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Turkish Presents in Romani dialects

Victor A. Friedman

0. Introduction

Among Bernt Brendemoe’s many valuable contributions to the fields of Turcology, historical linguistics, and contact linguistics, his monumental work on the Turkish dialects of Trabzon (Brendemoe 2002) stands out as a model of both comprehensive description and perspicacious analysis of historical developments and their causes and effects. Here I would like to take up a theme in Brendemoe (2005:255-262) that he also helped bring to my attention in a comment on my own work (Friedman 2006), namely the Turkish present tense in Romani dialects. In Friedman (forthcoming) I discuss the hierarchy of the copying of Turkish conjugations into Romani. Here I will examine in detail the forms and categories of Turkish present tenses used in Romani dialects in the Balkans, a topic that was beyond the scope of my earlier work and one which relates to Turkish as well as Romani dialectology. Turkish presents in Romani dialects show some remarkable conservatism both reflecting and enhancing our knowledge about their Romanian sources. At the same time, the current situation appears to have taken shape after Romani dialectal differentiation.

The copying—in Johanson’s (2002) sense—of Turkish conjugations into Romani occurs in a variety of dialects spoken in the former Ottoman Empire. The phenomenon as a whole, i.e. the use of Turkish conjugation for a group of verbs copied into Romani from Turkish, is distributed unevenly among various Romani dialects and is not confined to a specific geographic region or larger dialect group, albeit the majority of such dialects are spoken in eastern Bulgaria, and the heaviest copying is found there among speakers of dialects belonging to the North Balkan group. In some of these dialects, the degree of code copying is so heavy that the question arises—in communities where Turkish is also spoken—whether code copying or code switching is involved, and how to distinguish between the two. Copied Turkish present tense conjugations, however, are also found in Romani dialects where the adaptation of Turkish conjugations clearly represents a Romani-internal grammaticalization.

---

1 The consensus classification of the majority of Romani dialects is into four groups: Northern, Central, Vlax, and Balkan, each of which has two major divisions. Of these, the North and South Balkan and the South Vlax are spoken in the Balkans. In this paper, a superscript NB, SB, or SV will indicate whether a dialect is North Balkan, South Balkan, or South Vlax, respectively. For details on the complexities of Romani dialect classification see Mattus (2002) and Boeritzky & Igl (2004). The data used here are from RMS 2001-2005 unless otherwise specified. Numerals for dialects taken from RMS refer to the entry number in the database.
cal development, e.g. Futadži of Haskovo, Bulgaria (Ivanov 2000), as well as in communities where there is no longer any contact with Turkish and knowledge of Turkish has been lost, e.g. Agia Varvara, a suburb of Athens (Igla 1996). In such dialects, we can definitely speak of code compartmentalization, i.e. the use of different grammar for parts of the lexicon from different sources. Code compartmentalization occurs in all Romani dialects in the nominal system, where nouns of native origin or copied into the language up to contact with Byzantine Greek take a stem vowel of native origin, while nouns copied in after that contact do not use the native stem vowel (the terms thematic, oikoclitic, or Asian are used for the former and athematic, xenoclitic, or European for the latter), e.g. native vogni ‘soul’, dat. vogneske but (from Turkish) lafi ‘word’, dat. lafiskhe. The code compartmentalization of Turkish verbs in Romani gives us a window into Balkan dialectological processes.

1. Romani and Turkish Tense-Aspect Systems

The native Romani tense-aspect system is extremely stable and consists of two oppositions, which, following Matras (2002), we can label imperfective/perfective and non-remote/remote. The four paradigms thus produced are present (non-remote imperfective), imperfect (remote imperfective), preterite (non-remote perfective) and pluperfect (remote perfective). The imperfective/perfective opposition is marked by different stems and person markers, while remoteness is marked by an agglutinative suffix, usually -as, or a clitic derived from the preterite of ‘be’. Table 1 is illustrative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>imperfective</th>
<th>perfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-remote</td>
<td>kerav[as] = present</td>
<td>kerđum = preterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remote</td>
<td>keravas – kerava sine = imperfect</td>
<td>kerđumas – kerđum sine = pluperfect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: 1sg ker- ‘do’

All Romani dialects with Turkish conjugation copy the terminative preterite in -DI as in example (1):

(1) Fajma, on tušundylar kaj somas ko p’innoji.
They probably thought that I was in the pub.’ (Crimean 86 460)

In the case of Crimean Romani (which migrated thither from the Balkans) as well as a few other dialects (e.g. Varna Bugurdui [Parpulían], Pozarđiš/Malo Konare Kalajdži, only the Turkish terminative preterite in -DI occurs, usually with a generalized vowel. A number of factors contribute to this situation, including the fact that morphologically a dental stop sometimes (albeit not always) contributes to the derivation of native perfective stems in Romani, and semantically the two preterites are congruent in many respects. It is thus the case that while the past is generally taken to be more marked than the present, and that such is normally the case in Romani grammar, within the framework of relative contextual markedness, the Turkish DI-past is the least marked of the Turkish paradigms vis-à-vis Romani code compartmentalization and thus the most likely to occur.

