

1 Changes and variety in the Lovari verbal system

András Márton Baló
Eötvös Loránd University

Abstract

The Romani language, due to the circumstances in which it is used, frequently borrows lexical items, which leads to great diversity within the verbal system of each dialect. The phenomena and the ongoing processes in the verbal paradigms in relation to the adaptation of loan verbs seem to be of particular interest as they strongly influence the classification of verbs. If we look at the analogy-based processes which have taken place and are taking place, the change can easily be made part of the model and the distinction between a diachronic and synchronic approach loses its significance.

1 Introduction

The Romani language, due to the circumstances in which it is used, frequently borrows lexical items, which leads to great diversity within the verbal system of each dialect. Romani is originally divided into dialects on a geographical basis; the rich and variegated world of the dialects established in that manner is split into further varieties through further migration, and thus, for instance, whereas Lovari was originally spoken in western Romania, it is possible to talk about Hungarian and Austrian Lovari, which coexist with the Romungro and the Burgenland Romani varieties, respectively (both belong to the Central dialect group as opposed to Lovari, which is a member of the Vlax dialects), and the verbal systems of which show surprising differences that appear to be independent of the surrounding language but which are possibly connected to the other Romani varieties spoken in the area.

The phenomena and the ongoing processes in the verbal paradigms in relation to the adaptation of loan verbs seem to be of particular interest, as they strongly influence the classification of verbs. The changes that have happened and are happening in the language may make a strictly diachronic approach unnecessarily complicated, whereas, at the same time, it can be difficult to handle them within a traditional synchronic framework, dismissing historical facts. However, if we

look at the analogy-based¹ processes which have taken place and are taking place, the change can easily be made part of the model and the synchronic-diachronic dichotomy loses its significance.

2 Lovari verbal paradigms²

One of the crucial questions that arise in relation to the classification of verbs is the exact number of verb classes. The answer to this is not straightforward and depends significantly on the purpose we have in mind and the historical stage we are looking at.

Based on Matras (2002), it can be said that there are two separate, fundamental groups formed in accordance with the final sound of the stem: the consonantal and the vocalic verbs. As for the former one, the third person singular personal concord marker in the present is connected to the stem by the linking vowel /e/, whereas in the case of the latter one this vowel is an /a/; this renders for example the third person singular present tense form *kinel* in the case of the stem *kin-* ‘buy, purchase’ and *patjal* for the verb *patja-* ‘believe’, following the assimilation of the vowel of the concordance marker. Assimilation in itself would only result in the form **patjaal*, therefore it will eventually be necessary to postulate that one of the /a/ vowels is deleted: *patja + el > *patja-el >* (after the assimilation of the concord marker vowel) **patja-al >* (after the deletion of the concord marker vowel) *patja-l*. Alternatively, we can assume that only deletion takes place: *patja + el > *patja-el >*

¹The term analogy will be used in the broad, Saussurean sense throughout the paper: “an analogical form is a form made on the model of one or more other forms” (Saussure 1966: 161). In other words, patterns and exemplars, already existing in our minds, serve as bases for new forms or old ones undergoing some sort of change. Similarity in grammatical function involves similarity in form, or, in other words, “it is natural for related concepts to be designated by related sounds” (Humboldt 1999: 71). Patterns, however, may be functionally independent but formally alike. Analogy rests on statistical evidence; analogical force depends on the frequency of the pattern in question. A pattern with higher type or token frequency is more powerful. On the other hand, less frequent forms are more prone to undergo analogical change. One good example for an analogical model is Analogical Modelling (AM) or Analogical Modelling of Language (AML) devised by Skousen (cf. for example Skousen 2009) where patterns are represented by a dataset of exemplars. For each novel situation (given contexts), the exemplars are arranged into supracontexts to predict the outcome of a given context. Due to a dearth of sufficient amounts of data, as yet, the method has not been tested on the topic of the present paper but there is enough evidence to presume that analogy is at work.

²All the data presented in the paper come from either the two informants I have been working with, namely Mária Nagy from Nagykálló and Szilvia Lakatos from Pécs, or from the various sources listed in the bibliography, which comprise the results of extensive researches conducted all over Hungary; in the latter case, the data have been asserted by at least the two informants mentioned above. New and even more extensive, nationwide linguistic and dialectological researches are currently under preparation.

patja-l. These two ways of derivation are valid as long as we accept that the personal concord markers are as follows (the first person forms are linked to the stem with the vowel /a/ in the case of consonantal verbs as well, which gives for instance *kinav*, *kinas*):

