

## Clause Linking in (Epirus) Romani

Yaron Matras

*University of Manchester*

Clause linking in Romani is essentially similar to clause linking in most other European languages, especially languages of the Balkans: It is based primarily on linking two finite clauses by means of semantically specialised connectors (conjunctions), which introduce the Supporting clause (SC). These are usually derived from grammaticalised interrogatives or deictics. In Romani, they can be considered a case of ‘replica grammaticalisation’ (cf. Heine & Kuteva 2005) following the model of the contact languages in the earlier European history of Romani (i.e. Byzantine Greek), as well as in later periods. There is considerable uniformity among the conjunctions that derive in such a way. Another group of conjunctions tend to be borrowed from the respective contemporary or recent contact languages, and are therefore diverse among the dialects of Romani. It is interesting to note that, although variation occurs, the likelihood of a conjunction to be borrowed is often predictable (cf. Matras 1998, Matras 2002, Elšík & Matras 2006).

### Background

Romani is the only Indo-Aryan language that has been spoken mainly in Europe (as well as in communities of European emigrants) since the Middle Ages. Its origins are in a Central Indo-Aryan language, with layers of Northwestern or Dardic influence on morphological typology, and further influences on vocabulary as well as syntactic-typological structure and even grammatical morphology from Armenian, Iranian, and especially Byzantine Greek. Following the dispersal of Romani-speaking populations across Europe, from the late 14th century onwards, dialects have grown apart, both through internal changes and as a result of diverse contact influences. (For an introductory discussion of dialect diversity in Romani see Matras 2002, and the Sample Database on the Manchester Romani Project website, <http://www.llc.manchester.ac.uk/Research/Projects/romani/>; for an in-depth discussion of cross-dialectal structural changes see also Elšík & Matras 2006).

The variety selected for the present discussion is a Romani dialect spoken in the village of Parakalamos, near Ioannina, in the Greek district of Epirus.<sup>1</sup> Referred to by its

---

<sup>1</sup> I thank Hazel Gardner for her support in glossing part of the data, and Veronica Schulman for comments on earlier work on this dialect. The present paper was written at the Research Centre for Linguistic Typology at

speakers as *romacilikanes*, from the self-appellation *romacil* (akin to other group-internal endonyms used among Roma in other areas, such as *romanichel* in France and *romanichal* in Britain), it belongs to the dialects of the so-called Balkan subgroup of Romani, which have undergone relatively few innovative changes and are considered conservative within Romani as a whole. Epirus Romani appears to have been spoken in isolation from other Romani varieties for quite some time, and is particularly conservative in a number of aspects. It is one of several Romani dialects still spoken in a Greek-speaking area, which will have been the European ‘homeland’ of Romani prior to the dispersion of Romani populations across Europe. In addition to Greek, speakers have been exposed to influence from Turkish and especially Albanian.

The data considered here derive largely from questionnaire elicitation carried out as part of the Manchester Romani Project’s dialectological survey of Romani.<sup>2</sup> An overview of the project methodology can be found in Matras (2004a) and in Elšík & Matras (2006), as well as on the project’s website.<sup>3</sup> For a brief description of the Romacilikanes dialect of Parakalamos see Matras (2004b); for a discussion of the community from an ethnographic perspective see Theodosiou (2004).

## Clause structure in Romani

Romani clauses are generally finite, especially in the Balkan dialects of the language.<sup>4</sup> The modality distinction that is often expressed in other languages through the alternation of finite and infinitive forms is expressed in Romani, as in many of the other languages of the Balkans, through the choice of complementiser. Non-factual or subjunctive clauses are introduced by *te* and followed by the subjunctive (which is a contracted form of the present-future):

---

La Trobe University, Melbourne, during my visit there as Distinguished Fellow of the Institute for Advanced Study and as Australian Research Council International Fellow. I am grateful to R.M.W. Dixon and to Alexandra Aikhenvald for making this possible.

<sup>2</sup> Supported by Arts and Humanities Research Council grants no. B/RE/AN4725/APN11878 and B/RG/AN4725/APN9447, and Economic and Social Research Council grant no. RES-000-23-1133.

Recordings of Parakalamos Romani were carried out by Sissie Theodosiou.