The next least marked paradigms are the intraterminal present tenses—both focal and nonfocal (smidiki zaman and genişi zaman, respectively, in Turkish grammatical terminology)—but here the nature of congruence is more complex. Since native Romani verbs have only a single present tense form (and a single imperfect), the copying of Turkish present paradigms (and the imperfects derived therefrom using -DI) presents three possibilities: just one, just the other, or both. At the same time, however, the present system in the Balkan Turkish dialects is itself not uniform, and so before considering the Romani we must look at the Turkish.

It has long been recognized (at least since Németh 1956) that one of the distinguishing features of West Rumelian Turkish vis-à-vis East Rumelian Turkish is the absence of the intraterminal focal in -ye (Standard Turkish -yor-), and, in many cases but not all (e.g. not in Gostivar and Ohrid in western Macedonia, as well as Nevrkop [Gisce Delcev] in Përthin Macedonia [southwestern Bulgaria], see Jafar-Nasteva 1970:280, Tufan 2007, Kakuk 1972:245, Mollova 1962:95), the presence of a present in -ye whose origin may or may not be connected to an affixation of the auxiliary that gives modern Standard Turkish -yor- (Doerfer 1959 vs Németh 1956: 40-45; see also Adamović 1985:116-171, esp. 146, 165-71, Johansen 1989, Csató 2001, Brendemuehl 2002:246-48).

The complete absence of any sort of ye-present in the Turkish of parts of Macedonia might represent peripheral archaisms (cf. Brendemuel 2002), or, on the other hand, they could represent a loss. In either case, language contact in the multilingual environment of western Macedonia—including shift to Turkish in the towns motivated by various sociolinguistic factors—can be invoked, but in either direction. On the one hand, Macedonian dialects lack the kind of grammaticalized opposition between focal and non-focal (or progressive/non-progressive) that characterizes the rise of the Turkish smidiki zaman. While it could be argued that the Slavic perfective/imperfective opposition in present tense verbs might be conducive to strengthening such an opposition as a substrate effect, in fact Macedonian—and especially the western dialects—followed a different route than, say, Russian or even Bulgarian. Macedonian present perfectives are strictly limited to modal contexts; see Kramer 1986.) On the other hand, in Albanian the particle po is used
with the present and imperfect to render intraterritorial focal meanings similar to those rendered by Standard Turkish -yor- and -yordu-. And yet, precisely in Ohrid and Gostivar, both of which had (Dankoff & Elise 2000) and have significant Albanian-speaking populations as well as Macedonian-speaking, the local dialect has only the single, older, geniş zaman present.6

2. Turkish Presents in the Romani of Greece and Romania

Turning now to the Romani situation, the dialect of Agia Varvara6V (AV) (Igla 1996:61-62, 218) has only a single Turkish present, based on the geniş zaman, and follows the rules of Turkish vowel harmony to a limited extent and within the restrictions of the dialect’s phonology (stems in unrounded vowels can take -um, -im, or -om; stems in -if-/i take -u and those in -if-/j take -i or -u) as seen in Table 2:

| konuşturum, jazaram, beklerim | konuşturum, jazaram, bekleris |
| konuşturum, jazaram, beklerin | konuşturumun, jazaramun, beklerinis |
| konuştur, jazar, bekler | konuşturlar, jazalar, beklerler |

Table 2: Agia Varvara present conjugation of konuści ‘talk’, jaza ‘write’, bekler ‘wait’

Historically, speakers of the AV dialect, like other Southern Vlax speakers, spent a formative period in Romanian-speaking territory. They reached Greece via Slavic-speaking territory, apparently eastern Bulgaria (Igla 1996:2-3).

