that are more often switched to in bilingual corpora or borrowed diachronically (cf. e.g. Brody 1987; Salmons 1990). This is believed to happen because of their crucial role in managing intense communicative negotiations, which would lead long-standing bilinguals to adopt the whole set of DMs from the pragmatically dominant language among two or more languages in contact (cf. Matras 1998).

Our analysis is based on a corpus of free interviews conducted in the city of Pavia, totalling around eight hours (45.000 tokens). The sample comprises 26 Italian-Lombard Sinti bilingual speakers and is balanced for gender and age.

As observed for Romani varieties in general (cf. Matras/Adamou 2020), the analysis shows that most DMs are borrowed from the current contact language, i.e., Italian. Nonetheless, some Romani DMs can still be distinguished. The analysis will focus in particular on the two main categories that have proven to be more resistant to language contact, i.e.:

1. Verbs that occur with great frequency in a few forms of their paradigms, through which they have developed specific interactional, metatextual, or cognitive functions in discourse (cf. Bazzanella 1995). They can be found either within parenthetic sentences or at the right periphery of an utterance. Examples of such verbs are *ginel* 'to know' (e.g.

gines? 'you know?', *u gina me?* 'what do I know?'), *pinel* 'to say' (e.g. *pinas* 'let's say'), *dikel* 'to see' (e.g. *dikea?* 'you see?', *dikjal?* 'did you see?'), *xajuvel* 'to understand' (e.g. *xajudal?* 'understood?');

2. General extenders, i.e., a class of expressions whose original function is the extension of the reference of the noun or verb phrases they are accompanied to, resulting in the creation of an "ad hoc" category (Mauri 2017; Fiorentini/Sansò 2016). Examples are forms such as *koa / u koa* 'things' / 'the things', *krol* 'everything', *kjake* 'like this'.

To sum up, by providing a full array of DMs in Italian-Lombard Sinti bilingual speech, this study aims at contributing to the research on DMs in situations of asymmetric language contact (cf. e.g. Dal Negro 2005; Fiorentini 2017). The analysis confirms that Italian can be considered the pragmatically dominant language in the contact setting under survey (Matras 1998). However, the presence of specific DM categories preferentially expressed in Romani in the data may challenge the assumption that "Romani DMs such as fillers and tags are invariably those of the current contact language" (Matras/Adamou 2020: 345).

References

C. Bazzanella (1995). "I segnali discorsivi". In L. Renzi, G. Salvi, A. Cardinaletti (eds.). Bologna: Il Mulino, 3: 225-257.

S. Dal Negro (2005). "Lingue in contatto: il caso speciale dei segnali discorsivi". In G. Banti, A. Marra, E. Vineis (eds.). Guerra Edizioni, 73-88.

J. Brody (1987). "Particles borrowed from Spanish as discourse markers in Mayan Languages", *Anthropological Linguistics* 29: 507-532.

I. Fiorentini (2017). *Segnali di contatto. Italiano e ladino nelle valli dolomitiche del Trentino Alto-Adige*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

I. Fiorentini, A. Sansò (2016). "Interagire in contesto multilingue e cose così. Il caso dei *general extenders*". In C. Andorno, R. Grassi (eds.). Milano: Studi AItLA, 189-202.

B. Fraser (1998). "Contrastive discourse markers in English". In A. Jucker, Y. Ziv (eds). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 301-26.

B. Fraser (2009). "An Account of Discourse Markers", *International Review of Pragmatics* 1: 1-28.

Y. Matras (1998). "Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing", *Linguistics* 20: 281-331.

Y. Matras, E. Adamou (2020). "Romani and contact linguistics". In Y. Matras, A. Tenser (eds.). London: Palgrave Macmillan, 187-217.

C. Mauri (2017). "Building and interpreting ad hoc categories". In J. Blochowiak, C. Grisot, S. Durrleman-Tame, C. Laenzlinger (eds.). Berlin: Springer, 297-326.

J. Salmons (1990). "Bilingual discourse marking: code-switching, borrowing, and convergence in some German-American dialects", *Linguistics* 28: 453-480.

The Problem of Long versus Short Present Tense Forms Revisited: Conditional Constructions in Sepečides, Other Balkan Romani Dialects, and Their Balkan Context

Victor A. Friedman
University of Chicago & La Trobe University
vfriedm@uchicago.edu

Friedman (2018) discussed the problem of the difference between present tenses in *-a* (long) vs -Ø (short) in the Romani of the Balkans. Matras (2002:117-118, 156) indicates that for many dialects in the Balkans, the difference is one of indicative versus subjunctive (marked by *te*, but also the future marked by *ka*, etc.) e.g. *me kerava* 'I do/am doing' vs *me te kerav/me ka kerav* 'let me do~that I do/I will do'. Matras (2002:156) also notes an alternation between long and short for the indicative in Prilep but not for Arli or Sepečides, where the long/short opposition is presented as indicative vs subjunctive, but there is also alternation in these dialects. In Friedman (2018) — based on data from Cech, Heinschink and Halwachs (2009:168 et passim) as well as, Cech and Heinschink (2002), Boretzky (1993:177-178), and his own fieldwork, all of which document that the a/Ø alternation in the present is not predictably a matter of indicative vs subjunctive — came to the following conclusions:

1. Long presents become rare as one moves north
2. Longs presents are used for heightened narrative moments.
3. Long and Short presents are/were especially competitive in Skopje, but in general in the southern part of the Arli area, where contact with SV (Džambaz) is more recent (owing to social distinctions). Burgudži influence is also relevant.

The present paper builds on and refine these suggestions. First, it is important to note that, as observed by Matras (2002:156) and confirmed by Bernard Gilliat-Smith's materials first published in the *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* (now *Romani Studies*), as republished by Marushiakova and Popov (1998), Sofia Erli, like SV dialects, has completely lost the long present in *-a*. SV, having migrated as far as Greece and Turkey in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, may have been in a position to influence dialects south of its major areas of concentration. Sechidou (2011) indicates that the dialect near Serres maintains a strict distinction, but in the absence of texts, one cannot ascertain whether or not there is variation. Paspati (1870) has some interesting examples that support conclusion #2 above. Of particular interest in the investigation of this variation is Sepeči Romani, where long and short presents both occur in modal constructions, but with different value (Cech and Heinschink 1996:56). Long form presents in the protasis of certain kinds of realis conditionals occur, although they are not mandatory. The present paper therefore modifies and expands on the conclusions of Friedman

(2018). While Friedman (2018) drew on dialects from the former Yugoslavia, in this paper material from Albania (Tirard 2019) as well as what is now Greece and Turkey will provide a more nuanced picture of the dialectal distribution of long versus short presents in the Romani of the Balkans, both in terms of areal distribution and in terms of grammatical and pragmatic usages.

