Grammatical Relations in Romani

The Noun Phrase
1. Introduction

The use of a proleptic or resumptive oblique pronoun that agrees with a nominal or pronominal (and in some cases clausal) object as a marker of the role or function of a noun phrase (called object reduplication in Balkan linguistics), occurs in a variety of languages, but its occurrence in Romani is generally seen in the context of the Balkan languages with which Romani dialects all were, as many still are, in contact (Kostov 1962, Bubeník 1997, Friedman 1997). This paper will discuss Romani proleptic and resumptive oblique pronouns primarily in their Balkan context, with special attention to Macedonia but also with some reference to general and non-Balkan Romani considerations. I shall conclude that the phenomenon in Romani, while related to, and in some instances perhaps influenced by, the general Balkan phenomenon, is in many respects a quite distinct linguistic feature and more closely connected to boundary maintenance than to contact, i.e. the influence of social factors on grammar. The data from Macedonia are especially revealing in this respect.

Redundancy is the quintessential addressee-oriented linguistic principle, and agreement, understood in its largest possible sense, is the quintessential manifestation of redundancy at morphosyntactic levels. One might expect, therefore, in contact situations, where language change is being influenced by differences between fully formed communicative systems (i.e., languages), that a high degree of redundancy would be present for purposes of easing communication. Producing redundancy, however, is quite another matter. As it turns out, morphological redundancy, which in at least some instances is demonstrably resultant from earlier syntactic redundancies (cf. the abundant literature on grammaticalization, e.g. Traugott and Heine 1991), is an impediment to production and thus is often selected against in terms of competition of features in contact language situations. Moreover, there is evidence that suggests that intensive contact leads to the erosion of morphological agreement whereas isolation is
2. Reduplication in the Balkans

Focusing on the Balkans, we see that the principle of case simplification operates in Slavic, but not with quite the consistency in geographic distribution that one might expect. In general, the number of morphologically marked cases decreases as one moves south from Slovenian through the former Serbo-Croatian into Macedonian and Bulgarian. Thus by the time one reaches the Torlak dialects of southern Serbia, the only cases left are those with grammatical functions linked to the verb phrase, i.e. nominative, accusative and dative (cf. Friedman 1977). As one moves from southern Serbia into Macedonia and Bulgaria, case marking disappears from the noun and is left only in the pronoun – and in some regions only the clitic pronouns maintain the accusative/dative distinction.

If case loss, i.e. morphological simplification in the nominal system, is particularly characteristic of contact situations, however, the distribution of oblique case remnants in Balkan Slavic represents something of a problem. It is well known that southwestern Macedonia represents the heart of the Balkan linguistic convergence area (e.g. Hamp 1977), and yet it is precisely in this region, which represents the crossroads of peripheries, that Balkan Slavic dialects have preserved the most case forms – extending even to the nominal system (feminines in -va and masculine animates; see Krstevski 1982, Mazon 1936:54-64, Vidoeski 1998:65-93). Moreover, as Aronson (1993) has pointed out, it is precisely Balkan Romance that has been the most conservative of the Romance languages in preserving remnants of Latin nominal declensions (although southwestern Aromanian is actually less conservative than Romanian in this respect, see Markovik, forthcoming), and both Greek and Albanian maintain at least a 3-way case distinction. (Problems of details such as the Albanian ablative plural need not concern us here.)