According to Adamou (2006) the geniş zaman does not occur in Komotini6V (Gümüşkene), only the present in -yor. The linking vowel is usually -i, e.g., datunisi [sic] ‘we think’, konuştor ‘he talks’, jazmoir ‘he doesn’t write’, but cf. also, đinijsor ‘he comes back’, đitijsor ‘he thinks’. The one other Romani dialect with Turkish conjugation spoken in Greece for which we have some data is Florina (Lerin) Arli6N, jətarlar ‘they live’, bejmari–bejmor ‘they like’. While jətarlar is clearly geniş zaman, bejmari–bejmor is unclear. The loss of intervocalic -g- (begon) is consistent with the Florina Turkish dialect, which has a şimdiki zaman with suffixes in -eyr, -eyr, and -eyr although the geniş zaman suffixes show variation between -ar and -ur on the same stem and use the geniş zaman where Standard Turkish would have the şimdiki zaman (Mollova 1968). Unfortunately, the data currently at our disposal are not sufficient for more than this.

The one other dialect to be considered here that is not spoken in eastern Bulgaria is Spotori (Kalajdzija6N) of southeastern Romania. The forms beneri (1050) ‘it pleases’, ederin (827) ‘I do’, and jəarsor (868) ‘I live’ are all geniş zaman, which appears to be the only Turkish present in the dialect. These speakers probably crossed the Danube from Bulgaria, however, and so we shall now turn to dialects from Eastern Bulgaria.

As indicated above, Turkish conjugations in Romani dialects of Eastern Bulgaria show the possibility of generalizing one or the other of the Turkish present tenses, but the shape of the şimdiki zaman suffix shows considerable variation.

3. Turkish Presents in the Romani of Northeastern Bulgaria

Here we shall consider nine East Bulgarian dialects: Vălăi Dol Kalajdzija (Laxo)6N (VD), Sliven Nange (Gradeski)6N (SN), Sliven Muzikantska6N (SM), Dolni Çiftlik Kalajdzija6V (DK), Varna Kalajdzija6V (Pëtnik; Trakijski Kalajdzija Vlaxoria) (VK) Sinder Kalburi6V (SK), Kaspičan Xoraxan6V (XX), Šumen Xoraxan6N (ŠX), and Varna Zgăzian6N (Gradinaro Drindari) VG. These towns represent a relatively compact area between the Dobrudja Plateau to the north and the Balkan Mountains to the south. In terms of Turkish dialectology, the region is a blank in Németh (1980-81), and Adamović (1985:141) cites sources only to the north in Dobrudja itself. The nearest descriptions are those of the Omerguc region due north of Sliven and southwest of Šumen (Dalh 1976).

Dolni Çiftlik Kalajdzija6V (DK), like AV6V, has only the geniş zaman and does not exhibit any noteworthy peculiarities aside from variation between sevur and sevur alongside bitir[im], bieser[im], djušunjur[ium]. Futudž6N (Fu) (Ivanov 2000), like DK, also has only the geniş zaman, but without any variation in stem vowels departing from Standard Turkish. Vălăi Dol Kalajdzija6N (VD) has both types of present, e.g., konustor (649) and konusjorum (504) beklîr (707), etc. The one occurrence of konusjorum (1057) could represent a local archaism. The only occurrence of a geniş zaman form is actually in the context of an imperfect:

(2) Voj ačelai pa lende taj konustor lenge.
‘She was standing between them and talking to them.’ (649)

There is also a natively imperfect konusjorasam (812) ‘we were speaking’, where -am represents a native Romani 1p preteterite marker that has been added adglutinatively. The şimdiki zaman is also used in optative-subjunctive clauses:

---

6 The first part of the name is the town, the second is the group name, alternatives or specifications of suburbs are given in parentheses. Group names are not isomorphic with dialect lines, and so the superscript dialect classifications are the best guide. The abbreviation after the dialect name(s) is the one used in this article.
There are no other attestations with bien- but elsewhere we have seviyor (991) and seviyorlar (450, 564, 678) both in focal (immediate) and non-focal (generalizing) contexts. There is also an example with a low linking vowel: bojajor (929) ‘he paints’. The Turkish optative-subjunctive is used in te-clauses:

8. Ov avijas me kereste te konushun mansa.
   ‘He came to my house to talk to me.’ (440)

Sliven Muznikantska* also has relatively few Turkish verbs, but only the DI-past and the şimdiki zaman in terms of attested categories. In this it is unlike other Romani dialects in Bulgaria and resembles Komotini* insofar as it uses the şimdiki zaman but lacks the geniş zaman. The forms we have are the following: seveforum (753), seviyorlar (564, 678), seviyorlar (450) and the more archaic seviyorum (1050). See Csató (2001:416) on the loss of the aorist elsewhere in Southwest Turkic.