References

Boretzky, Norbert. 1993. *Bugurdži: Deskriptiver und historischer Abriß eines Romani-dialekts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Boretzky, Norbert & Birgit Igla. *2004. Komentierter Dialektatlas des Romani. Teil 1: Vergleich der Dialekte. Teil 2: Dialektkarten mit einer CD Rom*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Cech, Petra and Mozes F. Heinschink. 1996. Sepečides-Romani. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Cech, Petra and Mozes F. Heinschink. 1999. Sepečides-Romani: Grammatik, Texte und Glossar eines türkischen Romani-Dialekts. Weisbaden: Harrasowitz

Cech, Petra and Mozes F Heinschink. 2002. "The Arli dialect of Priština and other Arli varieties spoken in Serbia and Macedonia." 6th International Conference on Romani Linguistics, Center for the Study of Modern European Languages and the University of Graz, Austria, 12-14 September 2002.

Cech, Petra, Moses F. Heinschink, Dieter W. Halwachs, eds. 2009. *Momelja hem limonja: Arlijengere paramisja*. Klagenfurt/Celovec: Drava Verlag.

Friedman, Victor A. 2018. Long Versus Short Presents in Arli Romani, Paper presented at the 13th International Conference on Romani Linguistics, Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris, 13-14 September.

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

Paspati, A. 1870. Études sur les Tchinghianés ou Bohémiens de l'Empire ottoman. Constantinople: A. Kourmelas. (Repinted Osnabrück 1973, Piscataway, NJ 2009).

Sechidou, Irene. 2011. *Balkan Romani: The Dialect of Ajios Athanasios/Greece*. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Tirard, Aurore. 2019. *Les syntagmes nominaux polydéfinis en romani d'Albanie*, Ph. D. dissertation, Université Clermont Auvergne.

Swedish Finnish Kale dialect

Kimmo Granqvist
University of Helsinki
kimmo.granqvist@helsinki.fi

According to estimates, 3,000-5,000 Finnish Roma or Kale live in Sweden. In all, the estimates of the number of Travellers and Roma in Sweden vary between 35,000-100,000. The migration of Finnish Kale to Sweden has primarily taken place the since the late 1950s, after the adoption of the Nordic Passport Convention in 1957. Currently, the Kale are one the five main Romani groups in Sweden (Palosuo 2008: 13).

In my paper, I will discuss some aspects of the sociolinguistic situation of the Kale dialect in Sweden, comparing it to the one in Finland, in particular the degree of vitality/endangerment of it, and domains of use. The description will be partly based on previous studies on the sociolinguistic situation of Kale. These surveys suggest that Finnish Romani is even more seriously endangered in Sweden than in Finland (Bijvoet & Fraurud 2007; Hedman 2009; Hedman & Westerlund 2017), and partly on fieldwork among Kale in Sweden.

The second part of my paper will deal with language planning and written usage of the Kale dialect in Sweden, which has been carried out by the Institute for Language and Folklore / the Language Council of Sweden established in 2006. The Swedish education authorities have published teaching materials of Kale (Schwartz 2008; Hasan 2011), and a number of official texts, brochures and websites have been translated into Kale.

This Swedish written Kale differs radically from written usage in Finland, being an artificial mixed Romani variety based, on the one hand, on the lexicon and some grammar inherited from Kale used in Finland, and the other hand, on lexical and grammatical features borrowed most likely from Kalderash used frequently in Pentecostal parishes in Sweden. The resulting mixed variety is only partly mutually intelligible to speakers of Kale in Finland but facilitates the interaction of Kale in Sweden with other Romani groups.

I will conclude with a brief discussion on the impact of written Kale and attitudes and power relations pertaining to it.

References

Bijvoet, Ellen & Kari Fraurud 2007. *Det romska språket och romsk språkvård i Sverige.* Stockholm.

Hedman, Henry 2009. Suomen romanikieli: sen asema yhteisössään, käyttö ja romanien kieliasenteet. Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen verkkojulkaisuja 8. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus. http://scripta.kotus.fi/www/verkkojulkaisut/julk8/>

Hedman, Henry & Hanna Westerlund 2017. *Suomen romanikieli: Kenttäselvitys romanikielen asemasta, kielitaidosta ja kieliasenteista Suomessa = A field survey on the Romani status, proficiency, and language attitudes in Finland.* Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto

Palosuo, Laura 2008. *En inventering av forskning om romer i Sverige.* Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.

Schwartz, Allan 2008. *Ternesko Dīves pesko dādesa (en lärobok på den svenska kaaledialekten).* Stockholm: Liber.

Romano Glaso

Suzana Jovanović

independent scholar, Venezia

Can the participation of Roma and Sinti and the use of Romanes in research improve the understanding of the data?

The reflection arises in the European project *The immigration of Romanian Roma to Western Europe: causes, effects and strategies for future engagement - MigRom.* The research, conducted between 2013 and 2017, was coordinated by the University of Manchester. For Italy, the University of Verona participated; the Italian research group was coordinated by prof. Leonard Piasere. The interviews, collected with the ethnographic method through in-depth interviews, by Suzana Jovanovic together with Dr. Marianna Agoni and the Roma Dainef Tomescu, were translated into Italian, transcribed into Romanes and analyzed from a sociolinguistic and ethnolinguistic point of view by Suzana Jovanovic.

It will be presented the linguistic contact results: code alternation, code-switching, code-mixing, loans, calques and hybridisms, mixing of codes; but also the results of the possibility for Roma to use Romanes and empathy with the Roma researcher to transform the research context into a public space in which one acts with words against anti-Gypsyism. The data will be presented in Romanes. The research produced two types of text: a popular book, containing a selection of interviews transcribed in Romanesque, which documents the presence in Italy of that variant in a given historical moment. And two scientific articles, one containing sociolinguistics data and the other ethnolinguistics data.

The data tell us that research on the Romani language and with the involvement of Roma researchers must be made systemic in order to monitor the historical evolution of linguistic contact to see the results in the future. Romanes could be a tool of equal opportunities between Roma and gaže: the creation of a space of access to Romanes teaching and university research also for Roma and Sinti, bearers of an internal perspective and interpreters of an internal perspective, on the one hand it would improve the understanding of university research through a new epistemology on Roma and Sinti built through a deep, hermeneutical understanding of what Roma say or write: language and words must be analyzed and interpreted knowing very well the social context, the language, the culture, ethics, mentality and morals of the Roma who write and/or speak.

The research will be useful for the reconstruction of a historical reality of a given moment. In the future, the data could be used to evaluate the state of conservation or linguistic wear and tear of Romanes and relate it to democracy. Romanes could become a tool for creating an intercultural glottodidactic to preserve it: a formal knowledge of one's mother tongue could constitute the right linguistic education approach for Roma and Sinti children of Italian as a second language and stimulate them to become - why not? - linguists and researchers. This work could also be the basis for new research in the linguistic field such as studying the extreme outcomes of language contact.

References

Berruto, G. & Cerruti, M. *Manuale di sociolinguistica*. Novara, UTET 2015.

Bertaux, D. *Le récit de vie*. L'enquête et ses méthodes. 3e éd, Armand Colin, 2010.

Bertaux, D. *Les récits de vie. Perspective ethnosociologique,* Paris, 1997

Biscaldi*, A. Matera, M., Antropologia della comunicazione: interazioni, linguaggi, narrazioni. Roma, Carocci, 2016*

Corrao**,** S. «L'intervista nella ricerca sociale», *Quaderni di Sociologia*, 38 | 2005, 147-171. https://journals.openedition.org/qds/1058

Del Negro, S. Guerini, S. *Contatto. Dinamiche ed esiti del plurilinguismo.* Arance, 2007.