While the development of so-called analytic declension (i.e. the use of prepositions to express case relations) is an oft cited characteristic Balkan simplification, as is dative-genitive merger, Balkan object reduplication adds redundancy. Like the so-called loss of declension, object reduplication occurs in all the Balkan languages but under differing conditions in different dialects. In terms of conditioning, it ranges from pragmatic discourse functions such as focus and topicalization to fully grammaticalized, i.e. obligatory, marking along a continuum that includes definite and/or specific direct objects, all indirect objects, and various types of subordinate clauses (object and relative). Thus, for example, in the Balkan Slavic continuum, Torlak Serbian has reduplication only in the pronoun (which is where it first appears in early records of the other languages). In Bulgarian (and eastern Macedonian dialects), object reduplication is used for both pronouns and substantives, but it is discourse bound, i.e. not grammaticalized, and expresses topic or theme (cf. Dyer 1992, Guentcheva 1993, Leafgren 1997, Avgustinova 1998). In Greek, Romanian, and Albanian, it occurs with increasing degrees of obligatoriness (i.e. the contexts in which it is expected or required expand such that its omission ranges from infelicitous to ungrammatical, cf. Anagnostopoulos 1999), while in western Macedonian and Vlah (Aromanian), reduplication is most strongly grammaticalized (the same can be said for Albanian dialects). Figure 1 (cf. Aronson 1997:39) illustrates this situation as a continuum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+OBLIGATORY</th>
<th>±NON-OBLIGATORY</th>
<th>±ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>Vlah</td>
<td>Albanian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Object reduplication continuum

In addition to varying along a continuum from pragmatic to grammaticalized, object reduplication varies in the symbolic significance assigned to it. This is to say that reduplication, precisely because of its colloquial nature, becomes invested with political and other sociolinguistic significance (cf. Friedman 1994). Thus, for example, the material from Leafgren (1992:287) demonstrates that object reduplication is completely excluded from formal discourse in Bulgarian, while it can also bee seen that in the process of the codification of both Bulgarian and Macedonian, the normativization of object reduplication was an issue (Konesi 1993:16). In the end, it was its colloquial nature that dictated its acceptance in Macedonian and exclusion from Bulgarian (Friedman 1993, 1994). Similarly, reduplication is discouraged in the higher styles of Greek and Romanian. It is wholly dialectal in Serbian and is also considered dialectal in certain contexts in Albanian.

Explanations of the origins of object reduplication in the Balkans point to a variety of phenomena. Earlier work, e.g. Golab (1933), stresses the function of...
reduplication in disambiguating case functions in connection with the loss or simplification of nominal declension, as in the following Macedonian example:

(1)  
zenata mažot go₁ - ja₂ vide  
woman.DEF man.DEF him - her saw  
1. “the woman saw the man (it was the man that the woman saw)”  
2. “the man saw the woman (it was the man that saw the woman)”

The role of hyperdetermination as a feature likely to be selected for in contact situations, as well as the specific influence of South Balkan Romance, have also been noted (Ilijevski 1962-63, 1973). More recently, Aronson (1997), citing nearby phenomenon such as Hungarian transitive conjugations (i.e. polypersonal marking on the verb for definite direct objects) and the Turkish definite accusative has suggested that marking for transitivity is a crucial factor in the grammaticalization of object reduplication. In Macedonian, reduplication sometimes serves to mark transitivity:

(2) a. Keti spie  
Keti sleeps  
“Keti is sleeping”

b. Keti go spie Adrian  
Keti he.ACC sleeps Adrian  
“Keti is putting Adrian to sleep”

Čašule (1997) has also argued that the shift of clitics to absolute initial position (and in Macedonian the fixing of ante-penultimate stress and the creation of accentual units across word boundaries) was crucial to the process of grammaticalization.

We can conclude this overview by noting that object reduplication in the Balkans follows both a linguistic and a geographic continuum in its grammaticalization. The most peripheral zone of both occurrence and pragmatic conditioning is southeastern Serbian territory, constituting a northern and western boundary of the Balkan Sprachbund. Bulgarian and Romanian territories constitute the outer regions of discourse bound object reduplication with the beginnings of grammaticalization as well as northern and eastern boundaries of the Sprachbund. To the south is Greek territory, which together with Bulgarian and Romanian forms a kind of east Balkan grouping in which pragmatics predominates over grammaticalization. Albanian territory is both a western and northern edge and the region where grammaticalization begins to predominate over pragmatics, while Macedonian and Aromanian, in the center, have full grammaticalization. Albanian, Macedonian, and Aromanian can also be grouped together as the west Balkan languages where grammaticalization of object reduplication has progressed much further than in the east.