1ST SG	2ND SG	3RD SG	1ST PL	2ND PL	3RD PL
-av	-es	-el	-as	-en	-en

Table 1: *Personal concord markers (Matras 2002)*

We find the same personal concord markers in Hapsburg (1902). Although he chiefly describes the Romungro dialect, which he divides into several subgroups, there is a category he calls “wandering Gypsy”, which is not similar to any of the existing Romungro varieties. Following Vekerdi (1981), we may presume that the data under the heading “wandering Gypsy” derive from Vlax Romani dialects, to which they bear the most resemblance. It seems that he did not postulate different verb classes, as he made mention of only very few vocalic verbs, and they are not called vocalic; they are merely called verbs in which there is an /a/ instead of the /e/ in the second and third persons. The third person SINGULAR forms are listed as follows:

- (1) *xal* ‘eat’
žal ‘go’
daral ‘be afraid’
prastal ‘gallop’
dromal ‘travel’

The latter one, interestingly enough, is not attested in present-day Romani in this form at all. Instead, the form *dromar-* appears in Choli-Daróczi and Feyér (1988).³ However, several more examples for vocalic verbs with a stem-final /a/ are listed by Vekerdi (2000), for example (*ura-* ‘fly’, *izdra-* ‘tremble’, *prasa-* ‘mock’, *dukha-* ‘ache’ etc.), many of which come from Sanskrit, suggesting that the list in Hapsburg (1902) was not even complete at that time. As regards the personal concord markers, it appears more economical to say that the /e/ is an epenthetic vowel⁴ which is

³The derivational marker -ar (which can be *-er* or *-al* in other Romani varieties, cf. a widely quoted example, the verb meaning ‘bite’, which can be *dandar-* and *dindal-* in Vlax Romani or *dander-* in Vend) is productive — the semantic content of the derived word is transparent and there are no limitations on the derivation within the given semantic field (cf. Kiefer-Ladányi 2000). Although many of these verbs are listed in dictionaries, they are not lexicalised in the sense that they acquire a genuine meaning by the addition of the marker.

⁴The /e/ being an epenthetic vowel is also justified by the fact that it is deleted optionally or obligatorily in certain other positions. An example for the latter one is the inflexion of nouns of the

inserted when it is necessary (for resolving consonant clusters). Thus, we find the following layout:

1ST SG	2ND SG	3RD SG	1ST PL	2ND PL	3RD PL
-av	-s	-l	-as	-n	-n

Table 2: Personal concord markers (Baló 2008)

This renders *patja + l > patja-l* in the third person SINGULAR, and the deletion of the thematic vowel or the vowel of the marker would only have to be assumed in the first persons of the vocalic verbs. Another solution could be to suppose that each concord marker consists of only one single consonant. This would, however, imply an unjustifiable epenthetic /a/ in the first persons, as opposed to the /e/ of the other persons, which impels us to dismiss the assumption.

When examining the past forms, we find three diverse suffixes in Hapsburg (1902) for the “wandering Gypsy” variety, which is the outcome of an early differentiation of the Proto-Romani perfective marker *-it-* (Matras 2002). Following voice assimilation, it became *-d-* after /r/, /l/, /n/, /v/.⁵ Two more sounds, /z/ and /o/ are also mentioned in Hapsburg (1902) but there are no examples given, although verb stems ending in /o/ would be of extreme interest as they would have indicated the presence of other vocalic stems. In that stage, *-t-* still existed after /s/ and /ʃ/, while all other stems had been reassigned to the suffix *-l-*.⁶ By now, the traces of

žukel ‘dog’ type, where all other cases apart from the nominative lack the /e/ and take on the root form *žukt-*. In another inflexion class, /e/ may replace /o/ as a linking vowel in the oblique cases: nominative *sokro* ‘father-in-law’ becomes *sokres-* instead of *sokros-*. Yet again, this is likely to be an analogical effect, because as a result, the word will inflect according to the biggest noun class. If we take /e/ as an epenthetic vowel, the analysis of the personal concord markers is made easier in that we do not have to refer to assimilation in the case of vocalic verbs — and the deletion will not take place everywhere either, only in the first persons which do behave slightly differently anyway in many cases, for example in the paradigms of consonantal verbs, too, based on those mentioned above — but to a more general phenomenon, the role of the /e/ as a default vowel. In most cases, whether a stem belongs to the consonantal class is also made clear by the imperative, which is virtually the stem itself in the second person SINGULAR; the form is *patja* ‘believe (imperative)’ for the vocalic class consisting mostly of verbs with a stem-final /a/.

⁵The sound /v/ is somewhat peculiar if we consider the fact that it is actually deleted when the perfective marker is added, thus giving forms like *thod-* for the present tense stem *thov-*. Moreover, in the case of a derivational marker, it is not the perfective marker *-d-* that appears in its place but the marker *-l-*. This variation may be explained on a historical basis: in Hungarian Lovari, the marker in question has got the form *-ajv*, an equivalent of the marker *-av* coming from the verb *av-* ‘come, become’, whose irregular perfective form is *avil-*, which developed into *-ajl*. However, it is also possible to explain it in synchronic terms by referring to the affinity between the palatal approximant and the vowel /i/.

