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Abstract

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

1. Introduction

Unlike the other Balkan languages, which were the objects of a bi-directional multilingualism resulting in the convergence area known as the Balkan linguistic league, Romani (and Judezmo) experienced, for the most part, unidirectional multilingualism. In other words, speakers of the “classic” Balkan languages (and also Balkan Turkish) learned other languages and heard their languages spoken by others. Owing to their socio-political marginalization, however, Romani-speakers were more likely to be multilingual but their language was rarely learned by others. The occurrence of Romani words in slang and secret languages does not contradict this principle but rather is the exception that proves the rule, i.e. an indication of the relative rarity of bi-directional multilingualism affecting Romani. Romani unidirectional multilingualism is especially important for illustrating the significance of social relations in structural change, e.g. different rates and types of borrowing and feature retention (as boundary markers), relative conservatism in some areas of grammar (e.g. stress placement and nominal morphology) and relative openness in others (e.g. the treatment of affricates and modal categories). Romani code-switching both in nineteenth century texts as in modern radio programs likewise reflects the social context of Romani usage (see Friedman 1995a). Moreover, although the formative conditions of the Balkan linguistic league were eliminated with the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire into nation states and the rise of Balkan standard languages, Balkan multilingualism continues to be practiced at the local level, and especially among Romi. It is thus the case that speakers of majority languages in Balkan nation states are more likely to know English than a minority language, as was demonstrated in the case of Macedonia by the census figures from 1994 (Zavo za statistika
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2. Phonology

For Romani in general, the retention of distinctively aspirated consonants is a linguistic boundary marker at the phonological level in all the dialects (Venezia & Cernakov 1976: 293). It is a distinctive feature that does occur anywhere in Romani's European contact languages, and more over it constitutes a phonological dividing line between Romani and related contact languages such as Calo and Aqilo-Romani (Martin 1998: 11). The feature is distinctive within native vocabulary, e.g. čerel ‘steal’, čhorel ‘spill, empty, etc.’, perel ‘fall’, phorel ‘kill’, te ‘modal subordinator’/the ‘am’, ker ‘do’/kher ‘house’; at the same time, however, since aspiration is limited to native vocabulary items, the feature sometimes serves to distinguish non-native from native items: čuq ‘tea’/chaj ‘girl’, kala ‘tower’/khula ‘nonsense’. Some dialects also preserve a distinction between original /r/ and original retroflex /l/ as a distinction between two types of /r/ one flapped or tapped the other trilled (as is the case

1 Arli, whose name comes from Turkish jorli ‘local’ represents a dialect of long-settled Roms.

2 I am excluding here the indigenous languages of the Caucasus. Unlike the Ural mountains and the Aegien and Black seas with their connecting waterways, the border between Europe and Asia between the Black and Caspian Seas, is variously defined and geopolitically influenced, being variously placed at the Turkish-Persian political border; the ridge of the Caucasus Range, or the limits of Russia proper (i.e., Russia itself as a constituent of the Russian Federation; cf. Prothero 1920: 1, Bethell 1949: 74, 347).

3 It must be noted that there is variation in the consistency of the realization of the preservation of aspiration in individual lexical items. Both Boretsky & Igl (1994) and Petrowski & Velikovski
in Arli), uvular, or a retroflex tap, but this distinction is not shared by all dialects and in some cases may actually have been encouraged by contact with languages such as Albanian, which also distinguishes a tapped ard and a trilled /r/. It may thus function as a boundary marker locally, but not universally. Interestingly enough, in those regions where local Albanian dia-

lects have merged the two types of /r/, so have local Romani dialects. In the Macdonian dia-

lects of Romani, laterals behave as in Macedonian, i.e. clear before /f/ and front vowels, velar-

ized elsewhere (see also CorTJADE 1988).

A particularly salient point of contact is the palatals, where Romani appears to be particu-

larly open to contact-induced change. Thus, for example, dialects with Greek as the major contact language replace palatals with dents, while those with Turkish as the major contact language lack dental affricates, as does Turkish. The fronting of velars before front vow-

els in the various Balkan dialects, especially in Macedonia, also looks contact induced.