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.llc.manchester.ac.uk/Research/Projects/romani/>

<sup>4</sup> Gerundial forms are peripheral, and survive only in some dialects, usually in the north of Europe. Some central and western European dialects of Romani have abolished subject-agreement in complement clauses by generalising one of the finite forms, thereby introducing a quasi-infinitive into the language. Neither type of non-finite form is relevant to the dialect under consideration.

- (1) *oj na kam-el-a te dža-l ti pol-i*  
 she NEG want-3SG-IND COMP go-3SG.SUBJ to.F town-F.NOM  
 ‘She doesn’t want to go to town’

Optional omission of the complementiser is attested only for ‘can’:<sup>5</sup>

- (2) *bor-is av-es man-za?*  
 can-2SG come-2SG.SUBJ 1SG.OBL-INST  
 ‘Can you come with me?’

The factual or epistemic complementiser is borrowed from Greek – *oti* – and is followed by a subject and an independent indicative verb:

- (3) *dikh-l-jom oti oj na sines to kher*  
 see-PAST-1SG COMP she NEG was.3SG in.M house  
 ‘I saw that she was not at home’

Word order in Romani is variable, with direct and indirect objects generally following the verb except in focus constructions (topicalisation or left-dislocation). There is a tendency for non-factual complementisers to be followed immediately by the subjunctive verb, as in (1), while the factual complementiser is usually followed by the subject of the complement clause, as in (3). Subject pronouns can be omitted with contextually accessible referents (pro-drop). In adverbial subordinations (i.e. subordinated clauses that are neither relative clauses or embeddings or complements), there is generally flexibility in the positioning of the Focal Clause and the Supporting Clause.

### Temporal clauses

Temporal succession is expressed through iconic juxtaposition of the clauses, often mediated by *eli* ‘and’ (borrowed from Albanian):

---

<sup>5</sup> Note that here, and elsewhere, Greek-derived verbs, especially modal verbs but in some cases also lexical verbs, may retain their Greek-derived inflection. The glosses indicate simply the function of inflection endings, irrespective of origin.

- (4) *ksafnika ov ušti-ndil-o eli naš-t-o*  
 suddenly he stand.up-PAST-M and leave-PAST-M  
 ‘He suddenly stood up and left.’

The completion of the first event can be presented explicitly as a pre-requisite for its succession by the second event; this is achieved by *pastajna/ pa pastajna/ pastanja* ‘then’ (also an Albanian loan):

- (5) *tajça katel-iz-av-a a-ja buti eli pa pastajna ka dža-v*  
 tomorrow finish-LOAN-1SG-IND this-F work and after FUT go-1SG.SUBJ  
*ti poli*  
 to.F town  
 ‘Tomorrow I will finish this work and then I shall go to town.’

Relative time draws on either factual or non-factual constructions, often preceded by markers that are borrowed from Greek (and are employed in Greek in a similar way, i.e. preceding complementisers). Anteriority (‘before’) employs the non-factual complement structure with *te*, which is preceded by the Greek-derived conjunction *prin* ‘before’:

- (6) *Prin te av-av te džin-av akate dživ-id-om but*  
 before COMP come-1SG.SUBJ COMP live-1SG.SUBJ here.LOC live-PAST-1SG much  
*dur akatar*  
 far here.ABL  
 ‘Before I came to live here I lived far away from here.’

Final temporal clauses (‘until’) rely similarly on non-factual constructions, introduced either by anterior markers, as in (7), or by the conjunction *óska*, as in (8). The latter is based on Greek *ós-pu*, in a combination of a direct borrowing of the first element, and a calque of the second element – a relativiser – through Romani *ka* (note that both Greek *pu* and Romani *ka* derive from the respective interrogative ‘where’):

- (7) *ov na bori te naš-el prin te arakh-el o klidi*  
 he NEG can.3SG COMP leave-3SG.SUBJ before COMP find-3SG.SUBJ DEF key  
 ‘He can’t leave until he finds the key.’

- (8) *na borume te džah palal, ós-ka t'avel oj lačhes*  
 NEG can.1PL COMP go-1PL.SUBJ back until COMP be-3SG.SUBJ she well  
 'We cannot go back, until she gets well.'

Simultaneity or temporal overlap can be expressed in several different ways. Subject complements using the non-factual construction in *te* indicate a state or action of the object of the main clause ('object raising'):

- (9) *dik-l-om je muř-es te phir-el to drom*  
 see-PAST-1SG INDEF man-M.OBL COMP walk-3SG.SUBJ in.M street  
 'I saw a man walking in the street.'