⁶The threefold division of perfective markers is still present in certain dialects of Romani (cf. Matras 2002).

the marker *-t-* have completely disappeared from Vlax Romani dialects, its place having been taken by the suffix *-l-*.

Hapsburg (1902) does not even note the existence of vocalic verbs but several phenomena suggest that there is currently not just one, but even more vocalic groups, making the verbal system even more complicated. In a way, the third group of verbs present in the Vlax Romani dialects cannot actually be considered as a real verb class in that they are created through the disappearance or reduction of certain derivational markers on the one hand and through contraction on the other (Matras 2002). Thus, the reduction of the derivational marker — which may apply to loan verbs in general — in the stem *trajisar-*, which originally comes from the Romanian verb *trăi* ‘live’, leaves us with the form *traji-*. The same thing happens for instance with *prahosar-* ‘bury’ from *praho* ‘dust’ (which comes from Serbian прах), leaving *praho-*, or with *muntusar-* from Romanian *mântui* ‘save, rescue’, leaving *muntu-*; later on, we shall come back to these historical processes, which have, in effect, created new verbal paradigms using practically every element of the basic set of Romani vowels.

At the same time, in accordance with the aforementioned changes, Hungarian descriptions, grammars (e.g. Hutterer and Mészáros 1967), textbooks, as well as dictionaries list five distinct verb classes which, based on the data currently available, look like in Tables 3 and 4.

PRESENT INDICATIVE	consonantal class <i>kin-</i> ‘buy’	-a- stem verbs <i>loša-</i> ‘be glad’
SINGULAR	kinav	lošav
	kines	lošas
	kinel	lošal
PLURAL	kinas	lošas
	kinen	lošan
	kinen	lošan

Table 3: *The two basic verb classes (based on Hutterer and Mészáros 1967)*

The first two can be deemed basic verb classes, whereas the other three were created subsequently.⁸ Based on the discussion of Burgenland Romani (Halwachs

⁷Based on the data received from the informants, it seems that the second and third person PLURAL forms now appear in the form *trajinen*. This is a typical case of paradigm levelling; the first person PLURAL form has been extended over the whole PLURAL paradigm. It may also underline the effects of analogy, as the appearance of PLURAL forms containing the marker *-in* could be the result of the influence of other verbs containing it, or, in a broader sense, of the consonantal class.

⁸At the same time, Matras (2002) gives account of the fact that there are stems ending in *-i-*; one of these is the verb meaning ‘drink’, of Sanskrit origin, which cannot, therefore, be called a recent

PRESENT INDICA- TIVE	-i- stem verbs	-o- stem verbs		-u- stem verbs
	<i>traji-</i> ‘live’	<i>kerdjo-</i> ‘become’	<i>praho-</i> ‘shake’	<i>sunu-</i> ‘feel pity for’
SINGULAR	trajij/trajiv/trajisarav	kerdjuvav	prahoj	sunuj
	trajis/trajisares	kerdjos	prahos	sunus
	trajil/trajij/trajisarel	kerdjol	prahoj/prahol	sunul/sunuj
PLURAL	trajinas/trajisaras	kerdjuvas	prahonas	sununas/sunusaras
	trajin ⁷ /trajisaren	kerdjon	prahon	sunun/sunusaren
	trajin/trajisaren	kerdjon	prahon	sunun/sunusaren

Table 4: *The three additional verb classes (based on Hutterer and Mészáros 1967 and Choli-Daróczi and Feyér 1988)*

1998), Matras (2002) draws the inference that they are best regarded as one single residual class, because the forms are hard to fit into any sort of inflectional paradigm. He justifies this by the fact that the forms vary even within one paradigm; on the other hand, this variation shows a hierarchy: the contraction of the derivational markers (that is, the dropping of the consonant of the derivational suffix and the subsequent merging of the adjacent vowels) most easily takes place in the third person and least easily in the first person. This can be seen for instance in the paradigm of the -o- stem verbs in table 4, where the derived forms in the second and third persons (*kerdjuves*, *kerdjuvel*, *kerdjuven*, *kerdjuven*) are contracted, while the derivational marker is still visible in the first persons. Matras (2002) propounds that the consonant of the derivational suffix is elided, and subsequently, the vowel of the concord marker (that is, the epenthetic /e/) is assimilated to the vowel of the derivational suffix: *-ov-e-* > **-o-e-* > **-o-o-*. Additional deletion or fusion should be assumed to get rid of one of the two identical vowels. As for Hungarian Lovari, where the suffix takes the form *-uv*, Hutterer and Mészáros (1967) use the term “crasis” to refer to the change of the sequence *-uv-e-* to a single *-o-*. As crasis — even in its broadest sense — only involves vowels, the consonant /v/ is either deleted or becomes a vowel or a semi-vowel previously. In any case, the derivational suffix and the epenthetic /e/ merge into the vowel /o/, creating an extra vocalic class.