3. Reduplication in Romani: usual manifestations

The position of Romani as a Balkan language, while still not as firmly established as that of the classic Balkan languages, is receiving increasing attention (e.g., Boretsky 1993, 1994, 1995, Friedman 1985, 1997, Igl 1996, Joseph 1983:252-253, Kostov 1973, Matras 1994a, Uhlik 1973). In Romani we see that just as synthetic case marking is maintained, object reduplication is not strongly developed, although the phenomenon is present and, when taken in its broadest possible sense, is somewhat grammaticalized precisely in those contexts that differ from the other Balkan languages. I would argue that this is part of the fairly unique contact situation of Romani, which is unidirectional rather than bi-directional, i.e. Romans learn other languages but speakers of other languages usually do not learn Romani. Moreover, the role of Romani as an ethnic boundary marker is especially salient. This is in stark contrast to the situation under the Ottoman millet system, according to which religion rather than language was the focus of identity for most people in the Balkans.

Bubenik (1997) reviewed the material on Romani object doubling in the Balkans available to him (Boretsky 1993, 1994, Kostov 1962, Miklosich 1872-1880). Here I wish to add material that I have collected from Macedonia and Igl’s (1996:159-162) observations on Ajia Varvara in Greece. These data suggest that object reduplications in Romani is normally dislocational in some sense, i.e. it involves a distancing of the object noun phrase from the verb (cf. Igl 1996:154, also Matras 1994b:137-139) or differing cases for the same referent in the same clause (a grammatical disjunction, so to speak). Moreover, reduplication is usually discourse bound, i.e. pragmatically conditioned, and only weakly grammaticalized. The environments in which object reduplication occurs can be divided into two main types: A) possessive-existential and B) objective (accusative). Each of these types in turn has two subtypes: Aa) simple possessive (nominate-accusative) and Ab) locative-existential possessive; and Bb) intraclausal objective and Bb) interclausal objective. The following examples, mostly in Skopje Arti, illustrate each of these types:
Possessive-existential, simple; nominal & pronominal (= Aa)

(3) Rahim (1994:4)

sakoja dzito dz is k pli Roma Union,
every second town is it.ACC its.own Roms Union
numa ola na len nisave vijivaharija
only they is not they.ACC no.kind connection
“every second town has its own Romani Union, but they have no
connection with one another”

Possessive-existential, locative-existential (= Ab)

(4) Mrmeska (1994:6)

akava virusi […] majbut isi le ko rat, ki sperma,
this virus […] most is it.ACC in blood in sperm
ko vaginalno sekreti thaj ko dajakoro thud
in vaginal secretions and in maternal milk
“the largest quantities of this virus are in blood, in sperm, in vaginal
secretions, and in maternal milk”

Objective, intraclausal; pronominal (= Ba)

(5) Jusuf (1974:14)

e Rifatos pendzarav, e diha da pendzarav,
the Rifat I know the daughter and I know
ama man ma amoize man kidisave bucende
but me don’t emobal me this work.PL.LOC
ridtaj kerav tuke
request I make you.DAT
“I know Rifat and I know his daughter, but don’t mix me up in this
business, I beg of you”

Objective, intraclausal; nominal (= Ba)


o melalo pani na piena le ni o dzungale ruyu
the dirty water not they drink it.ACC nor the bad wolves
“even wicked wolves do not drink dirty water”

b. Aija Varvna (Igla 1996:161)

djas les i ciriki ekh paradigama e rakles
it.gave him the bird one example the boy.ACC
“the bird gave the boy an example”

Objective, interclausal (= Bb)


me kingjum o li so dikkilum ole soldaj ki dukjana
I bought the look what we.saw it.ACC both in the shop
“I bought the book that we both saw in the shop”

b. Darman (1994:2)

jek parani lafi so drabargjem le sigate
one old word what we.read it.ACC recently
“an old proverb that we read recently”