Donzelli, A. (a cura di), Antropologia del linguaggio. Roma, Meltemi, 2021.

Duranti, A. *Antropologia del linguaggio*. Roma, Meltemi, 2000.

Duranti, A. *Etnopragmatica. La forza nel parlare* . Roma: Carocci Editore, 2007.

Jovanocic, S. *Rom e romanes per una nuova epistemologia sui rom*. In preparazione.

Jovanocic, S. Romanes. *Gli effetti del contatto linguistico*. In preparazione

Jovanovic, S. *Romano Glaso.* In preparazione.

Marcarino, A., Etnometodologia e analisi della conversazione. Urbino, Quattroventi, 1997.

Matera, V. *Antropologia culturale e linguistica. Lo studio del linguaggio nel contesto antropologico.* Milano, Unicopli, 2005.

Matras ,Y. *Romani: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021

Matras,Y. *Language Contact*. Cambridge University Press, 2009

Pistacchi, M. (a cura di), *Vive voci. L'intervista come fonte di documentazione.* Roma, Donzelli, 2010.

Romani Noun Endings in Comparative-historical Context

Katarina Katavić
Department of Indology and Far Eastern Studies
University of Zagreb, Croatia
katavicffzg@gmail.com

Romani is a New Indo-Aryan (NIA) language that has developed from Old Indo-Aryan (OIA) via Middle Indo-Aryan (MIA) through various phonological and morphological changes. These changes affected all parts of the language, including the phonological and morphological structure of nouns, which led to the formation of New Indo-Aryan, in this case, Romani nouns.

The main focus of this paper will be masculine nouns ending in *-o*, which correspond with masculine nouns ending in *-ā* in another NIA language – Hindi, whose endings stem from the old diminutive suffix: OIA *-akaḥ/-akam* > MIA *-ao/-aaṃ* > R. *-o*, H. *-ā* (e.g. OIA *aṇḍa* 'egg' > *aṇḍakaḥ* > MIA **aṇḍao* > R. *anrro*, H. *aṇḍā*); as well as masculine nouns ending in consonants, which, unlike those previously mentioned, have not developed through diminutive forms (e.g. OIA *karṇa* 'ear' > MIA *kaṇṇa* > R. *kan*, H. *kān*).

Based on the analysis of more than 1500 masculine Hindi nouns by using the TLex dictionary software and their comparison with approximately 150 masculine Romani nouns, this paper will present statistics and categorization of the nouns which have developed from OIA through diminituvisation, and of those which have not, including an explanation of possible reasons behind this occurrence in both languages. This paper will also include the analysis of feminine noun endings based on approximately 140 Romani and 1200 Hindi feminine nouns.

References

Bagasheva-Koleva, Mariya. (2014). *The Case of Lexicalized Diminutive Nouns in Some Slavic Languages*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/38332698/THE_CASE_OF_LEXICALIZED_DIMINUTIVE_NOUNS_IN_SOME_SLAVIC_LANGUAGES (26th April 2023).

Beames, John. (1966). *A Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India. Book II: The Noun and Pronoun*, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal. (1st ed. 1875).

Beníšek, Michael. (2012). *On the origin of the consonantal feminine stems in Romani*. Retrieved from http://www.romistika.eu/docs/Benisek_presentation_10icrl.pdf (14th June 2019).

Boretzky, Norbert, & Igla, Birgit. (1994). *Wörterbuch Romani-Deutsch-Englisch für den südosteuropäischen Raum*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Bosanac, Siniša; Lukin, Dora, & Mikolić, Petra. (2009). *A Cognitive Approach to the Study of Diminutives: The Semantic Background of Croatian Diminutives*. Retrieved from https://apps.unizg.hr/rektorova-nagrada/javno/stari-radovi/430/preuzmi (26th April 2023).

Hacken, Pius ten, & Thomas, Claire. (Eds.). (2013). *The Semantics of Word Formation and Lexicalization*, Edinburgh University Press. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt9qdrxv (26th April 2023).

Jurafsky, Daniel. (1996). Universal Tendencies in the Semantics of the Diminutive. *Language*, Vol.72, No. 3. Retrieved from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Universal-Tendencies-in-the-Semantics-of-the-Jurafsky/2c7a8b3b16dd365139408ee3b3524b3ac3ba3e16 (24th April 2023).

Katavić, Katarina. (2022). *Postanak i ustroj romskoga u okviru povijesti indoarijskih jezika*, doctoral thesis, University of Zagreb, Croatia. Retrieved from https://repozitorij.ffzg.unizg.hr/islandora/object/ffzg:6029 (26th April 2023).

Matras, Yaron. (2002). *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGregor, Ronald Stuart. (2002). *Oxford Hindi-English Dictionary*, New York: Oxford University Press. (1st ed. 1993).

Monier-Williams, Monier. (2002). *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. (1st ed. 1899).

Oberlies, Thomas. (2005). *A Historical Grammar of Hindi*, Graz: Leykam Buchverlag.

Parzuchowski, Michał; Bocian, Konrad, & Gygax, Pascal. (2016). Sizing Up Objects: The Effect of Diminutive Forms on Positive Mood, Value, and Size Judgments, *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 7: 1452. Retrieved from https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01452/full (26th April 2023).

Turner, Ralph Lilley. (1926). The Position of Romani in Indo-Aryan. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*, Ser. 3, Vol. 5, No. 4.

Turner, Ralph Lilley. (1962–1966). *A comparative dictionary of Indo-Aryan languages*, London: Oxford University Press. Digital edition: https://dsalsrv04.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/soas/.

Vrabie, Irina. (2020). *Polysemy in Morphology. The Case of the Diminutive*, doctoral thesis, University of Galați, Romania. Retrieved from http://193.226.56.236/bitstream/handle/20.500.14043/28283/Rezumat_Teza_doctorat_Vrabie_Irina_2020EN.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y (26th April 2023).

Synchrony and diachrony of differential object marking in Romani

Kirill Kozhanov
University of Potsdam
kozhanov@uni-potsdam.de

Romani demonstrates differential object marking (DOM) by overtly marking direct objects when they are expressed by pronouns (1) and animate nouns (2), whereas inanimate nouns (3) retain their direct (~ nominative) form (Matras 2002: 86–87; Adamou, Matras 2020: 94). Cf. the following examples from Lithuanian Romani:

(1) *Mir-í   pxén   dźin-él lés.*
     my-dir.sg.f   sister.dir.sg   know-prs.3sg 3m.sg.obl
     'My sister knows him/it.'
(2) *Mir-í   pxén   dźin-él do   ćxav-és.*
     my-dir.sg.f   sister.dir.sg   know-prs.3sg that   guy-obl.sg
     'My sister knows that guy.'
(3) *Mir-í   pxén   dźin-él da   láv.*
     my-dir.sg.f   sister.dir.sg   know-prs.3sg that   word.dir.sg
     'My sister knows this word.'

In this paper I take a closer look at the variation in DOM across Romani dialects and assess the factors which influence the object marking patterns. I compare the results of the study with the diachronic paths in the evolution of DOM described in the typological literature and suggest a diachronic scenario which accounts for the development of DOM in Romani.