We might want to posit that the frequency of the first person forms has something to do with the fact that they keep their original shape, but then again the frequencies of the SINGULAR and the PLURAL forms can differ significantly. The irregular behaviour of the first person forms is actually palpable in almost all of the verbal

formation reduced from a derived word at all. Although it has got a consonantal stem, p-, in the Vlax Romani dialects (its third person SINGULAR form is *pel*, which is *pīl* in the Vend and *pijel* in the Romungro dialects), its imperative form (*pi*) reveals that it belongs to the -i- stem verbs.

paradigms, including the consonantal verb class, so it seems that the grammatical category itself also exerts a significant force, and that is why there is such a striking similarity in the differentiation.

The -o- stem class originally contained verbs formed with the intransitive derivational marker *-(j)olu(v)*, but the group later expanded to contain verbs like, for example, *ašo-* ‘stay’, a variation of the consonantal verb *ačh-*. The marker presumably derives from the verb *ov-* ‘become’, which still exists in the Romungro dialects, and it appears in Lovari in the form *-uv*; virtually the /j/ is kept, too, by the palatalisation of the stem-final consonant preceding it (cf. Hutterer and Mészáros 1967). However, the marker, in effect, only appears in the first persons — at least in older derivations, as we could see above — and contraction takes place in the other persons, creating the -o- stem verb class. At the same time, it may still preserve the marker throughout the whole present tense paradigm in recent derivations:

PRESENT INDICATIVE	<i>kraj</i> ‘king’ > <i>krajuv-</i> ‘rule’	<i>krujal</i> ‘around’ > <i>krujuv-</i> ‘go round’ (in the forms <i>kruji-</i> and <i>krujav-</i> as well)	<i>kucuv-</i> ‘whet’ (in the form <i>kuci-</i> as well)
SINGULAR	<i>krajuvav</i> <i>krajuves</i> <i>krajuvel</i>	<i>krujuvav</i> <i>krujuves</i> <i>krujuvel</i>	<i>kucuvav</i> <i>kucuves</i> <i>kucuvele</i>
PLURAL	<i>krajuvas</i> <i>krajuven</i> <i>krajuven</i>	<i>krujuvas</i> <i>krujuven</i> <i>krujuven</i>	<i>kucivas</i> <i>kuciven</i> <i>kuciven</i>

Table 5: Recent derivations with the marker *-uv* (verbal information provided by Szilvia Lakatos)

The perfective stems of these verbs are actually *krajil-*, *krujil-* and *kucil-*. Considering the analogical effects, this is interesting in several aspects. On the one hand, the past tense is formed following the pattern of the -o- stem verbs, which were also derived by the marker *-(j)olu(v)* originally, for example *dičo-* ‘be visible, appear’, perfective *dičil-*, *keco-* ‘hang’, perfective *kecil-*. On the other hand, the formation follows that of the -i- stem verbs (see *gindi-* ‘think’ for instance, perfective — among other variants — *gindil-*) instead of the expected **krajud-*, **krujud-*, **kucud-*; this leads us to believe that the effects of the contracted forms are presumably felt in the past tense.

However, this is not the only problem with the -o- stem verbs: there is another phenomenon, namely that the drop of the aforementioned derivational marker *-sar* results in the existence of two different types of -o- stem groups. This split can be explained on a historical basis. Traditionally we can say that the ones belonging to

the *praho-* type are of “novel” origin as opposed to the ones belonging to the *kerdjo-* type, which were created through internal derivation and contraction; this, however, does not make it easier to classify them. Moreover, one has to handle the drop of the derivational marker *-sar* with care, in the case of Lovari at least, as the first person forms cannot be traced back to the form containing *-sar*:

- (2) 1ST SG *prahoj* >? *prahosarav* $\not\leftarrow$ **prahov*
 1ST PL *prahonas* >? *prahosaras* $\not\leftarrow$ **prahos*

We could presume that the aim of maintaining the paradigmatic contrast triggers a form in the first person plural which is different from the second person singular but why would this be achieved by inserting a /n/ and why would it not happen to the -a- stem verbs? We find something very similar if we consider the -i- and the -u- stem verbs, which may lead us to believe that the processes can be very similar, too.