Example (3) contains two typical possessive constructions, one with a nominal
possessor (“town”) the other with a pronominal possessor (“they”) and both
with accusative objects after “be”. The second clause in the sentence illustrates
the fact that Skopje Arli, like Kosovo Bugürđi (Boretzky 1993:96), permits
159). The accusative pronoun after “be” is obligatory in these constructions
(cf. Igla 1996:159). Sentence (4) is also a kind of possessive existential, but here
the reduplicated pronoun refers to that which is possessed, cf. the Macedonian equi-

vivalent in (8), which also uses an oblique pronoun to denote existential posses-

sion:

(8) Macedonian (Mrmeska 1994:6)

virusi […] Jarnmogu go ima vo krvta
virus.DEF […] most it.ACC it has in blood.DEF
“the largest quantities of the virus are in blood[...]

In examples (5) and (6a) the unmarked VO order is violated and a resumptive
pronoun follows the verb, whereas in (6b) the initial position of the verb and the
interposition of the subject between it and its object triggers the reduplication. In
(7a) and (7b) the object pronoun in the relative clause refers to an item in the
main clause, the difference being that in (7b) the pronoun is the short form
whereas in (7a) it is not. In all of these examples, the reduplicative pronoun is
facultative and its function is pragmatic (discourse bound), generally enabling
the focus to occur on the initial or preposed element in (5) and (6) but on the
head of the relative clause (rather than the verb) in (7).

A striking feature of object reduplication in Skopje Arli is precisely the fact
that it is so weakly grammaticalized and does not correspond to the strong
grammaticalization of the Macedonian system with which it is in intimate contact.
This is clearly illustrated in examples (9a) and (9b), which I recorded in July
1994 from a single broadcast of a Skopje Romani radio music-request program (entitled Gili pali gili “Song after song”) in which the announcer switched freely back and forth between Romani (9a) and Macedonian (9b):

(9) a. Skopje Romani
   o Ajfur thiaj o Džemo tari i Śvedska bhaharen
   the Ajfur and the Džemo from the Sweden they.congratulate
   e praden e Ramjîsetke thiaj e Mirsadek, the marriage.ACC the Rami.DAT and the Mirsada.DAT
   aj e Safetêske thiaj e Sadija bhaharen and the Safet.DAT and the Sadija.DAT they.congratulate
   o bijav the wedding
   “Ajfur and Džemo from Sweden congratulate Rami and Mirsada on their marriage, and they congratulate Safet and Sadija on their wedding”

b. Naza i Oli od Śvedska im go chestitat
   Naza and Oli from Sweden them it they.congratulate
   brakot na Rami i Mirsada, marriage.DEF to Rami and Mirsada
   a na Safet i Sadija im ja chestitat svadbata and to Safet and Sadija them it they.congratulate wedding.DEF
   “Naza and Oli from Sweden congratulate Rami and Mirsada on their marriage, and they congratulate Safet and Sadija on their wedding”

The Macedonian version has two sets of reduplicated pronouns that are completely obligatory, whereas the Romani has no reduplication even in the second clause, with its prepsembled object, albeit dative not accusative. Similarly, Mark 9:37 cited by Bubenik (1997:96) – which shows reduplication of 1st person accusative pronouns in Romanian, Albanian, and Macedonian but not in Bulgarian and Greek – does not have reduplication in any of the Romani translations I have seen so far (10a), the only type of reduplication being possessive constructions such as (10b).8

(10) a. Erši (Metkov 1995:93, 161)
   kovatô lel jekes sar o čhavî Mere alaveste,
   this who takes one.ACC as the child my name.LOC
   taj Mon lel, taj kova lel man, len na man,
   and me takes and this takes me they.take not me
   a Okolest Kovatô Man bičkulejgas
   but that.OBL ths.who me sent
   “whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name receiveth me, and whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me but him that sent me” (Mk 9:37, King James Version)
   b. nesavo manuš isine les duj čhâve
   certain man was him.ACC two sons
   “a certain man had two sons” (Lk 15:11, King James Version)