In the absence of gerundial constructions, predications that describe the actions of the subject of the main clause are arranged in a paratactic way:

- (10) *ov a-l-o man-za garav-el-as kati*  
 he come-PAST-3.M 1SG.OBL-INST hide-3SG-REM something  
 'He came towards me hiding something.'

Clauses are linked with *kana* 'when' when the purpose of the supporting clause (SC) is to serve as a point of reference for the temporal anchoring of the focal clause (FC), leaving open whether there is temporal overlap or not. Such constructions can thus be used for either simultaneity, as in (11), or for posteriority, as in (12):

- (11) *oj daran-dil-i kana dikh-l-jas-os*  
 she fear-PAST-F.3 when see-PAST-3SG-M.CL  
 'She was frightened when she saw him.'

- (12) *kana stamac-al-o o skoljos arxi-sajl-om te dolev-o*  
 when end-PAST-3.M DEF school begin-PAST-1SG COMP work-1SG  
 'After I finished school [= when school ended], I started to work.'

Durative relations are expressed by Greek *oso*:

- (13) *gilav-d-am gilja oso ker-ah-as buti*  
 sing-PAST-1PL songs while do-1PL-REM work

‘We sang songs while we were working.’

Conditional clauses are introduced by *ama*, which is borrowed in this function from dialectal and colloquial Greek (in other languages of the Balkans and beyond, *ama* is a contrastive marker, continuing its original function in Arabic). Occasionally, *ama* is followed by inherited *te* (which in Romani serves as both conditional marker and non-factual complementiser), which immediately precedes the verb. In potential conditional constructions, the verb appears in the present (indicative or subjunctive) or future tense in the conditional clause, and in the future tense or imperative in the main clause. The focal clause is not usually introduced by any particular marker, but its predication is usually limited in its tense marking to either the future (marked with *ka* + present subjunctive; exs. 14-15), the imperative (ex. 16), the conditional (marked by *ka* + imperfect; ex. 17) or the remote conditional (*ka* + pluperfect; ex. 18):

- (14) *ama pj-av-a thud but k' av-av but zural-i*  
if drink-1SG-IND milk much FUT be-1SG.SUBJ very strong-F  
‘If I drink a lot of milk I will be very strong.’
- (15) *ama k' av-es, ka dikh-av tu*  
if FUT come-2SG.SUBJ FUT see-1SG.SUBJ you  
‘If you will come, I shall see you’
- (16) *ama te dikh-es kati phin man-ge*  
if COMP see-2SG.SUBJ something tell 1SG.OBL-DAT  
‘If you see something, tell me.’
- (17) *ama ther-av-as xandi love ka d-av-as tu*  
if have-1SG-REM some money FUT give-1SG-REM you  
‘If I had some money I would give [it] to you.’
- (18) *ama tu t' av-eh-as idžara ka ther-es-as-i*  
if you COMP come-2SG-REM yesterday FUT have-2SG-REM-F.CL  
*dikhlo*  
seen  
‘If you had come yesterday you would have seen her.’

Concessive conditionals are expressed by Greek-derived *eθ an* ‘even if’:

- (19) *prepi te dža-h othe eθ an na kam-eh-a te dža-s*  
must COMP go-2SG.SUBJ there even if NEG want-2SG-IND COMP go-2SG.SUBJ

‘You have to go there, even if you don’t want to go.’

## Consequence

Cause and result are expressed by *soste* and *soske* (the Romani interrogative *so* ‘what’ in the locative and dative case forms, respectively):

(20) *ka dža-v te sov-av akana soste šom čind-i*  
FUT go-1SG.SUBJ COMP sleep-1SG.SUBJ now because be.1SG tired-F  
‘I shall go to sleep now because I am tired.’

(21) *d-in-as-o olja soske na kam-el-as-os*  
give-PAST-3SG-M.CL that.F.OBL because NEG want- 3SG-REM-M.CL  
‘He gave it to her because he didn't need it want it’.

Purpose clauses behave in Romani much like non-factual complements: They are introduced by a non-factual complementiser, and the verb appears in the subjunctive. In Parakalamos Romani, ‘simple’ purpose clauses, in which the semantic connection between main and subordinated clause is straightforward, are introduced by *te*:

(22) *gel-jom te dikh-av me da-ja*  
went-1SG COMP see-1SG.SUBJ my.OBL mother-F.OBL  
‘I went to see my mother.’