If we take a closer look at the -i- stem verbs now, we can see that the two variations — the one with the marker *-sar* and the one not containing it — coexist. The picture here is not quite clear either: Hutterer and Mészáros (1967), similarly to Choli-Daróczy and Feyér (1988), only list the forms without the marker *-sar*, although they do note that several verbs have got a variant containing it. Based on the data provided by the informants, however, the forms containing the marker *-sar* do exist at the present time. On the other hand, Cech and Heinschink (1999) say that there is another paradigm in Austrian Lovari, containing another derivational marker, *-in*, while the forms containing *-sar* and the contracted forms are typical of Serbian Kalderaš and seldom appear in Austrian Lovari. This is demonstrated through the example of the verb *gindi-* ‘think’:

PRESENT INDICATIVE	(Austrian) Lovari		(Serbian) Kalderaš	
	full forms	contracted forms	full forms	contracted forms
SINGULAR	<i>gindinav</i>	<i>gindij</i>	<i>gîndisarav</i>	<i>gîndiv</i>
	<i>gindines</i>	<i>gindis</i>	<i>gîndisares</i>	<i>gîndis</i>
	<i>gindinel</i>	<i>gindij</i>	<i>gîndisarel</i>	<i>gîndil</i>
PLURAL	<i>gindinas</i>	<i>gindinas</i>	<i>gîndisaras</i>	<i>gîndis</i>
	<i>gindinen</i>	<i>gindin</i>	<i>gîndisaren</i>	<i>gîndin</i>
	<i>gindinen</i>	<i>gindin</i>	<i>gîndisaren</i>	<i>gîndin</i>

Table 6: *The possible present indicative paradigms of the verb gindi- ‘think’ in Austrian Lovari and Serbian Kalderaš (based on Cech and Heinschink 1999)*

Cech and Heinschink (1999), Hutterer and Mészáros (1967) and Matras (2002) all consider the verbs with the thematic vowel /i/ as loan verbs (mostly from Romanian and Hungarian), the paradigm of which, differing both from that of the

consonantal class and that of the vocalic class, was created through contraction. However, it is hard to explain how the form *gindinav* became *gindij* (contrary to the fact that the form *gîndisarav* became *gîndiv*) and why the form *gindinas* was kept in the first person PLURAL while the form *gîndisaras* became *gîndis* in Kalderaš.

There is no doubt that these verbs (for example *gindi-* ‘think’, *vorbi-* ‘speak’, *traji-* ‘live’) are originally loanwords. Moreover, it is also important to note that Cech-Heinschink (1999) list a fair number of loan verbs with a stem-final /i/ (*kereškeditl* ‘trade’, *njeril* ‘win’, *cipil* ‘shout’, *pihenil* ‘rest’, *atkozil* ‘curse’ etc.), that is, in the form of -i- verbs, rather than in a form containing the derivational marker -in, and there are plenty of Hungarian Lovari examples as well (e.g. *indulil* ‘leave’, *sorakozil* ‘have fun’). Verbs can apparently be borrowed directly into the -i- stem class, omitting the phase preceding the contraction, that is the one in which they are supposed to contain a derivational marker. This may lead us to believe that the -i- stem verbs have indeed come to form a verb class in their own right. The question will be discussed in the section on loan-verb adaptation in more detail.

The appearance of the derivational marker -in (or -(V)n) is indeed a possibility; Baló (2008) also suggests that it can play a role in the first person plural and the whole of the past (in other words, preterite or perfective) paradigm, and not only that of the -i-, but also that of the -o- and -u- stem verbs. (The thematic vowels derive from the vowel component of either the suffix -(V)n or the suffix -(V)sar.) The forms in question thus begin to look like the parallel forms of the verbs belonging to the consonantal class, so it can be viewed as a means of analogy yet again.

PAST INDICATIVE	<i>vorbil</i> ‘speak’	<i>prahol</i> ‘bury’	<i>sunul</i> ‘feel pity’
SINGULAR	vorbndem	prahndem	sunundem
	vorbndan	prahndan	sunundan
	vorbndas	prahndas	sunundas
PLURAL	vorbndam	prahndam	sunundam
	vorbndan	prahndan	sunundan
	vorbnde	prahnde	sununde

Table 7: One of the possible past paradigms of the additional verb classes (based on Baló 2008 and Choli-Daróczy and Feyér 1988)

Nevertheless, the emergence of the derivational marker -in is strange, because, among the varieties of Romani spoken in the region, it is more widely used for the adaptation of loan verbs in the Central dialect group; so, following this train of thought, loan verbs are inserted into Austrian Lovari with the help of a loan marker. In any case, it seems that while there is an alternation between the forms containing the marker -in and the ones without it in Austrian Lovari, an identical alternation

is present in Hungarian Lovari between the forms containing the marker *-sar* and the forms without it. In addition, it is worth noting that *-in* also seems to appear in Hungarian Lovari as an independent loan-verb adaptation marker, and, as mentioned above, the immediate use of contracted forms is a very productive way of borrowing new verbs.