Data for this study come from the Romani morpho-syntax database, a questionnaire-based database of Romani dialects questionnaire (https://romani.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/rms/). The questionnaire compiled by Yaron Matras and Viktor Elšík includes around 300 lexical questions and 700 sentences aimed at the elicitation of morphosyntactic information (including 260 transitive clauses). I implement a usage-based approach to this data, i.e. I look at the variation in direct object marking as it is reflected in the answers to this questionnaire. I annotated all examples with direct objects expressed by animate nouns (59 in total) for i) case marking; ii) definiteness; iii) specificity; iv) humanness, and v) origin (borrowed vs. not borrowed). In addition, I checked 60 clauses with direct objects expressed by pronouns and inanimate nouns. In total, I used data from 118 locations in Europe, freely available in the database.

The data shows that the three main factors constraining DOM in Romani dialects are: *pronouns vs. nouns > animacy > definiteness*. The factor of definiteness and other additional factors (e.g.

human vs. animal, borrowed vs. inherited nouns) demonstrate an areal distribution. Some dialects in the database, e.g. Romani dialects of Finland, exhibit clear tendencies towards the loss of DOM, whereas other dialects, e.g. of Italy, develop a new DOM pattern (by replicating the South Italian DOM system with the preposition *a* 'to' by the means of the Romani preposition *ki*).

Finally, I argue that the overt marking of direct objects in Romani originates in the expansion of dative-like markers (= Middle Indo-Aryan genitive-dative obliques), a development with numerous parallels cross-linguistically (Kuteva et al. 2019: 359–360). In Romani, this expansion first affected pronouns, than animate definite nouns and later (perhaps already in Europe) animate indefinite nouns.

References

Adamou, Evangelia & Yaron Matras. 2020. Romani syntactic typology. In: Yaron Matras & Anton Tenser (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Romani Language and Linguistics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 187–227.

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

Kuteva, Tania, Bernd Heine, Bo Hong, Haiping Long, Heiko Narrog, and Seongha Rhee. 2019. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

New insights into Zargari Romani

Yaron Matras
Aston Institute for Forensic Linguistics,
Birmingham and Department of Hebrew Language, University of Haifa
y.matras@aston.ac.uk

Ioana Aminian Jazi
Commission *Vanishing Languages and Cultural Heritage* (VLACH),
Austrian Academy of Sciences
ioana.nechiti@oeaw.ac.at

Zargari is perhaps the most curious of all Romani varieties: It is spoken in Western Asia as a consequence of an eastwards migration of speakers of a European variety of Romani apparently originating in the Balkans during the Ottoman period (Windfuhr 1970). It is also in unique simultaneous contact with a Turkic language (Azeri) and an Iranian language (Persian) both of which have had a considerable impact on lexicon and grammar (Baghbidi 2003, Djonedi 1996). It is now an endangered language spoken by less than five hundred people. So far, information about Zargari is limited to two descriptive sketches (Windfuhr 1970, Baghbidi 2003) and a lexical compilation (Djonedi 1996).

The paper draws on a recent pilot project carried out in the Zargar settlement in Iran in 2022, combined with insights gained through a short dialect elicitation during an encounter with speakers outside of Iran in 2005. Our analysis is anchored in two theoretical strands: In the field of contact linguistics, the assumption that contact influence in the domain of grammar is structured hierarchically in relation to the semantic-pragmatic functions of grammatical categories and so it is to some extent at least predictable (Matras 2009 [2020]), and in the field of Romani dialectology the assumption that dialect differences owe their emergence, shape and distribution to the diffusion of individual innovations from a variety of different epicentres into neighbouring speech communities resulting in a complex patchwork of interlacing isoglosses (Matras 2005; see also Elšík & Beníšek 2020). We will use the recent Zargari samples to test both hypotheses, examining the distribution of contemporary contact influences from Azeri and Persian alongside the retention of European contact influences, and comparing internal developments with key diagnostic isoglosses in European Romani. We will consider the implications of our findings both in regard to a theory of contact-induced language change and in regard to the so-called geographical diffusion model in Romani dialectology.

References

Baghbidi, Hassan Rezai (2003) The Zargari language: An endangered European Romani in Iran. *Romani Studies*, 13(2), 123-148.

Djonedi, Fereydun. (1996) Romano-Glossar: Gesammelt von Schir-ali Tehranizade. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 46: 31-59.

Elšík, Viktor and Beníšek, Michael (2020) Romani dialectology. *The Palgrave Handbook of Romani language and linguistics*, ed. Yaron Matras and Anton Tenser, 389-427. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Matras, Yaron (2009 [2020]) *Language contact.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matras, Yaron (2005) The classification of Romani dialects: A geographic-historical perspective. *General and applied Romani linguistics: Proceedings from the 6th International Conference on Romani Linguistics*, ed. Barbara Schrammel, Dieter W. Halwachs and Ambrosch Gerd, 7-26. Munich: Lincom.

Windfuhr, Gernot L. (1970) European Gypsy in Iran: A first report. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 12, 271-292.

The phonetics and phonology of rhotics in Romani:
a preliminary survey

Giulia Meli
Università degli Studi di Milano
giulia.meli@unimi.it

Chiara Meluzzi
Università degli Studi di Milano
chiara.meluzzi@unimi.it

The reconstructed Early Romani phonological system had two rhotics: /r/ and /ř/. The first traces back to the MIA and OIA dental or alveolar trill /r/, and the second is the outcome of the OIA initial retroflex /ḍ/ and of the internal geminate retroflexes, such as /ṭṭ/ and /ḍḍh/ (cf. Beníšek 2020: 28). Although in many varieties rhotic opposition has been lost, some of them still preserve it (cf. Boretzky and Igla 2004, Teil 1: 45 and ff.). The outcomes of these two rhotics in historical varieties have partly been discussed (see for instance Matras 2002: 50-51 and Baló 2020: 122-124), but the study of their phonological status needs further research, especially regarding the phonetic realization of these phonemes.

In order to explore the phonetic and phonological status of rhotics in Romani, we examine a set of varieties, by also taking into account the lexical interface. The varieties have been selected among the dialectal groups (e.g. Vlax, South Balkan II, North Central), which, according to the aforementioned paragraphs in Boretzky and Igla (2004), should somehow preserve the rhotic opposition. This work is based on the following varieties: Kalajdži (BG-007, South Balkan II), Bugurdži-Parpuli (BG-052, South Balkan II) and Kalderaš (YU-010, Vlax). Our analysis takes the perspective of acoustic phonetics, by extracting data from the Romani Morpho-syntax database.

We narrowed down the corpus of the analysis to two sets of lexemes: the Indian stratum, in which the Early Romani rhotic phonemes may be expected if preserved, and a group lexical items from the more recent stratum or strata of borrowing. In each set, observe the rhotic phones in initial, final and intervocalic position. The acoustic analysis distinguishes the difference phases of rhotic realization (namely, closure and aperture, cf. Celata et al. 2016). The results consider not only rhotic type (e.g., tap vs. trill vs. approximant) but also rhotic duration as standardized by the whole word duration. As independent variables, we include rhotic position within the word, but also the lexical stratum within the lexicon and, when possible, the frequency of the lexical item.