The basic Romani five vowels system tends to be fairly open to additions from contact lan-

guages, especially in loan words. Thus, for example, front rounded vowels, schwa, back unrounded vowels, etc., are present in those dialects in contact with languages whose systems include such sounds (cf. VENTCILE & CERENKOV 1976: 295–296 and BORETZKY 1991). In the context of Macedonia, however, the accentual system is another site of boundary main-

tenance. The western dialects of Macedonian all have stress fixed on the penultimate or antepenultimate syllable, whereas native Romani stress is oxytonic (albeit paroxytonic or even proparoxytonic if the word ends in an affix of clitic origin, e.g. dženëskorò 'person' GEN). In general, however, not only does Romani retain its stress on native words, but it avoids this same stress in European borrowings, although the difference is merged in the oblique, e.g. aztëpo 'pocket' (Turkish ceb), DAT džepskoe vs. dzenë 'person', DAT dženëske; sfiri 'hammer' (Gk. sfýr), DAT sfírskoe vs. vogy 'soul, belly, etc.' DAT vogyeskë.

Innovation is another area of distinctiveness. In the case of the dialects of Macedonia, instrumental studies have yet to be conducted, and so my conclusions are based on unstruc-

tural observation rather than systematic study. Nonetheless, it is clear and corroborated by

(1998) have examples where both aspirated and unaspirated phonemes occur as variants in a given

morpheme. In other instances, however, no such variation occurs. While the feature may have been weakened in some cases, there is evidence from some dialects /f/ has passed to /h/ and that the loanwords will be different in different dialects. The examples here are all from Macedonia. Citations in Romani employ the spelling system in use in Macedonia for both offic-

ial and unofficial documents (d. FREIDMAN 1995a).

Note that trilled /r/ can also occur in loans, even where it is not etymologically justified, e.g. koro 'blind' < Persian kör. The Persian is also the source of Turkish kör, which, however cannot be the source of the Romani kör owing to the vocalism and consonant.

It should be noted, however, that dental affricates are etymologically quite marginal in Romani,

except in dialects in contact with systems where they are prominent or where /t/ and /d/ have under-

gone affrication, as in the Bugurdi dialect of Macedonia and Kosovo/Kosova.

The tendency to shift the stress away from the main syllable area in the main dialect areas of Southern

West South Slavic (the former Serbo-Croatian) known as the neo-štokavian acute is a similar phe-

nomenon, albeit historically independent of the Macedonian insofar as the two are separated by the

Zeta-Lovćen and Prijepom-Timok dialects, which do not have this shift. In all these regions, Romani

retains its distinctive accentual pattern.

BORETZKY & IGLO (1994: 370) record šukairpe 'beauty', attributing it to Macedonian influence, but it could be just a shift from šukair 'pretty' to the nominalizer -pe rather than a retraction. In any case, there is considerable variation (e.g. sfiri is feminine in Boretzky & Iglo 1994 and Petrov-


For the sake of convenience, I am including all such suprasegmental features as pitch, tone, timbre, etc. under the term intonation.

In the area of morphology, the best known boundary marker is the distinction between what

HANCOCK (1995: 54) calls thematic and thematic in the decenisional system, i.e. Romani substantive of Greek origin and those borrowed into the language up to the time of the

initial contacts with Greek generally have a stem vowel /e/ before oblique forms, while later borrowings, i.e. those that took place after the presumed dispersal of Romans throughout Europe, do not. This can be seen in the examples cited earlier and re-cited here, e.g. aztëpo 'pocket' (Turkish ceb), DAT džepskoe vs. dzenë 'person', DAT dženëske; sfiri 'hammer' (Greek sfýr), DAT sfírskoe vs. vogy 'soul, belly, etc.' DAT vogyeskë.

Although the pattern itself may be borrowed, nonetheless, it is significant that it appears to have been adopted precisely before the diaspora (Baker 1997, cf. also CortJADE 1991).

The adaptation of verbs into Balkan Romani dialects is usually carried out by means of a derivational affix (cf. Boretzky 1993a: 66) or compounding with verbs such as ker- 'do', e.g. Skopje Arli mislinel (Macedonian misliši + Greek present -in-), kerel sabri 'endure' (Turkish sabri 'patience'), kerel komenari 'comment on', but also kerel buti 'work' (using native

This type of boundary marking is attested in the United States. Certain intonational patterns are characteristic of African-American Vernacular English (AAVE) such that even in the Southeast, whose dialects are the basis for AAVE, it is usually possible for a native speaker of US English to tell from the beginning of the telephone conversation on the race of the interlocutor. It is important to note, however, that while these patterns are associated with ethnic dialects in the US, many African-America-

nese are bi-dialectal while others, especially those who are from old northern families, do not speak AAVE. On the other hand, LABO (1996: 88–91) has shown that teenage whites whose main associa-

tions are with speakers of AAVE will adopt the same intonational patterns, although certain less sali-

ent phonological features (e.g. the change of v lar nasal sonorant to dental in final position) may be lacking.