Following this line of reasoning it seems more justified to surmise that the process is not going the original way, that is, from the *-sar* forms towards the contracted forms, but in the opposite direction: the new verbs are inserted first among the *-i-* stem verbs with high token frequency, then the consonantal class with high type frequency begins to attract them and consequently the forms with the markers are created. This does not only make it easier to explain why the first person singular form is typically *gindij* etc. — we could say that it is a separate class, which appears to differ from the consonantal and the *-a-* stem verbs in this respect —, but also why *gindiv* can emerge, too (which cannot occur in Austrian Lovari; the influence of other, surrounding dialects — either Kalderaš or Romungro — possibly plays a role in its emergence in Hungarian Lovari).

Let us take a glance at the various possible forms of this verb in Hungarian Lovari. The paradigms in the table below appear uniformly, but the situation is far from being so clear-cut. Whether the diverse columns can be mixed is uncertain and whether we should talk about intra-speaker or inter-speaker variation is also ambiguous, or, alternatively, whether we would have to say that Hungarian Lovari itself can be divided into several varieties.

INDICATIVE	PRESENT		PAST		
SINGULAR	gindij/gindiv	gindisarav	gindindem	gindilem	gindisardem
	gindis	gindisares	gindindan	gindilan	gindisardan
	gindij/gindil	gindisarel	gindindas	gindilas	gindisardas
PLURAL	gindinas	gindisaras	gindindam	gindilam	gindisardam
	gindin	gindisaren	gindind(in)e	gindil(in)e	gindisard(in)e
	gindin	gindisaren	gindind(in)e	gindil(in)e	gindisard(in)e

Table 8: *Some of the possible present and past paradigms of the verb gindi- ‘think’ in Hungarian Lovari (based on Hutterer and Mészáros 1967, Choli-Daróczi and Feyér 1988 and data from the informants)*

If we look at the past tense forms for a moment and consider those mentioned above in connection with *-sar* and *-in*, what we can see is not surprising at all. The fourth column of Table 8 shows the “regular” past forms, that is, the ones with the marker *-l-* after a vocalic stem, whereas the third and fifth columns show the past of derived forms where the derivational markers are *-in* and *-sar*, respectively. It is

interesting to note that the past forms containing the suffix *-in* do not require the existence of the appropriate present forms; present forms formed with that marker were not attested in Hungarian Lovari.

The *-u-* stem verbs (see table 4 above) also serve as a good argument for the influence of both the *-i-* stem verbs and the consonantal class. The *-u-* stem class, similarly to the *-i-* stem class, is exclusively made up of loan verbs, but it is very small. Apart from the modal auxiliary *trubul* ‘must, need’, these verbs do not even exist for a lot of speakers, who use *-i-* stem verbs instead: *mentil* instead of *muntul* ‘save, rescue’, *senil* instead of *sunul* ‘feel pity for’ etc. The few *-u-* stem verbs thus seem to have moved partly towards the *-i-* stem verbs, partly towards the consonantal class with the appearance of the marker *-sar* (cf. the alternation in the plural).

According to the data, the *-i-* stem paradigm in the present can go with any of the past paradigms, although the extent and nature of the variation — the question whether a certain speaker, community or variety uses one and the same paradigm, or to put it differently, where variation begins exactly — is again something that awaits clarification. However, now it can clearly be seen, that there are at least two different kinds of analogical forces “competing” in the verbal system — that of the consonantal class and that of the newly formed *-i-* verbs.

3 Loan-verb adaptation

Loan verbs were originally adapted in such a manner that, by looking at the markers taking part in the adaptation, it could clearly be seen whether the verb in question is part of the core lexicon or borrowed, whether it belongs to the class of “stable” or “mobile” words. These two parts of the lexicon formed two grammatically different layers (cf. Matras 2002 and Choli-Daróczi and Feyér 1988). What exactly can be considered as belonging to the “mobile” class is controversial and arguable. A particularly interesting question is whether the words and grammatical markers which became part of the language during the Roma’s lengthy sojourn in Byzantium — before they scattered in Europe and the diversification of dialects began — belong to the inherited lexicon or cannot be deemed equally influential or basic as the Indo-Aryan vocabulary. What seems certain is that they form a layer which is independent from both the earlier Indo-Aryan lexical elements and the words which were borrowed into the language later; they often differ from dialect to dialect but cannot be clearly separated. Psycholinguistic research has yet to establish how these layers are regarded by native speakers and how they are actually stored in the mind, because it may influence the analogical processes at work in the verbal system. It would be extremely worthwhile to map the mental distinction made between the two types of *-o-* verbs. For the purposes of the present study, and due to a lack of

sufficient evidence, we will disregard the possible differences resulting from the temporal aspects of the lexicon and consider all forms as carrying equal weight.