The statistical analysis shows the presence of many rhotic types, differently distributed in the selected Romani varieties. In Kalajdži the variability is generally reduced to a unique rhotic realization as tap; some sporadic trills appear only in final position and in Indian lexemes. Bugurdži and Kalderaš shows a similar pattern of variation, in which tap/trill alternation is maintained in the Indian stratum. Furthermore, this variability is linked to the origin of the rhotic: the outcomes of the /r/ are usually taps and the outcomes of /ř/ are trills.

These results may suggest that Kalajdži is innovative with respect to the phonological status of the Early Romani rhotics, while Bugurdži and Kalderaš are conservative. As far as the more recent strata concerns, the analysis shows that in Bugurdži tap is the only rhotic type attested, while in Kalderaš we find a strong frequency of taps in statically significative variation with other rhotic types. This variation within the recent lexical strata of Kalderaš seems similar to the situation observed by Oslon 2018 for Russian Kalderaš and it needs further studies.
In conclusion, the phonetic analysis of Romani rhotics could help us understanding the phonological status and evolution of this complex sound class.

References

Baló, A.M. 2020. Romani Phonology. In Y. Matras, A. Tenser (eds.). The Palgrave Handbook of Romani Language and Linguistics. London: Palgrave Macmillan. 119-153.

Beníšek, M. 2020. The historical origins of Romani. In Y. Matras, A. Tenser (eds.). The Palgrave Handbook of Romani Language and Linguistics. London: Palgrave Macmillan. 13-48.

Boretzky, N. Igla, B. 2004. Kommentierter Dialektatlas des Romani. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Celata, C., Meluzzi, C. and Ricci, I. 2016. The sociophonetics of rhotic variation in Sicilian dialects and Sicilian Italian: corpus, methodology and first results. Loquens, 3(1), e025.

Matras, Y. 2002. Romani. A linguistic introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oslon, M.B. 2012. Отражение южнославянского *r в заимствованиях из старорумынского в цыганский. Journal of Language Relationship, Вопросы языкового родства, 16 (1): 62-72.

The distribution of the definite article and other determiners in Gurbet Romani in Eastern Serbia: a quantitative corpus-based study

Mirjana Mirić

Institute for Balkan Studies, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Belgrade
mirjana.miric@bi.sanu.ac.rs

The study explores the variation in the distribution of the definite article and other determiners in the noun phrase (NP) in Gurbet Romani in Eastern Serbia, a variety which has been in contact with the articleless Serbian language. Although many Romani varieties have retained the article (Boretzky 2000, Friedman 2000, Matras 2002, Leggio 2011), some dialects lost it due to contact with the languages without articles (Uhlik 1951, Matras 1999, Friedman 2006, Sonnemann 2022).

The aim of the present study is to investigate if the distribution of the definite article and other determiners depends on: a) the origin of a head noun (Romani inherited nouns vs. Serbian loan nous), b) the age of speakers (adults vs. children).

The data for the study are taken from the corpus of narratives in Gurbet Romani, recorded from 2016 to 2018. The corpus comprises samples of narratives of bilingual Romani-Serbian speakers: 12 adults (N=8,360 word tokens) and 20 elementary-school children (N=7,895 word tokens).

The overall number of analyzed NPs is 1,081 (adults) and 858 (children).
We selected NPs with bare nouns, with or without adjectives ((*baro*) *manuš* '(big) man'), as well as NPs with the following adnominal modifiers occupying the determiners slot in the NP: the definite article (*o iv* 'the snow'), possessive determiners (*mi dej* 'my mother'), demonstratives (*goja džuvlji* 'that woman'), indefinites (*nesave manušen* 'some men'), interrogatives (*savo arrno* 'which egg'), and genitive adnominals (*Bibijako djive* 'Aunt's Day)'.

The analysis shows that the noun origin affects the distribution of the definite article and determiners in general, as the Serbian loan nouns are more frequently used as bare than modified by determiners in comparison to the Romani nouns, in both adults' (χ^2=11.291, df=1, p<0.001) and children's sample (χ^2=22.744, df=1, p<0.001) (Table 1). The same effect holds when the definite article is analyzed separately, although the significant difference between Romani and Serbian loan nouns is observed only in the adults' sample (χ^2=15.613, df=1, p<0.001) (Table 2). The analysis of prepositions incorporating definite articles will also be

presented. These findings will be discussed from the language contact perspective, suggesting that the obtained difference is contact-induced.

Additionally, the analysis reveals the age difference in the use of the definite article with Romani nouns, as children tend to employ the definite article less frequently than adults (χ^2=5.412, df=1, p<0.001) (Table 3). An additional analysis of proper nouns also showed that children tend to use the article less frequently with proper nouns than adults (χ^2=13.876, df=1, p<0.001) (Table 4). The obtained age difference is not a consequence of the children's less frequent use of determiners, as children actually modify nouns with determiners more frequently than adults (χ^2=24.657, df=1, p<0.001) (Table 5). These findings might suggest the potential ongoing change, i.e., gradual loss of the definite article in Gurbet Romani (cf. Sonnemann 2022), but the discussion must take into account the issues pertaining to the narrative development in children, as well as topics of children's narratives, which may have affected the frequency and choice of particular types of modifiers.

References

Boretzky, N. 2000. "The definite article in Romani dialects". In V. Elšík, Y. Matras (eds.), *Grammatical relations in Romani. The noun phrase*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 31–64.

Friedman, V. A. 2000. "Romani in the Balkan Linguistic League". In Ch. Tzitzilis, Ch. Symeonidis (eds.), Balkanlinguistik: Synchronie und Diachronie. Thessaloniki: University of Thessaloniki,95–105.

Friedman, V. A. 2006. Dialectological perspectives on Romani in the Balkan linguistic league. *Балканско езикознание* XLV/1: 45–54.

Leggio, D. V. 2011. The dialect of the Mitrovica Roma. *Romani Studies*. Fifth Series, 21/1: 57–114.

Matras, Y. 1999. The speech of the Polska Roma. Some highlighted features and their implications for Romani dialectology. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 9 (1999): 1–28.

Matras, Y. *Romani. A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Sonnemann, A. *Language Families in Contact. The Mutual Impact of Slavic and Romani*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Uhlik, R. *Prepozitivni i postpozitivni član u gurbetskom*. Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, 1951.