(23) *d-in-om e gadž-es xande love te kin-el kafe-s*  
give-PAST-1SG DEF man-M.OBL some money COMP buy-3SG.SUBJ coffee.OBL  
‘I gave the man some money to buy coffee.’

‘Complex’ purpose clauses are introduced by *ka te*. Here, there is either intensified planning and effort and so ‘reflective intent’ on the part of the actor to achieve the goal, or alternatively the connection between the two events is not entirely obvious and demands reinforced emphasis (see discussion in Matras 2004a):

(24) *ov kin-d-as nev-e cavala ka te dža-l ti poli*  
he buy-PAST-3SG new-PL clothes COMP COMP go-3SG.SUBJ in.F town  
‘He bought new clothes in order to go to town.’

(25) *sigo ka me ther-av but love ka te kin-av mindo*

soon FUT I have-1SG much money COMP COMP buy-1SG.SUBJ my.M  
*mo aftokind-os*  
 my.M car  
 ‘Soon I will have enough money in order to buy my own car.’

### Addition

Unordered addition is expressed, like temporal succession, by the coordinating conjunction *eli*, borrowed from Albanian:

(26) *to sabahi pj-as-a kafe-s eli to apojama pj-as-a čaj*  
 in.M morning drink-1PL-IND coffee-OBL and in.M evening drink-1PL-IND tea  
 ‘In the morning we drink coffee and in the evening we drink tea.’

Exemption is marked by Greek *éxθos* accompanying a non-factual construction:

(27) *éxθos te beš-el-a to kafenijos, na ker-el-a but praymata*  
 apart COMP sit-3SG-IND in.M café NEG do-3SG-IND much work  
 ‘Apart from sitting in the café, he doesn’t do much work.’

Contrast is expressed through the introduction of the focal clause with Greek-derived *ala*:

(28) *kanonika uštj-av-a tis epta to sabahi ala adives ušt-indil-om ka to šov*  
 usually rise-1SG-IND DEF seven in.M morning but today rise-PAST-1SG at in.M six  
 ‘Usually I get up at seven in the morning but today I got up at six.’

### Alternatives

Though no example sentence can be retrieved from the data, disjunction is known to employ the Greek disjunctive conjunction *i*; cf. the focus construction in (29):

(29) *to vend i te d-el-a biršindo i te av-el-a eras*  
 in.M winter or COMP give-3SG-IND rainy or COMP come-3SG-IND wind  
*i o duj*  
 or DEF two  
 ‘In winter it is either rainy or windy or both.’

Negative addition is marked by Greek-derived *xoris* accompanied by the non-factual construction:

- (30) *oj phir-d-as jira kato kher xoris te arakh-el phirav-d-i*  
she walk-PAST-3SG around at.M house without COMP find-3SG.SUBJ open.F  
*e vudar*  
DEF door  
'She walked around the house without finding the door open.'

### Manner

The relevance of the factuality opposition to general clause linking, even beyond complementation, is encountered again in the domain of manner. Real manner is introduced by *sar* 'how', combined with the relativiser *ka* introducing a factual clause:

- (31) *mar-d-os sar ka mar-d-os but zuales*  
kill-PAST-M.CL how REL hit-PAST-M.CL very hard  
'They killed him through hitting him too hard.'

Hypothetical manner, by contrast, is marked similarly with *sar*, but in combination with the non-factual complementiser *te*, and this combination is reinforced by Greek-derived *omos* 'like, as if':

- (32) *vaker-el-a omos sar te dikh-el-a buti but*  
talk-3SG-IND like how COMP see-3SG-IND work much  
'He talks as if he would work a lot.'

### Summary

Romani draws exclusively on independent, uninflected clause initial markers for clause linking. These may appear either at the beginning of the Focal clause, or at the beginning of the Supporting clause, depending on the (semantic) type of link. Only conditional clauses are marked on both sides of the link, though the primary marking here is clearly by means of a conjunction introducing the Supporting clause, and it is primarily the semantics of the

link that limit the choice among tense and mood categories in the Focal clause. Focal clauses are otherwise always factual, and allow a choice of tense/mood category in their verb. By contrast, Supporting clauses may be either factual or non-factual, each type accompanying a distinctive set of linking types. Factual Supporting clauses are in the minority, and cover the domains of temporal posteriority and overlap, durative-overlap, temporal overlap with subject raising, consequence, and real manner. Non-Factual clauses cover temporal overlap with object raising, temporal anteriority and finality, conditional, and purpose clauses, exemption, negative addition, and hypothetical manner.