Varna Kalajdži* also has relatively few Turkish verbs, but it has two presents: şimdiki and geniş. The former is of the τ-type, e.g. bitirii (770), biyiieriler (450), setiiler (564), diyşiunjürüm (736); examples of the geniş zaman are diyşiunjürüm (718), seveyrim (579), and biyiierim (753).

The final four dialects—Varna (Gradinarevo) Drindari (Gadžkano)** (VG), Sindel Kalburdi** (SK), Kaspičan Xoraxani** (XX), Šumen Xoraxani** (ŠX)—all have medium to heavy copying. All but SK use Turkish optative-subjunctives after the Romani subjunctive marker te as well as Turkish synthetic future and negative forms of Turkish verbs (as opposed to native Romani analytic markers ko[n] plus present or optative-subjunctive and na plus affirmative, respectively, used in dialects with light to medium copying of Turkish paradigm). But all but SK also use Turkish infinitives, usually after some other Turkish element, e.g. bıšlađo baarna ‘she began to scream’ (VG 759) Okha džana trin džição koniumaa. ‘He knows [how] to speak three languages’ (XX 894), but Rachi ljjon o grastis gijon te ajđama ‘Yesterday I took my horse and went for a ride’ (ŠX 1035) is an exception to this.*

Elicited paradigms are given in Tables 4 and 5, the former with a back-vowel stem, the later consonantal with front vocalism. Table 6 gives additional forms for each dialect demonstrating other features (back vowel stems for ŠX, front vowel stems for VG, and variations in linking vowel and endings for various dialects).

---

* Elicited paradigms in RMs give only the imperfactive and perfective non-remote in Romani, and in dialects with Turkish conjugation only a single present and the DI-past. We give sample elicited paradigms for those dialects for which they were available, which was not for all dialects with Turkish conjugation, since some dialects did not use Turkish verbs for those lexical items for which paradigms were elicited.

7 The problem of Turkish infinitives in Romani dialects is beyond the scope of the present paper, but this last example presents significant challenges to models of codeswitching that attempt to define the relationship between two languages in such phenomena on purely formal grounds.
Table 4: kapa ‘close’ (3s preterite kapada) (263)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SK</th>
<th>KX</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kapaim</td>
<td>kapais</td>
<td>kapieik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapai</td>
<td>kapaisinis</td>
<td>kapiesin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapai</td>
<td>kapallar</td>
<td>kapilar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: evlen- ‘get married’ (282), etiw- ‘arrive, reach’ (304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SK</th>
<th>KX</th>
<th>SX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>evlenim</td>
<td>evlenis</td>
<td>evlenierik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evlenisin</td>
<td>evlenisis</td>
<td>evleniesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evlensi</td>
<td>evlenilari</td>
<td>evleniler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Additional examples 1s, 3s, 3p; *=negative

Table 7: Glosses of stems for Table 8

As can be seen from these tables, SK and VG display the kind of y-present usually associated with West Rumelian Turkish but also attested in Dobrudja (Adamović 1985:141) while KX and SX show both a low front vocalism in the -y/er- of the *gimiki zaman, and, in the third person, and final vowel seen in Şumen (Adamović 1985:150) and the Omurtag region, in which latter region -e is devoiced to -e word finally (Dalli 1976:108). It thus appears that Şumen and Kaspıpán Romani are consistent with Şumen and Omurtag Turkish, while the Romanis of Varna and Sindel is influenced by Dobrudjan Turkish. The Varma negative without raising in azeitmeim (1003) occurs also in Omurtag. Forms like bekli (VG 509) also occur in Dobrudja, while the Sindel forms oku (884) and išiyo (886) might both be archaisms, albeit išiyo looks like and abraded yor-gimiki, and such forms are attested in the Turkish southeastern Bulgaria (Němec 1980-81).

4. Conclusion

The forms of Turkish present tenses in Romani dialects with Turkish conjugation display considerable complexity reflecting both contact with local Turkish dialects and Romani-internal processes. Table 8 summarizes the types of present tenses that are attested.