Frequency tables:

Age				Bare nouns	Nouns modified with determiners	Total
Adults	Noun origin	Romani	Count	253	379	632
			% within Noun origin	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
		Serbian	Count	226	223	449
			% within Noun origin	50.3%	49.7%	100.0%
Children	Noun origin	Romani	Count	121	342	463
			% within Noun origin	26.1%	73.9%	100.0%
		Serbian	Count	164	231	395
			% within Noun origin	41.5%	58.5%	100.0%

Table 1. Absolute and relative frequency of bare nouns and nouns modified with determiners across age and noun origin

Noun origin				Bare nouns	Nouns with the article	Total
Romani	Age	Adults	Count	303	150	453
			% within Age	66.9%	33.1%	100.0%
		Children	Count	133	41	174
			% within Age	76.4%	23.6%	100.0%
Serbian	Age	Adults	Count	266	68	334
			% within Age	79.6%	20.4%	100.0%
		Children	Count	172	51	223
			% within Age	77.1%	22.9%	100.0%

Table 2. Absolute and relative frequency of bare nouns and nouns modified with the definite article across noun origin

Age				Bare nouns	Nouns with the article	Total
Adults	Noun origin	Romani	Count	303	150	453
			% within Noun origin	66.9%	33.1%	100.0%
		Serbian	Count	266	68	334
			% within Noun origin	79.6%	20.4%	100.0%
Children	Noun origin	Romani	Count	133	41	174
			% within Noun origin	76.4%	23.6%	100.0%
		Serbian	Count	172	51	223
			% within Noun origin	77.1%	22.9%	100.0%

Table 3. Absolute and relative frequency of bare nouns and nouns modified with the definite article across age

			Bare nouns	Nouns with the article	Total
Age	Adults	Count	40	52	92
		% within Age	43.5%	56.5%	100.0%
	Children	Count	58	23	81
		% within Age	71.6%	28.4%	100.0%

Table 4. Absolute and relative frequency of bare nouns and nouns modified with the definite article across age (proper nouns)

			Bare nouns	Modified nouns	Total
Age	Adults	Count	479	602	1081
		% within Age	44.3%	55.7%	100.0%
	Children	Count	285	573	858
		% within Age	33.2%	66.8%	100.0%

Table 5. Absolute and relative frequency of bare nouns and nouns modified with all determiners across age

A Transylvanian trilingual (Romani-Latin-Hungarian) dictionary from the 18th century

Julieta Rotaru
Inalco Paris
julieta.rotaru@inalco.fr

Victor Shapoval
Moscow City University
shapovalvv@mgpu.ru

Aurore Tirard
Inalco Paris
aurore.tirard@inalco.fr

This is a presentation of the forthcoming critical edition of the "Dictionary Gypsy-Latin and Hungarian, which was made out of curiosity for Michael Pap Szathmári by Michaelis Farkas alias Vistai [...]". The manuscript is preserved in the Central University Library, Cluj, and has been described by Vekerdi (2006). The author nicknamed *Wolf* (Hungarian *Farkas*) was a Rom from Viştea (nowadays a village in Gârbău, Cluj) studying at the Unitarian College of Cluj. The basis of this trilingual dictionary is an enlarged Hungarian translation (2147 entries) of Cristopher Keller's popular Latin dictionary (approximately 2000 entries), a "short book made for the usage of the students of the elementary classes" (*usum infimarum classium puerillium excerpta*). The Romani lemmas are added by the "Wolf" on separate sheets intercalated between the printed pages of the original Latin-Hungarian dictionary. In most cases, the Romani translation is done from Latin, not from Hungarian. Marginal notes are added by at least five other co-authors, as well as copious introductory cultural and historical references: Gesner (1555), Grellmann (1783) and Fessler (1787), the latter being most probably the *terminus post quem* of the dictionary. The "Wolf" provides with some sketches of Romani grammar, e.g. samples of declension following the Latin pattern. Here is the example of the Romani translation for the lemma *abdomen*, translated as *has, kövérség* in Hungarian ('belly, thickness, fatness'):

Perr, cħulipo		[Nominative: /perr/, /tʰulipo/]
G.	*Lepareſzkiro*	[Genitive: /le parreskiro/]
D.	*Lepareſzke*	[Dative: /le parreske/]
A.	*Lepareſz*	[Accusative: /le parres/]
V.	*O! Perrale*	[Vocative: /o perrale/]
Ab.	*Lepareleſztár*	[Ablative: /le parrelestar/]

As expected, this Transylvanian does not participate in North Vlax innovations such as /t͡ʃʰ/ > /ɕ/, /ʃ/ (e.g. *tsináv* /t͡ʃinav/ < *čhinav 'I cut'), nor to /d͡ʒ/ > /ž/, /ʒ/ (e.g. *tsánáv* /t͡ʃanav/ < *džanav 'I know'). It contains borrowings from Romanian (*szkurton* /skurtoⁿ/ 'short') as well as Hungarian (*dumboſz* /dumbos/ 'hill'). It participates to North Central innovations, such as the devolitive modal verb: *kampelasz* translates *necesse (necessum), szükség* 'needed' – and to North Central archaisms such as the 2sg copula person marker -al: *hal* 'you are' (Elšík & Beníšek 2020; Matras 2022). It shows the lenition of /s/ in all copula forms (*hom* 'I am', *hin* 'it is') and in intervocalic position (*tuhá* 'with you', *leha* 'with him'). Slavic borrowings came both directly (*totſináv* /tot͡ʃinaːv/ 'I sharpen') and through Hungarian (*vacſorá* /vat͡ʃoraː/ 'supper', Hungarian *vacsora*) and Romanian (*snoppoſz* /znopos/ 'bundle', Romanian *snop*). It also contains few adapted borrowings from Albanian (*bizináv́* /bizinaːv/ 'I believe', Albanian *besoj*). We illustrate the salient features of this Romani lexicographic work, showing some insight into the evolution of a little-studied dialect.

Keywords

Dialect classification, historical linguistics, lexicography, philology, critical edition, Transylvania, Romani, Hungarian, Latin.

References

Elšík, Viktor, and Michael Beníšek. 2020. "Romani Dialectology." In: *The Palgrave Handbook of Romani Language and Linguistics*, Yaron Matras and Anton Tenser (eds.), 389-427. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fessler, Ignaz Aurelius. 1787. *Institutiones linguarum orientalium, hebraeae, chaldaicae, syriacae et arabicae.* Breslau: Wilhelm Theophil Korn.

Gesner, Conrad. 1555. *Mithridates: De differentiis linguarum tum veterum tum quae hodie apud diversas nationes in toto orbe terrarum in usu sunt.* Zürich: Christoph Froschauer.

Grellmann, Heinrich Moritz Gottlieb. 1783. *Die Zigeuner: ein historischer Versuch über die Lebensart und Verfassung, Sitten und Schicksahle dieses Volkes in Europa, nebst ihrem Ursprunge*. Dessau/Leipzig: Verlags-Kasse.

Keller, Cristopher. 1768. *Primitiva lingvae latinae vocabula e Christophori Cellarii Libero memoriali.* In usum infimarum classium puerillium excerpta. Claudiopoli: Impressum per Josephum S. Pataki.

Matras, Yaron. 2002. *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vekerdi, József. 2006. "An 18th-century Transylvanian Gypsy vocabulary". *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 59 (3), 347-360.