4. Reduplication in Romani: unusual manifestations

Having argued that Romani object reduplication is normally dislocational in a broad sense, we must nonetheless note certain non-dislocational constructions in which the resumptive pronoun is the only item between the verb and the object. Bubenik (1997:98) cites a number of examples from Miklosich (1872-1880) with VO order and the resumptive pronoun between the verb and object with no lexical intervening material:

   de ma man
   give.IMP me.CLIT me.ACC
   “give something/to it me!”
   b. me tovav ka i bołca
   I wash it the press
   “I am washing the press”9
   c. Skopje Erši (December 1973)
   ma mukh ma man
   don’t leave.IMP me.CLIT me.ACC
   “don’t leave me!”

Examples (11a) and (11c) are of the same type; (11a) illustrates the fact that “give” can take an accusative object while (11c) is one of the few such examples that is modern. Example (11b) uses an nominal rather than a pronominal object. (I do not count the definite article as intervening lexical material but rather a necessary grammatical part of the object phrase.) Two other problems with Romani object reduplication in a Balkan context are the clitic/non-clitic opposition and the opposition accusative/non-accusative.

In the classic Balkan languages, the distinction between clitic and non-clitic pronouns is a clear one and is an essential part of object reduplication. In various dialects of Balkan Romani, however, this is not the case. Aside from the fact that
many Romani dialects do not distinguish clitic forms, and those dialects that do have a long/short opposition do not necessarily employ the short forms as special clitics, examples (5) and (7) show that Romani can use long pronominal forms as reduplicative.10 Another crucial difference between Romani and the classic Balkan languages is in case usage. While the classic Balkan languages have at most an accusative/dative distinction in the oblique, Romani preserves five oblique case distinctions (see Friedman 1991).11 Moreover, it is only the accusative that is implicated in normal reduplicative behavior in Romani. On the other hand, Boretzky (1993:96) gives examples with all the other oblique cases except the locative (i.e. dative, genitive, instrumental and ablative) of which example (12) is illustrative:

(12) Bugurđi (Boretzky 1993:96)

\begin{align*}
\text{ali tu te manges la} & \text{ar} \quad \text{pares kadla romnjatar} \\
\text{but you that you get her.ABL money.ACC this woman.ABL} \\
\text{“but you should get money from her, from the [Romani] woman”}
\end{align*}

The Romani possessive constructions actually reflect the language’s Indic origin, and while the calquing of a lexical verb meaning “have” occurs in some dialects, most Balkan dialects have been remarkably conservative in this respect (cf. Friedman 1997:54). The almost exclusive use of the accusative in such object constructions (which in other languages often have dative objects) could reflect the postpositional origin of the non-accusative oblique cases (cf. Matras 1997 on the hierarchy of case relations in Romani).

Iglia (1996:161) observes that Ajia Varvara Romani has calqued the Greek construction illustrated in (13) and (iii):

(13) Ajia Varvara

\begin{align*}
\text{a. dzi\={n}es len} & \text{ sa it.ACC.PL all you.know it.ACC.PL all} \\
\text{sa dzi\={n}es len} & \text{ ola it.N.ACC.PL you.know all ola in kseries} \\
\text{all you.know it.ACC.PL all you.know everything you.know it.N.ACC.PL you.know}
\end{align*}

She notes, however, that the use of the plural accusative resume pronoun in Romani makes this a literal loan-translation rather than a reflection of the Romani system. I would argue that a similar explanation can apply to the examples in (11), which are not dislocational, while examples such as (12) can either be treated as anacoluthic or extensions of dislocational reduplication.