It has already been established that clause linking is a domain that attracts structural borrowing in situations of language contact (cf. Matras 1998). Romani is an excellent example for contact phenomena, since all members of the speech community are bilingual, and different varieties of Romani are in contact with different languages under comparable sociolinguistic conditions. Interestingly, it appears from the data on Epirus Romani that some domains of clause linking are more prone to borrowing than others. Like other Romani dialects, contact influences here are layered, and we find structures from the contemporary contact language Greek, alongside elements from the recent contact language Albanian (no longer spoken by the younger generations). It is first of all notable that all markers that introduce Focal clauses are borrowed. This does not, in my opinion, have to do with their status at the beginning of focal clauses, but rather with the semantics of the link itself. We find greater stability of borrowed material in the area of temporal succession and addition, where Albanian markers are kept, while the field of disjunction and contrast are vulnerable to the ongoing influence of the contemporary contact language Greek (confirming the hierarchy but > or > and proposed in Matras 1998). Other domains that are borrowing-prone are temporal anteriority and finality, exemption, negative addition, condition and concessive condition, and hypothetical manner; once again, the semantics-pragmatics that appear to motivate borrowing here are well in line with recent observation on the contact-susceptibility of delimitation, restriction, exemption, and contrast (for a discussion see Elšík & Matras 2006 and especially Matras 2007).

## References

- Elšík, Viktor & Matras, Yaron. 2006. *Markedness and language change: The Romani sample*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2005. *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Matras, Yaron. 1998. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics* 36-2, 281-331.
- 2004a. Typology, dialectology and the structure of complementation in Romani. In: Kortmann, Bernd. Ed. *Dialectology meets typology*. Berlin: Mouton. 277-304.
  - 2004b. Romacilikanes: The Romani dialect of Parakalamos. *Romani Studies* 14-1: 59-109.
  - 2007. The borrowability of structural categories. In: Matras, Y. & Sakel, J. eds. *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Theodosiou, Aspasia. 2004. Be-longing in a doubly occupied place: The Parakalamos Gypsy musicians. *Romani Studies* 14-1: 25-58.



Table 1: Overview of clause linking marker in Epirus Romani (shaded fields indicate non-factual *te*-clauses)

Linking type	SC marker	FC marker	origin	order
Temporal succession 1		<i>eli</i>	Albanian	fixed FC-FC
Temporal succession 2		<i>eli pa pastajna</i>	Albanian	fixed FC-FC
Relative time: Anterior	<i>prin te</i>		Greek + <i>te</i>	flexible
Relative time: Final	<i>oska te</i>		Greek <i>os</i> +REL + <i>te</i>	flexible
Relative time: Overlap (object raising)	<i>te</i>			fixed FC-SC
Relative time: Overlap (subject raising)				fixed FC-SC
Relative time: Simultaneity, posteriority	<i>kana</i>		‘when’	flexible
Relative time: Simultaneity – durative	<i>oso</i>		Greek	flexible
Conditional	<i>ama (te)</i>	tense/mood selection	Greek (+ <i>te</i> )	flexible
Conditional: concessive	<i>eθ an</i>		Greek	flexible
Consequence	<i>soste, soske</i>		‘what’ + LOC/DAT	fixed FC-SC
Purpose clause	<i>te, ka te</i>			preference for FC-SC
Addition: unordered		<i>eli</i>	Albanian	flexible
Addition: exemption	<i>éxθos te</i>		Greek + <i>te</i>	flexible
Contrast		<i>ala</i>	Greek	fixed
Alternative: Disjunction		<i>i</i>	Greek	flexible
Alternative: negative addition	<i>xoris te</i>		Greek	flexible
Manner: real	<i>sar ka</i>		‘how’ + REL	flexible
Manner: hypothetical	<i>omos sar te</i>		Greek + ‘how’ + <i>te</i>	flexible

Table 2: Map of clause linking in Epirus Romani: Linear arrangement (marker in FC or SC), functional-semantic categorisation (rectangle = factual, oval = non-factual), and etymology of markers (with shadow = borrowed; within those: clear = Albanian, shaded = Greek).