Romani short and long present:
some historical and typological aspects

Andrea Scala
Università degli Studi di Milano
andrea.scala@unimi.it

Romani dialects display in present tense two different inflection patterns, called respectively short present and long present. The latter differs from the former only in having a morpheme -*a* (cfr. e.g. Kalderašitska *sováv* "I sleep" vs Lombard Sinti *sováva* "id."). In the dialects in which the long form expresses present tense (Lombard Sinti, Arli, Burguǧi, Sepeči etc.), the short one usually has the value of an achronic subjunctive mood, mainly used in subordinated clauses. In other dialects (Erli, Kalderašitska, Lovaritska, Romungro, Finnish Romani etc.) the long form expresses future tense or some rare modal content, such as confirmative function, and the short one the present tense (Boretzky-Igla 1994, p. 394; Matras 2002, pp. 156-157). From a historical point of view the short inflection is the only one that can be directly traced back to Middle and Old Indo-Aryan present inflection (cfr. e.g. *sov-* "to sleep": 1s *sov-av* < MIA *suvāmi*, OIA *svapāmi*, 2s *sov-es* < MIA *suvasi*, OIA *svapasi*, 3s *sov-el* < MIA *suvadi*, OIA *svapati*; Sampson 1926, pp. 187-188; Matras 2002, pp. 143-144; Benišek 2020, p. 33), while the long inflection, with its final -*a*, is surely an innovative form. Final -*a* of the long present has been considered an indicative mood marker that contrasts with the zero-marked subjunctive form (Matras 2001, p. 167 and 2002, p. 155). As for the etymology of the morpheme -*a*, it is very probable that it derives from a process of grammaticalization of some originally free and later cliticised form, but the very reduced phonological form makes difficult to individuate an ancestor in MIA or OIA; a first step in this way could be a better definition of the original meaning of -*a* in verbal inflection. It is very remarkable that the verb *ǧan-/ǧin-* "to know" does not show the long inflection with -*a* in those dialects in which the long form is the default form for present tense. This unexpected morphological irregularity could be a trace of some original content of the morpheme -*a* that was incompatible with the inner semantic of a stative verb like "to know". As stative verbs are usually incompatible with progressive aspect (cfr. English *I know* but *I am knowing, Spanish *yo se* "I know" but **yo estoy sabiendo*), a possible hypothesis is that -*a* was in origin a morpheme indicating progressive aspect. Put after the person-number markers of the old short present, the morpheme -*a* probably added to the verbal form a progressive meaning, forming a progressive present. In the history of Romani this original meaning of -*a* would have gone lost and the long present would have become in some dialects a future tense, in other dialects the default form for present tense. This supposed evolution finds a noteworthy typological parallel in the history of Armenian (Vaux 1995, p. 137). Last, but not least, the emergence of new present tense forms from progressive periphrasis and the

evolution of OIA present towards subjunctive functions are phenomena well attested in NIA languages.

References

Beníšek, Michael, 2020, *The Historical Origins of Romani*, in Matras, Yaron & Tenser, Anton, 2020, *The Palgrave Handbook of Romani Language and Linguistics*, Cham, Palgrave Macmillan: 13-47.

Boretzky, Norbert & Igla, Birgit, 1994, *Wörterbuch Romani-Deutsch-Englisch für den südosteuropäischen Raum*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

Matras, Yaron, 2001, *Tense, aspect and modality categories in Romani*, in «STUF. Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung» 54,2: 162-180.

Matras, Yaron, 2002, *Romani. A linguistic introduction*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Sampson, John, 1926, *The dialect of the Gypsies of Wales*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Vaux, Bert, 1995, *A Problem in Diachronic Armenian Verbal Morphology*, in J. J. Weitenberg (ed*.), New Approaches to Medieval Armenian Language and Literature*, Amsterdam-Atlanta, Rodopi: 135-148.

Implicit attitudes towards spoken and written Romani: Evidence from an Implicit Association Test

Melanie Schippling
University of Cologne/CNRS-LACITO
m.schippling@uni-koeln.de

The Implicit Association Test (IAT, Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz 1998) is a method from sociopsychology increasingly used to study language attitudes (McKenzie and Carrie 2018; Rosseel, Speelman, and Geeraerts 2019; Vari and Tamburelli 2020). In this study, I present the results of an IAT to explore implicit attitudes towards spoken and written Romani. To my knowledge, this is the first study of implicit attitudes on this topic and could complement studies of explicit attitudes.

Implicit attitudes are defined as "introspectively unidentified (or inaccurately identified) traces of past experience that mediate favorable or unfavorable feeling, thought, or action toward social objects" (Greenwald and Banaji 1995: 8). Implicit language attitudes may deviate from explicit ones (McKenzie and Carrie 2018) because the latter are modulated by social desirability (Pantos and Perkins 2013).

Method Design. The IAT was conducted online. 14 audio files of an RMS Kalderaš sample (YU-010) and their orthographic representation were used as the audio and text target stimuli (categories 'spoken' and 'written'). 16 nonverbal attribute stimuli were selected from the Open Affective Standardized Image Set (OASIS; Kurdi, Lozano, and Banaji 2017) representing general emotional valence ('positive' and 'negative') and exhibiting no semantic overlap with the target stimuli.

Participants. 42 participants from 12 different countries completed the IAT (age range: 13-56 years, mean: 22,69 years; 22 female, 20 male). The participants self-assessed their reading (mean=1,67) and writing habits in Romani (mean=1,33) on a scale from 0 'never' to 4 'regularly'. They were contacted through a Romani NGO and compensated for their time.
Procedure. The participants were instructed to categorise stimuli as fast and accurately as possible by pressing the respective keyboard keys indicated on the screen. The program measured their reaction times which are predicted to be faster in a congruent condition, i.e. where target and attribute stimuli evoke matching associations.

Analysis. 25 data sets were analysed using the D score algorithm (Greenwald, Nosek, and Banaji 2003). Their mean D score suggests an implicit preference for spoken over written Romani (mean≈0,041). A linear model with the predictors of ROMANI IN THE EDUCATION SYSTEM, AGE,

GENDER, and READING HABITS IN GERMAN fits the data best and significantly predicts D scores (F(4, 20)=3.92, p=0.0165, R^2=0.4395 , $adj.\ R^2$=0.3274).

Results. Results show a significant association between positive emotion stimuli and written Romani with increasing AGE (p=0.00795) and presence of ROMANI IN THE EDUCATION SYSTEM in the country of origin (p=0.01928).

Discussion. This study reveals that AGE and inclusion of ROMANI IN THE EDUCATION SYSTEM positively impact implicit attitudes towards written Romani. The finding that older adults have positive associations with written as compared to spoken Romani contrasts with previous work on explicit attitudes which shows that they choose to promote oral tradition instead (Schippling, in prep.). Results about the role of formal education in Romani are in line with those of a survey on explicit attitudes (Padure and Adamou 2021). I will discuss these findings in the context of language transmission and education policies.

References

Greenwald, Anthony G., and Mahzarin R. Banaji. 1995. 'Implicit Social Cognition: Attitudes, Self-Esteem, and Stereotypes.' *Psychological Review* 102 (1): 4–27. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.102.1.4.

Greenwald, Anthony G., Debbie E. McGhee, and Jordan L. K. Schwartz. 1998. 'Measuring Individual Differences in Implicit Cognition: The Implicit Association Test.' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74 (6): 1464–80. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1464.

Greenwald, Anthony G., Brian A. Nosek, and Mahzarin R. Banaji. 2003. 'Understanding and Using the Implicit Association Test: I. An Improved Scoring Algorithm.' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 85 (2): 197–216. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.197.

Kurdi, Benedek, Shayn Lozano, and Mahzarin R. Banaji. 2017. 'Introducing the Open Affective Standardized Image Set (OASIS)'. *Behavior Research Methods* 49 (2): 457–70. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0715-3.