10 Some dialects distinguish proper names ending in unstressed /u/ from borrowed common nouns in unstressed /u/ such that the later are assimilated to the native pattern, e.g. Aja Varvara askeri 'soldier' (Turkish asker), but Jami DAT Jamite [igle (1996: 34–35); see Boretzky 1993a: 33], but Sepčedës dëti 'paim', (Turkish dëti), DAT dëtëskë (Cich & Hinschenk 1999: 21).
material). These methods are paralleled in the other Balkan languages, e.g. Macedonian kal-ajasa (Turkish kalay ‘thin’ + Greek aorist -is), deflorisə ‘deflower’, stori aber ‘inform’ (Macedonian stori ‘do’ + Turkish haber ‘news’). In the case of the analytic adaptation pattern using ‘do’, similar patterns are found throughout the area in contact with Turkish ( Freedman 1996: 107) but may in fact be an inherited South Asian feature (cf. Masica 1976: 141–58).

A specific feature of the dialect of Ajia Varvara as well as some of the dialects of East Bulgaria is the conjugation of verbs of Turkish origin using person markers of Turkish origin, e.g. beklerim, beklerdem, beklerimas, ‘wait’ I SG – PR, AOR, IMP. PLU vs. e.g. native kerav, keradem, keravas, keredemas ‘do’ (same categories). This is a relatively isolated phenomenon that seems to be an arrested development of language shift (cf. Mazzing 1987: 27–28; Iglia 1996: 3, 61–65), but it is worth noting as a morphologically instantiated boundary marker in the morphology of the verbal system. Dialects in contact with Slavic can incorporate elements of Slavic verbal prefixation by borrowing prefixes that can carry lexico-argumental meaning, e.g. kinel/pokinel ‘buy/pay for’. The distinction is a lexical adaptation of the Slavic imperfective/perfective grammatical distinction. In Romani, the opposition is not part of the grammar, although the lexical effect is difficult to translate: here, the form with po- focusses somehow more on the completion of the act, on its telos, as in the following example:

(1) Avdive alo nesavo barvalo džambazi ko Muto today come-3SG. AOR some rich Džambaz to M. thaj vakegija kaj ka avet tajsa te and say-3SG. AOR that FUT come-3SG. PR tomorrow SUB kinel tut te dadestar! Ka pokinel buy-3SG. PR you your father-ABL FUT pay-for-3SG. PR you-ACC frajercal!
gold.coins-INS

‘Today some rich Džambaz came to Muto’s and said that he will come tomorrow to buy you from your father. He will pay for you with gold (florins)’ [Jusuf 1974]

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

4. Morphosyntax – contact

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

The synthetic comparison of adjectives, e.g. the suffix -eder, is lost or highly restricted in Balkan Romani and replaced by analytic comparative and superlative markers borrowed from Balkan Romance (maj), Balkan Slavic (po, naj), Turkish (daʃla, en) etc., e.g. baru ‘big’, pobar, majbaro, daʃla baru ‘biggest’, najbaro, embaro, majbaro ‘biggest’. This loss of synthetic inflection and replacement with borrowed analytic morphology is a salient post-Byzantine Balkanism, i.e. one that developed after the first wave of Romani speakers left the Balkans for northern Europe. Those dialects that did not remain in the Balkans either maintain the old synthetic comparative in -eder with greater consistency, or devise other means to express comparison.

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

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

The development of an analytic future using an invariant particle derived from the verb meaning ‘want’ is one of the earliest identified shared morphosyntactic features of the Balkan languages, and the Romani dialects of the Balkans are included in this development. In the Romani dialects of the Balkans this future marker is usually the particle ka, which is derived from the root kām (3SG kāmela) ‘want’, e.g. ka kerar ‘I will do’. This type of future formation occurs in both Vlax and non-Vlax dialects, but was lost or never developed in some non-Balkan dialects. It is interesting to note that in some dialects the opposition

11 The prefix po- is one of the most common for marking perfectivity throughout the Slavic languages. Cf. in this respect also let ‘take, do, get’ using the Macedonian preverb do-.

