



Morphology – Verb

Dieter W. Halwachs

In contrast to the conjugation of pre-european verbs, the conjugation of recent loans from European languages is characterised by adaption morphemes, which according to Boretzky/Igla (1991) derive from Greek¹

pre-european	european	european	european	european
general	Kalderaš-	Bugurdži-	Sepečides-	Burgenland-
ker-el	gind-isar-el	izbir-iz-la	jazd-in-ela	pis-in-el
phen-el	traj-isar-el	trešt-iz-la	anlat-în-ela	gondol-in-el

Kalderaš- = Kalderaš-Romani; Bugurdži- = Bugurdži-Romani; Sepečides- = Sepečides-Romni;
Burgenland- = Burgenland-Romani

kerel (make, do) [←ai. *karoti*]; *phenel* (say) [←ai. *bhanati*]

gindisarel (think) [←rum. a *gîndi*]; *trajisarel* (live) [←rum. a *trăi*]

izbirizla (choose) [←skr. *izbirati*]; *treštizla* (tremble) [←skr. *treštati*]

jazdinel (write) [←tk. *yazmak*]; *anlatînel* (explai) [←tk. *anlatmak*]

pisinel (write) [←skr. *pisati*]; *gondolinel* (think) [←ung. *gondol*]

The conjugation of verbs involves two sets of morphemes differentiated by the category 'person' – {av}, {es}, {el}; {as}, {en}, {en}, which are suffigated to the present stem, and {/om/um/em/}, {/an/al/}, {/as/ah/a/}; {am}, {/en/an/}, {e}, which are attached to the perfective stem. Furthermore two morphemes – {a} and {/as/ahi/} – are involved in verb formation.

Depending on the appearance of the suffix {a}, we distinguish preentic short forms from presentic long forms:

	short forms	short forms	long forms	long forms
	singular	plural	singular	plural
1	ker-av	ker-as	ker-av-a	ker-as-a
2	ker-es	ker-en	ker-es-a	ker-en-a
3	ker-el	ker-en	ker-el-a	ker-en-a

The functional distribution of short and long forms differ from variety group to variety group: in *Kalderaš-Romani*, the short forms function as present indicative, while the long forms have subjunctive and future meaning. In *Arlije-* and *Bugurdži-Romani* the long forms are generally used as present indicative, while the short forms stand for subjunctive or alternatively also for present indicative. In *Burgenland-Romani* the short forms function as present, the long forms as future. In contrast, the varieties spoken in the Balkans form the future anylatically with the particle {/ka/kam/kama/} derived

¹ The morphological characteristic of the more recent loans, and the entire integration morphology of Romani, respectively is borrowed from Greek, as demonstrated in Bakker (1997).



from the verb *kamel* (love, want, wish) and the present: *ka kerav* (I will make). The present short forms are also the basis for the imperfective, which, just like the pluperfect, is formed through suffigation of the morpheme {/as/ahi/}. For the pluperfect, however, the perfective forms function as a basis²

	imperfekt.	imperfekt.	perfective	perfective	pluperfect	pluperfect
	singular	plural	singular	plural	singular	plural
1	ker-av-as	ker-as-as	ker-d-om	ker-d-am	ker-d-om-as	ker-d-am-as
2	ker-es-as	ker-en-as	ker-d-an	ker-d-en	ker-d-an-as	ker-d-en-as
3	ker-el-as	ker-en-as	ker-d-a(s)	ker-d-e	ker-d-as-as	ker-d-en-as

imperfekt. = imperfective

Characteristic of the preterital stem is an infixed formant between stem and ending – in the case above it is /-d-/, which frequently also appears jotted or palatalized /-dj-/ or, as shown in the following example, as shifted to an affricate /č/. This example from the *Romani* of Burgenland moreover shows the /-ahi/ suffix, which is characteristic of the *Romani* of Burgenland and of its surrounding varieties. Moreover, the example shows sound changes and contractions at the morpheme boundaries, as well as modal functions of preterital forms, with the pluperfect only used as irrealis:

	imperf.p.	imperf.p.	perf.r.	perf.r.	irrealis	irrealis
	singular	plural	singular	plural	singular	plural
1	ker-ahi	kerah-ahi	ker-č-om	ker-č-am	kerčom-ahi	kerčam-ahi
2	kereh-ahi	kern-ahi	ker-č-al	ker-č-an	kerčal-ahi	kerčan-ahi
3	kerl-ahi	kern-ahi	ker-č-a	ker-d-e	kerč-ahi	kerčan-ahi

imperf.p. = imperfective (potentialis); perf.r. = perfective (realis)

The passive voice is either synthetically formed with the affixes {/ov-/av-/}, e.g. *mardjovav* (I am being hit) : *marav* (I hit). If this formation is not productive as is the case for the *Romani* of Burgenland, it is formed analytically by Past Participle + 'be': *mardo ojav* (I am hit).

It is impossible to treat phenomena of the *Romani* verb as mood and passive formation of individual dialects sufficiently in this context. As a conclusion, the present indicative forms of the verb 'to be', which also functions as copula are listed in several *Romani* varieties, including etymology and parallels in New-Indo-Aryan languages:

	Sinte	Bgld.	Kald.	Bugurd.	Sep.	Sansk.	Hindi	Panjabi	English
1	hom	som	sîm	s(i)jom	isinóm	asmi	hau / hu:	ha:	I am
2	hal	sal	san	sjan	isinán	asi	hai	hai	you are
3	hi	hi	sî	si	isí	asti	hai	hai	he/she is
1	ham	sam	sam	sjam	isinám	smas(i)	hai	ha:m	we are
2	han	san	san	sjen	isinén	stha	ho	ho	you are

² The difference between perfective and imperfective is an aspectual one (Matras 2002).



3	hi	hi	sî	si	isí	santi	hai	han	they are
---	----	----	----	----	-----	-------	-----	-----	----------

Sinte = Sinte-Romani; Bgld. = Burgenland-Romani; Kald. = Kalderaš-Romani; Bugurd. = Bugurdži-Romani; Sep. = Sepečides-Romani



References

- Bakker, Peter (1997) *Athematic morphology in Romani. The borrowing of a borrowing pattern*, in: Matras, Yaron / Bakker, Peter / Kyuchukov, Hristo (eds.) *The Typology and Dialectology of Romani. The borrowing of a borrowing pattern*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 1-21.
- Boretzky, Norbert / Igla, Birgit (1991) *Morphologische Entlehnungen in den Romani-Dialekten (Arbeitspapier 4 des Projekts "Prinzipien des Sprachwandels")*. Essen.
- Matras, Yaron (2002) *Romani: a linguistic introduction*. New York/Cambridge.