The origins of the loan-verb adaptation markers go back to the Greek inflection endings; for example in Vlax Romani it is the Greek aorist forms (*-is-/as-/os-*) that appear (Matras 2002 based on Miklosich 1872-80). However, they do not insert the new, borrowed verbs just by themselves: they are linked to the derivational markers *-ar* and *-av*, depending on whether it is a transitive or an intransitive verb. This is where the markers *-sar* and *-sajv* come from, and this is how they can be broken down on a historical basis into a “carrier” derivational marker (*-ar* and *-av/-ajv*) and the particle *-(V)s-* which would serve to mark the fact that the verb is borrowed. As the markers themselves end in a consonant, too, all the loan verbs formed by their addition are inserted into the consonantal class which has got the highest type and token frequency.

- (3) Hun. *ás* > *ašisar-* ‘dig’
 Sl. *dosta* > *dostasar-* ‘content oneself’
 Hun. *indul* > *indulisar-* ‘leave’
 Rom. *scrie* > *iskirisar-* ‘write’
 Rom. *ajuta* > *žutisar-* ‘help’
- Gr. $\chi\alpha\nu\omega$ (aor. $\chi\alpha\sigma\alpha$) > *xasajv-* ‘disappear’
 Hun. *kezdődik* > *kezdődisajv-* ‘begin’
 Sl. (or Rom.) *slobod-* > *slobodisajv-* ‘be freed’
 Rom. *scăpa* > *skepīsajv-* ‘escape’

The above examples are just a few of the large number of similar instances, quoted to show how frequent and multifarious the pattern is. Another question arises here: is it worth to consider these two markers complex? It would make the description much simpler if we could really say that in actual fact it is the *-s-* element — disregarding the vocalic component for the moment — that is used to insert loan verbs, and if this particle appears on a verb, we will know for certain that it is a borrowed item. However, the two markers take part in internal derivation as well, no matter how we classify the Indo-Aryan and the later elements of the lexicon, as it can be seen from the examples below, where the words *kolo* ‘soft’, *lolo* ‘red’ and *phen-* ‘say’ are of Sanskrit, the adjective *zuralo* ‘strong’ is of Persian origin.

- (4) *kolo* ‘soft’ > *kolosajv-* ‘become soft’
lolo ‘red’ > *lolosajv-* ‘turn red’
phen- ‘say’ > *phenosar-* ‘promise’
zuralo ‘strong’ > *zuralosar-* ‘strengthen’

Moreover, as mentioned earlier, there are other known ways of adapting loan verbs. Most of those listed above have got free variants with the same meaning (what the variation is exactly based on is a question awaiting clarification), which could be contracted forms but might as well have been inserted into the language straight away as *-i-* stem verbs — whether the two variants were borrowed independently of each other or one is derived from the other cannot be established for certain due to a lack of sufficient historical evidence.⁹

<i>ašisar-</i>	<i>aši-</i>
<i>indulisar-</i>	<i>induli-</i>
<i>žutisar-</i>	<i>žuti-</i>
<i>slobodisajv-</i>	<i>slobodi-</i>
<i>skepisajv-</i>	<i>skepi-</i>

Table 9: *Loan verbs with the same meaning but with a different form (based on Hutterer-Mészáros 1967, Vekerdi 1985 and and Vekerdi 2000)*

Another similar example is the verb *fajosar-* ‘be liked’, which exists in the form *fajo-*, too (the same meaning is expressed by the verb *teci-* in Austrian Lovari and Romungro). From our standpoint, it is interesting to note that the verb *trajisar-/traji-* ‘live’ has got an additional variant, *trajo-* in Hungarian Lovari, the inflection of which follows the pattern of the (*-o-* stem) verbs containing the marker *-(j)olu(v)*, which in turn does not take part in the adaptation of loan verbs originally. According to Cech-Heinschink 1999, forms without the marker *-sar* are rare in Austrian Lovari, as opposed to Hungarian Lovari; it has also been mentioned above that another derivational marker, *-in* appears here, which goes back to the Greek present tense inflection markers (Matras 2002), and which places the new verb in the consonantal class, just like the other derivational markers. This is also important due to the fact

⁹A somewhat similar phenomenon can be seen in Daco-Romanian (cf. Costanzo 2008), where loan verbs of Balkan origin mostly fall into the [+sc] subclass of the 4th conjugation, but that is not always the case; it may happen that they fall into the [-sc] subclass or a different conjugation altogether. This variation continues into the contemporary language, as shown by the example of the English verb *blog*, which can be *bloguiesc* but also *bloghez*. Costanzo (2008) adds — and this is true for Lovari, too — that different patterns are employed and that variation is a result of analogical change.

that the marker *-in* does take part in the adaptation of loan verbs in the Central dialects, and, at the same time, it appears in an identical role in Lovari:

- (5) H. *bokszol* > *boksolin-* ‘box’
 H. *szív* > *sivin-* ‘suck’
 H. *arat* > *aratin-* ‘reap’