5. Conclusion

From the foregoing examples it should be clear that Romani object reduplication, while it resembles that found in the classic Balkan languages in certain respects, also differs from them in fundamental ways that are related to the preservation of the declensional system not only grammatically but socially. While it is true, as observed in many sources (Friedman 1997, Iglia 1999, and Matras 1997), that the Romani case system is undergoing simplification under contact conditions in many Balkan dialects, it has not been lost in any of them. Similarly, while object reduplication of the type found in the classic Balkan languages occurs in Romani, it does so either in completely facultative discourse-bound dislocations (as in examples 5, 6, and 7) or in imitations that can be taken as nonce syntactic borrowings rather than part of the grammatical structure (as in examples 11 and 13). The data from Macedonia, as illustrated in example (9), is especially important in this respect. Macedonian has the most highly grammaticalized system of pronominal reduplication of all the Balkan languages, and yet the Romani dialects of this region (and it should be noted that Arli, whose name comes from Turkish yerli “local” probably represents a dialect of long-settled Roms, cf. Friedman & Dworkoff 1991) do not seem to display any more reduplication than dialects in Greece, Bulgaria, or Kosovo – if anything, it may be somewhat less frequent. Moreover, the preservation of the possessive construction that avoids a lexical verb meaning “have” and instead employs “be” with a referential pronominal object is a use of reduplication (sensu largo) that is quite different from that found in the other Balkan languages. This leads me to conclude that, like the preservation of synthetic declension, the Romani treatment of reduplication appears to be more of a boundary marker than a contact phenomenon. In this the treatment differs significantly from grammaticalized phenomena such as future marking using invariant ka and the use of te plus finite verbs for infinitival and conditional clauses, both of which are classic Balkanisms. The foregoing material suggests that in the realm of syntax, it is the noun phrase (including noun phrases that are parts of verb phrases) in which Romani maintains its boundaries and the verb phrase (sensu stricto) that is more open to contact phenomena.
Notes

1 As Arosenius notes, the terms obligatory and non-obligatory (and, we can add, absent) are relative. Insofar as emphatic oblique pronounal reduplication occurs in Southern Serbian, object reduplication is highly restricted but not absent (Behl 1905:401, 408):

(i) mene me tepaxe
    me.ACC me.ACC.CLIT beat.3SG.IMPF
    “he beat me”

(ii) digle
    mu njemu
    came.3SG.AOR him.DAT-CLIT him.DAT
    “he came to him”

According to Mackridge (1985:223), reduplication in Greek is obligatory when the word ola means “everything”:

(iii) su kseireis ola
     it you know all
     “you know everything”

Brian Joseph (p.c.), however, points out that even here the usage, while obligatory, is still in a sense discourse bound. When the emphasis is less on “everything”, reduplication is not required:

(iv) su kseireis ola oso xriazone na kseireis
     now you know all as much you need that you know
     “now you know everything you need to know”

At the same time, Joseph (p.c) points out that “the use of a weak pronoun together with a strong personal pronoun (e.g. me kseireis emena vs. kseireis emena “you know me”) – if stated in terms of the properties of the strong personal pronoun forms – seems grammatical, but once one recognizes that the strong pronoun forms are inherently emphatic, then the object reduplication with them boils down to a discourse factor.”

In Bulgarian, reduplication is required in only one context: With the preposed object of an impersonal (usually negative) existential (Queenicheva 1993:164):

(v) rikad od tuk, ama rikatu ja njema
    the sleeve is here but the hand it.ACC has not
    “the sleeve is here but there is no arm”

In Romanian, an animate relativized direct object must be reduplicated (Mallinson 1986:194):

(vi) aconsa e proprichul pe are am tredus o
    this is clause DO that I have translated it
    “this is the clause I translated”

The same holds true for a preposed indirect object (Mallinson 1986:209):

(vii) biszatului i -am da un cadeu
    the.boy.DAT him.DAT I have given a present
    “to the boy I gave a present”

In Albanian, all indirect objects must be reduplicated and in Macedonian and Vlah the obligation is extended to definite direct objects. There are other contexts that permit reduplication in all the Balkan languages, including indefinite objects that are specific (see Anagnostopoulou 1999:785 for a discussion of the relevance of a scale of referentiality). In some of these contexts, as indicated above, failure to reduplicate might be stylistically marked or infelicitous (cf. Joseph & Filippaki-Warburton 1987:245-246), but such violations are pragmatic rather than grammatical. (See Friedman 1994 ‘for further discussion and bibliography.)