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

13 In some dialects, the particle occurs as kām, and in some the lexical verb itself preserves an old I SG ending (kām was regular kām) — but none of these facts change the basic parallel with the classic Balkan languages (cf. also Boretzky 1998, 1999).
between long and short presents, e.g. kerav/kerava 'do 1SG' is reinterpreted as a present/future opposition (Hancock 1995: 99, Ventecl & Cerevskov 1976: 315). The dialects in which this reinterpretation occurs have been in contact with North Slavic, where the perfective present has evolved into a future, i.e. where there are two morphological presents, one of which has the value ‘future’. Thus, in both Balkan and post-Balkan Romani, calques on futures in contact languages appear to have occurred. 14

The use of a possessive construction to express necessity and negated futurity is a Balkanism that has been calqued into both Balkan Romani and Balkan Turkish, despite the absence of a lexical verb meaning ‘have’ in many dialects of the former and all of the latter. Thus, for example, Roman si nain te avav ‘I have to come’ calques exactly the Macedonian imum da odam, Albanian kam te vij (Greg-Albanian kam me ardhje functions as the unmarked future). Similarly, a non-agreeing construction that is used for both negated existence and negated possession is used for negated futurity in e.g. nai man te avav ‘I shall not come’, cf. Macedonian nema da odam, (Balkan Turkish yoktur gideyim, Friedman 1982), etc.

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

(2a) O beng te hal tumaro šoro! [Jusuf 1974]
the devil SUB eat-3SG. PR your head
‘May the devil eat your head!’

(2b) Te si tut nieci bori mangibaskve, mang
if you=ACC intent bride taking-DAT take-IMV
‘If you have the intention of seeking a bride, seek!’ [Jusuf 1974]

Conditional expressions involve combinations of calqued or borrowed markers in the protasis (calqued use of the subjective marker te or the adverb kana ‘when’, Macedonian ako ‘if’, Turkish eger ‘if’ with or without te) with calqued constructions or borrowed markers in the apodosis (borrowed Macedonian conditional marker bi, calqued use of the future marker ka with various tenses including present, imperfect, and pluperfect). Owing to its multiplicity of markers and calques, Macedonian Arli reflects the quadripartite conditional division of Macedonian (see Kamer 1986): hypothetical (i.e. potential) vs. expective (i.e. future) and within each of these fulfillable vs. unfulfillable (similar to realis/irrealis), although there appears to be some variation in the use of bi for hypothetical conditionals (see also Boretzky 1999b: 88–89). 15

14 In Balkan Romani, the long present in -a generally does not occur after modal subordinators such as ka FUT and te SUB, but these are tendencies rather than absolute rules, especially in conditional clauses or when a progressive meaning is implied (see Friedman 1997b). Moreover, the long form is normal with the conditional marker bi.

15 Bugurđi also has postponed filler the imperfect (Boretzky 1993b: 90).

EXPECTATIVE FULfillable
(3a) Eger o manuš te na džangija... evapi ka
if the person SUB not know-3SG. AOR account FUT
kerel pe...
make-SG self
‘If the person does not know... one counts...’ [1994 census instructions]

(3b) Ako e manuškeske is = Eger teisi e manuškes...
if the person-DAT is = if SUB+is the person-DAT
‘If the person...’ [1994 census instructions]

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

(3d) kana šaj ov, soske naši me?
when be.able he why not.be.able I
kana šaj ov, soske me te naši?
when be.able he why I SUB not.be.able
‘If he can, why not me/why can’t I?’ [Romano Sunimal, Vol. 1, No 3, 94.04.01]

EXPECTATIVE UNFulfIcabLe
(3e) Te aveya sine jainute, ka lea sine thuđ
SUB come-3PL. PR PA morning-LOC FUT take-3 SG. PR PA milk
‘If they had come in the morning, they would have gotten milk.’ [Jusuf & Kepeški 1980: 116]

(3f) Me ka gilagiasm sine
I FUT sing-1SG. AOR PA
‘I would have sung...’ [Jusuf & Kepeški 1980: 118]

HYPOTHETICAL FULfillable
(3g) Te ćingara man, me bi avava
SUB invite-2SG. PR me I CON come-1SG. PR
‘If you were to invite me, I would come.’ [cf. Jusuf & Kepeški 1980: 122]

HYPOTHETICAL FULfillable/UNFulfIcabLe
(3h) Te ćingara man sine, me bi avava sine
SUB invite-2SG. PR me PA I CON come-1SG. PR PA
‘If you were to invite me, I would have slept.’ [cf. Jusuf & Kepeški 1980: 120–123]