4 Summary

It is apparent from the above that it is a difficult question whether it is actually worth postulating more vocalic classes in synchronic terms in Hungarian Lovari. Matras (2002) writes that this may be right for certain dialects, but for Romani as a whole it is more adequate to deem these derivational, rather than inflectional forms. In any event, the variegated examples shown above and the unusual diversity point to the fact that there are several analogical forces working in the verbal system, as shown below through the verb meaning ‘live’:

PRESENT INDICATIVE	-i- stem variant	variant containing the marker <i>-in</i> (Austrian Lovari)	variant containing the marker <i>-sar</i>	-o- stem variant
SINGULAR	trajij	trajinav	trajisarav	trajuvav
	trajis	trajines	trajisares	trajos
	trajil	trajinel	trajisarel	trajol
PLURAL	trajinas	trajinas	trajisaras	trajuvav
	trajin	trajinen	trajisaren	trajon
	trajin	trajinen	trajisaren	trajon

Table 10: *The possible present indicative paradigms of the verb traji- ‘live’ (based on Hutterer and Mészáros 1967, Cech and Heinschink 1999 and data from the informants)*

The existence of the four different types of inflection patterns may most easily be explained if we presume that — in some form or another — the *-i-* and *-o-* stem paradigms are in fact present in the verbal system besides the consonantal and the vocalic (*-a-*) classes. The (consonantal) verbs, which originally inflected according to the variants in the two middle columns, created a separate class, which then could make its effect felt (cf. the verbs belonging to the *praho-* type mentioned above) and insert loan verbs, while — under the influence of the original derivation

— the derived forms survived or reappeared. It also seems that the group of -o- stem verbs — which were originally derivational, too — became powerful enough to have an analogical effect and attracted the verb to itself, which in turn began to inflect according to the pattern retaining the marker in the first persons. So we do not have to consider the -i- and -o- stem verbs as separate verb classes, as there is no need for well-defined paradigms for the analogical changes to take place; it is enough if there are patterns which are powerful enough to influence the newly inserted forms and those already in existence.

References

- Baló, A. M. (2008). A Strange Case of Defectiveness in the Lovari Verbal Paradigm. In: Kálmán, L. (ed.) *Papers from the Mókus Conference*. Budapest: Tinta, 118-136.
- Cech, P. and M. F. Heinschink (1999). *Basisgrammatik. Arbeitsbericht 1a des Projekts Kodifizierung der Romanes-Variante der österreichischen Lovara* (hrsgg. von Dieter W. Halwachs). Vienna: Verein Romano Centro.
- Choli-Daróczi, J. and L. Feyér. (1988). *Cigány nyelvkönyv*. [Romani textbook] Budapest: Magyarországi Cigányok Kulturális Szövetsége.
- Costanzo, A. (2008). On the expansion and productivity of a Balkan Romance conjugational sub-class. Poster presented at the First Oxford Workshop on Romance Verb Morphology.
- Halwachs, D. W. (1998). *Amaro vakeripe Roman hi — Unsere Sprache ist Roman: Texte, Glossar und Grammatik der burgenländischen Romani-Variante*. Klagenfurt: Drava.
- Hapsburg, Archduke J. K. (1902). *Zigeunergrammatik*. Budapest: Viktor Hornyánszky, Printer to the Imperial and Royal Court.
- Humboldt, W. von. (1999). *On Language. On the diversity of human language construction and its influence on the mental development of the human species*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutterer, M. and Gy. Mészáros (1967). *A lovári cigány dialektus leíró nyelvtana*. [A descriptive grammar of the Lovari Gypsy dialect] Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság.
- Kiefer, F. and M. Ladányi (2000). A szóképzés. [Derivation]. In: Kiefer F. (ed.) *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan, 3, Morfológia*. [Structural Hungarian Grammar 3. Morphology] Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 137-164.
- Masica, C. P. (1991). *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Matras, Y. (2002). *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miklosich, F. (1872-80). *Über die Mundarten und Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europas*. Vienna: Karl Gerold's Sohn.
- Saussure, F. de (1966). *Course in General Linguistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Skousen, R. (2009). Expanding Analogical Modelling into a general theory of language prediction. In: Blevins, J. P. and J. Blevins (eds.) *Analogy in Grammar: Form and Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 164-184.
- Vekerdi, J. (1981). *A magyar cigány nyelvjárás nyelvtana*. [A grammar of the Romungro dialect] Pécs: Pécsi Tanárképző Főiskola.
- Vekerdi J. (ed.) (1985). *Cigány nyelvjárás népmesék* [Folk tales in the Gypsy Dialects] Debrecen: Kossuth Lajos Tudományegyetem.
- Vekerdi, J. (2000). *A comparative dictionary of Gypsy dialects in Hungary*. Budapest: Terebess.