McKenzie, Robert M., and Erin Carrie. 2018. 'Implicit–Explicit Attitudinal Discrepancy and the Investigation of Language Attitude Change in Progress'. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 39 (9): 830–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1445744.

Padure, Cristian, and Evangelia Adamou. 2021. 'The Activity Spheres Framework Applied to Language Policy: Dispositions towards Romani Revitalization in Romania'. Accessed 20 March 2023. https://shs.hal.science/halshs-03268416.

Pantos, Andrew J., and Andrew W. Perkins. 2013. 'Measuring Implicit and Explicit Attitudes Toward Foreign Accented Speech'. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 32 (1): 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X12463005.

RMS = 'Romani Morpho-Syntax Database'. n.d. Accessed 20 March 2023. https://romani.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/rms/.

Rosseel, Laura, Dirk Speelman, and Dirk Geeraerts. 2019. 'Measuring Language Attitudes in Context: Exploring the Potential of the Personalized Implicit Association Test'. *Language in Society* 48 (3): 429–61. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404519000198.

Schippling, Melanie. In prep. 'On the Relations of Spoken and Written Romani'. PhD dissertation, Cologne/Paris: University of Cologne/CNRS-LACITO.

Vari, Judit, and Marco Tamburelli. 2020. 'Standardisation: Bolstering Positive Attitudes towards Endangered Language Varieties? Evidence from Implicit Attitudes'. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, October, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1829632.

"Na tarávë li čammárdi". Death or rebirth of a language?

Giulio Soravia

Emeritus professor, University of Bologna
soravia.giulio@gmail.com

How does a language die? But in fact do languages die? These questions are endlessly asked for by linguists, but it does not seem likely we will ever have a satisfactory answer. So, let us put the question in another way: how do languages change? Is it possible to have an answer to such a question simply by observing what happened to a language "evolving" and ultimately disappearing for lack of speakers? Is this death of the language or a complex metempsychosis? Where are the remnants of the soul of that language? A real case study: Italy represented the first step preluding the spreading of Rom in Europe. Possibly since the XIII century - or even before - several groups conducted a nomadic life, but some Rom chose – or were forced – to settle down. The following phase shows Sinte in Northern Italy and diverse groups of Rom in the south of Rome and the Marche. These became the ancestors of Abruzzian and Calabrian Rom with some family groups moving to big cities like Naples and Pescara, to Sicily etc. and being assimilated in the urban environment. Some thrived (Abruzzi horse breeders, money lenders, Calabrians as little smiths under the protection of feudal lords as Marquis Berlingeri and Bevilacqua). Some were lost.

At the beginning of the 20th century, two groups spoke what later became different languages, but it was only in 1972 that we discovered that one of these languages was still in use in Calabria. We called it an innovative form because of the existence of the verb "have", but soon we realized that such a verb was found also in the Balkans in the language of the Tchinghiané. The question was wrong from the beginning. Death of a language is when a language has no more the inner force to contribute to global communication. Our aim was not to compare languages to reconstruct proto-forms by means of improbable *ausnahmslose* laws, but to assign languages their rightful place they are entitled to in the frame of a global ecological system of languages. In biology we consider variety a richness to ensure equilibrium in nature. Accordingly, humans are a mixture of nature and culture communicating by means of language. Disappearance of a language is a dangerous loss: in a social ecosystem even the disappearance of the feeble voice of a minority means the breaking of a chain, an attempt to peace.

References

Hagege, c., *halte à la mort des langues,* odile jacob, paris 2000.
Morelli, b, e g. soravia, *i pativ mengr. la lingua e le tradizioni dei rom abruzzesi,* roma, centro studi zingari 1998.

Paspati, a. g., *ètudes sur les tchinghianès ou bohémiens de l'empire ottoman,* constantinople, emprimérie a. koroméla, 1870.

Soravia, g. e c. fochi, *vocabolario sinottico delle lingue zingare parlate in italia,* roma, centro studi zingari, 1995.

Soravia, g., *la lingua romanes d'abruzzo,* bologna, bonomo editore, 2019.

Terracini, b., *conflitti di lingua e di cultura,* venezia, neri pozza, 1957.

"Merel muŕo šoro, te na xe!" Offer in Romani interaction

Andrea Szalai

Hungarian Research Centre of Linguistics, Budapest
szalai.andrea@nytud.hu

The paper examines conventionalised practices through which Romani speakers express hospitality in everyday interaction. Offering food or drink *(imbimo)* among the Transylvanian Gabor Roma usually requires an intense, elaborate ritual negotiation, consisting of various adjacency pairs. When a guest is welcomed, the host is expected to utter a series of offers, while the addressee in turn is expected to show polite reluctance. (For similar patterns of offer in Arabic, Farsi and Chinese interaction, see: Grainger et al. 2015, Koutlaki 2002, Chen 1996.) However, in Romani interaction the insistence is not limited to repeated offers. The host usually makes extra interactional investment when attempts to convince the guest to accept the offered food or drink. In order to index the genuineness of the offer, s/he usually reinforces its illocutionary force by various conditional (self-)curses. (E.g. *Xa, phrala! Merel muŕo šoro, te na xe!* 'Eat, my brother! May my head die, if you didn't eat!') By uttering ostensible self-curses *(trušula),* the hosts symbolically inflicts harm (e.g. loss, death) on themselves, performing self-face threats. In the context of hospitality, the usage of conditional (self-)curses is the default practice in Gabor Roma communities. The absence of curses triggers socio-pragmatic inference: the guest might perceive that s/he is not welcomed and not treated with respect in the given situation.

The paper is based on participant observation and audio-recorded data, which I collected in the course of a longitudinal linguistic anthropological fieldwork in Gabor Roma communities in Transylvania, Romania. This dataset includes both naturally-occurring offers, and metapragmatic narratives on this interaction ritual. In a case study, I will examine the sequential organisation and main interactional characteristics of an audio-recorded offer. Using the method of conversation analysis, I pay special attention to the various means of insistence (e.g. repetition, conditional curses, overlaps, exclamatory intonation) which contribute to the intensity of the ritual negotiation in offer.

By examining the patterns of a frequently used interaction ritual (Kádár 2017), the paper contributes to sociopragmatic and linguistic anthropological studies on Romani. Studying the role of curses in hospitality may offer theoretical considerations for (im)politeness research. Although a curse might be perceived as a strategy of linguistic aggression, it can serve other, relationship-forcing purposes. As Romani data show, the use of conditional curses can be socially accepted, even expected in certain situations, what is more, it might be evaluated as polite behaviour. A better understanding of these interactional patterns can support the deconstruction of a widespread ethnic stereotype which depicts Roma as rude, "cursing people".

References

Chen, R. 1996. Food-plying and Chinese Politeness. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 7 (3–4): 43–55.

Grainger, K. et al. 2015. Offering and hospitality in Arabic and English. *Journal of Politeness Research* 11 (1): 41–70.

Kádár, D. 2017. *Politeness, Impoliteness and Ritual: Maintaining the Moral Order in Interpersonal Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koutlaki, S. A. 2002. Offers and expression of thanks as face enhancing acts: *tae'arof* in Persian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 1733–1756.