The expression of expectative unfulfillable (irreal) conditionals by means of the future-marking particle plus a conjugated past tense (usually the imperfect, cf. Golab 1964) is another classic Balkanism found in Balkan Romani that also survives sporadically in the Vlax dialects, e.g. ka soovav sine – ka soovav – kamnas soovav ‘I would have slept’. Moreover, in Macedonian Arli the South Slavic conditional marker bi has been borrowed. The use of the aorist in conditional constructions, however, argues in favor of Matrak' (this vol-
The formation of the Arli imperfect by means of the long present plus /i/ – see below also seems to calque the use of Macedonian third singular imperfect bebe as a generalized emphatic past marker, e.g. bebe sum bit 'I was'. Other examples of calquing such as the use of pefi/ 'self' as an invariant intransitive marker on the model of Macedonian se 'ibid.' also involve the verb phrase.

5. Morphosyntax – resistance

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

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

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

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

One of the most striking morphosyntactic boundaries between Romani and the classic Balkan languages is in the phenomenon of object reduplication. Although object reduplication does occur in Romani, it is weakly grammaticalized and, e.g., in Skopje does not corre-

- This is not to say that the nominal system is impervious to interference, but I would argue that in morphosyntactic terms it is nonetheless more resistant. This is especially true in Macedonian dialects, where e.g. the old locative in /-te/ is still in everyday use (e.g. Jušer 1974). Similarly the survival of the complex system of Romani deictics in various forms in various dialects is a distinctively boundary marker (see Matras 1994 for a coherent analysis). While the grammatical marking of definiteness via an article may be a contact phenomenon, the material used for the marking is arguably native (see Sampson 1992[1968]: 152), and is in any case not postposed as in Slavic, Romance, and Albanian.

Macedonian Arli is also among the conservative Romani dialects in its lack of a lexical verb meaning 'have'. While dative pronouns can occur in constructions with /be/ to indicate possession, these are in variation with accusative and locative pronouns, e.g. si mange - si mande - si man 'I have' (literally 'it is to me - on me - me'). In any case, these count as verbal rather than nominal possessive constructions, i.e. possession is indicated by means of a verb phrase not a noun phrase.

spond to the strong grammaticalization of the Macedonian system with which it is in intimate contact. This is clearly illustrated in examples (5a) and (b), which I recorded in July 1994 from a single broadcast of a Skopje Romani radio music-request program (Gill pull gill 'Song after song') in which the announcer switched freely back and forth between Romani (5a) and Macedonian (5b):

(5a) O Ajnuri thaj o Džemo tari i Švedska the Ajnur and the Džemo from the Sweden bhareer e pranuien e Ramijske thaj congratulate-3SG. PR the marriage-ACC the Rami-DAT and e Mirsadake aj e Safetiske thaj e Sadjaka the Mirsad-DAT and the Safet-DAT and the Sadj-DAT bharen o bijear ... congratulate-3SG. PR the wedding ... 'Ajnur and Džemo from Sweden congratulate Rami and Mirsad on their marriage, and they congratulate Safet and Sadj on their wedding.'

(5b) Naza i Oli od Švedska im go chestiitat Naza and Oli from Sweden them it congratulate-3SG. PR brakot na Rami i Mirsad a na Safet marriage-DEF to Rami and Mirsad and to Safet i Sadjoto im ja chestiitat svadbata ... 'Naza and Oli from Sweden congratulate Rami and Mirsad on their marriage, and they congratulate Safet and Sadj on their wedding.'

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

Romani object reduplication, while it resembles that found in the classic Balkan languages, is not in all respects equivalent. The case system retains its vitality in all of them. Similarly, while object reduplication of the type found in the classic Balkan languages occurs in Romani, it does so either in completely facultative discourse-bound dislocations (as in 6a) or in imitations that can be taken as nonce syntactic borrowings rather than part of the grammatical structure (as in 6b; cf. also Igl 1996: 161).

(6a) O melado pani na pierna le ni o džungle the dirty water not drink-3PL.PR it-ACC nor the bad rura wolves
'Even wicked wolves do not drink dirty water.'

[Jušer 1996: 125]
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6. Conclusion

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

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

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABL</th>
<th>ablative</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>genitive</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td>PLU</td>
<td>pluperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>aorist</td>
<td>IMV</td>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>clitic</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>conditional</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>3SG/FL prefix of 'be'</td>
<td>used as univariant past (remoteness) marker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