2 Idiomatic translations are my own unless otherwise noted. Examples of frequently occurring colloquial sentences are not given with sources.

3 Consider in this regard the following Balkan proverb (Ikonomov 1968:200):

(viii) a. Turkish
    yasag bas qilsseq
    bent head.DEF.ACC sword cuts not

b. Bulgarian/Macedonian
    pokoren/poklomena glava sabs ne ja see bent
    head sword not it.ACC cuts

c. Greek
    kefali proskynemeno spathi dhon to kivei
    bent head sword not it.ACC cuts

d. Romanian
    copiat piecat nu -I prede sabia
    head.DEF. bent not it.ACC cuts sword

e. Albanian
    kokë e falur s' priest kurvit
    head PART.F.NOM bent not is cut never
    “a sword does not cut off a bent head” (= “keep your head down”)

Here the Slavic and Greek both translate the Turkish definite direct object by using a reduplicative pronoun with an indefinite (but specific or referential) noun phrase. The connection between referentiality and transitivity requires further investigation.

The other Balkan language in this position was Judezmo, which also differs in important ways from the remaining Balkan languages, e.g. in its maintenance of infinitives (see Joseph 1983:252-53).

Later (1973:55-66) also gives material not cited by Bubenik (1997), but it does not add significantly to our typology here.

6 I am omitting here the question of subject reduplication (Boretzky 1993:96-97, Matras 1999), which is always discourse bound (at least, in the Balkans), as opposed to the resumptive use of object pronouns, which is either grammaticalized or very heavily pragmatized (i.e., at times contextually ruled governed in such a way that it is sometimes taken for grammaticalized) in all the Balkan languages.

7 The speaker here is using Macedonian Bugardzii pronunciation, but the construction also occurs in Arli.

8 I should note that the language from which the translation was made may also have played a role in lack of reduplication, but the complete absence from Romani translations is nonetheless striking. Vit Bubenik (p.c.) makes the point that reduplication in the New Testament Greek
gospels is more frequent in Matthew and Mark than in Luke and John, but this does not appear to have been a factor in the Romani translations I have seen.

9 Hancock (1995:63) gives similar examples from American Vlax Romani but states: “Probably because English doesn’t have this feature, it is less common in American Vlax than in the dialects spoken in Europe.”

10 Thus, for example, a number of dialects distinguish long and short 1st and 2nd singular accusative pronouns but make the same long/short distinction in the nominative plural, e.g. ISG.NOM me, ACC man/me, 2SG.NOM tu, ACC notu, 1PL.NOM amen/ame, ACC amen, 2PL.NOM tamen/tamne, ACC tamne (see Elišk, Personal pronouns, this volume). Some dialects do not even make these distinctions (e.g., Ajaš Varvara, Igl 1996:37). According to Bořetzký (1994:52), in Kalderash long/short opposition in the nominative plural occurs also as a non-clitic/clitic one in the accusative. Kosovo Bugundži has a dative clitic the in addition to the long form take (Bořetzký 1993:45). According to Hancock (1995:62), American Vlax distinguishes oblique long and short forms in all persons. The Atri 3rd person oblique pronouns may occur with or without an initial stressed d- (see examples 7a and 7b), but the distinction is not necessarily one of non-clitic/clitic (cf. Bořetzký & Igl 1994:385-386).

11 I am excluding the vocative, whose syntactic behavior differs from that of true oblique cases.
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