Table 8: Summary of Types of Present Tenses in Romani Dialects with Turkish Conjugation

As can be seen from Table 8, the type of Turkish present(s) depends more on the Turkish dialects with which the Romani is in contact than on the Romani dialect group to which the speech community belongs. Thus, for example, both North Balkan and South Vlax dialects in southeastern Bulgaria and Greek Thrace have the yor-gimiki zaman, while those near Dobrudja both have the y-gimiki zaman. Meanwhile, the North Balkan dialects near Omurtag (Kaspıpán, Şumen) have the
The absence of any şimidiği zaman from Agia Varvara, Florina Arfi, Spoiorti, Futadži, and Dolni Čiflik could in some cases be ascribed to simplification to conform with native Romani patterns after a loss of contact with Turkish, but not for Futadži and Dolni Čiflik, where Turkish is still a contact language. At the same time, the absence the şimidiği zaman from some Turkish dialects in Macedonia raises the possibility that the absence is an archaic conservatism characteristic of a social, if not a geographic, periphery (cf. Brendemoen 2002:257-262).

In terms of chronology, the fact that the shape of the Turkish present is independent of the group to which the Romani dialect belongs suggests that the phenomenon of Turkish conjugation—at least as currently attested—either has its origins in or is influenced by the linguistic situation after the differentiation of the Balkan and Vlax dialect groups. The evidence in Evliya Čelebi (Friedman and Dunkoff 1991) as well as the distribution of Romani-internal archaisms and innovations (Matras 2005), suggests the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the period of Vlax differentiation, which puts Turkish conjugation in Romani as taking its present shape after that time. Within Turkish itself, Brendemoen (2002:255-62) argues for the possibility that the şimiş dik zaman in Trabzon is not an abraded form of the şimidiği zaman but rather an intraterminal gerund with auxiliary, and that the resemblances between dialects in eastern Anatolia and the Balkan periphery (West Rumelia and Dobrudja) are peripheral archaisms rather than either parallel developments or the importation of eastern Anatolian speakers to the Balkans. On the one hand, forms such as Siştel or (.SK 884) and or (SK 886) or Sliven Nange dalio are suggestive of how the abrasion might have taken place. On the other hand, the restricted attestation of imperfects affixing idî to the şimidiği zaman as opposed to the genis zaman (cf. Brendemoen 2002:256 on Trabzon)—the former is absent in Onurtag (Dalli 1976:119)—argues for a separate origin of the şimidiği zaman and the relative conservatism of Turkish conjugations in Romani. Combining the various factors adduced above, then, we can thus say that while the current state of Turkish conjugation in Romani represents a Romani and Turkish dialectal situation and distribution from the beginning of the decline of Ottoman power in the Balkans, the combined evidence from various Romani dialects can also support Brendemoen’s hypothesis for the peripheral archaic nature of the şimidiği zaman.
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Is Eynu a mixed language, a borrowed lexicon, or something else?

Tooru Hayasi

1. Introduction

Eynu is a linguistic variety spoken by small groups of people called Abdal, scattered over the southern districts of the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of China. Different speculations have been presented on the origin of Eynu, but judging from its present state, its phonology and grammar are completely of Modern Uyghur, while its lexicon contains non-Uyghur words mainly of Persian origin. Some scholars have claimed that Eynu is a mixed language, whereas others have argued that it is simply the result of extensive borrowing. It is true that characteristics of Eynu may apparently be interpreted as the result of either mixing or borrowing. Both interpretations, however, have problems.

In this paper, after briefly introducing Eynu, its lexical make-up will be examined. Then, based on the findings during our fieldwork, I will sketch another possible story of its lexical structure, in which Phonetic Selective Copying is likely to play an essential role. Finally I will also refer to the possibility that it might be relevant to seemingly unrelated phenomena, such as lexical free variation and neologism.

Map 1 shows the location of Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of China, where Eynu is spoken, and Map 2, the possible distribution of the Abdal people according to previous studies such as Grenard, Pelliot, Le Coq, Mannerheim, Hilden, Raquette, Stein, Zhao and Aximu, and Mutallip Sidiq, which Lasdtäter and Tietze (1994) have listed in order.

* The original version of this paper was presented at the Tilburg Workshop on Codecopying (8-10 March, 2007, at Tilburg University). I am grateful to Ad Backus, the organizer of the workshop, for a wonderful opportunity of substantial discussion. I am greatly indebted to Abdurishid Yakup, Agnes Bahnoy, Bernd Brendemuhlen, Eva A. Csato, Szee Dogrotz, Lars Johanson, Jonathan Owens, and Carol W. Pfitz on various information and discussion. I also thank Mark Rosa for his scrupulous assistance in the preparation.

† Although the word Eynu, a synonym of Abdal, is known only to some Abdal people, I refer to the linguistic variety by this name, since scholars seem to have already accepted it as the name of this linguistic variety, while the name Abdal, exclusively used by non-Abdal Uyghurs, has a strong discriminatory connotation.