Alexandre Rusakov & Olga Abramenko

NORTH RUSSIAN ROMANI DIALECT: INTERFERENCE IN CASE SYSTEM

0.1. The goal of the present article is to discuss some interference processes affecting the nominal system of North Russian Romani dialect (NRRD), a typical example of the heavily interfered inflected Romani dialect.

0.2. The NRRD belongs, as is well known, to the Baltic dialectal group, and is spoken mainly in the Northern part of modern Russia. The materials are based on the fieldwork (syntactic questionnaire and texts of different genres) conducted in Vyrica and Mikhailovka villages near St. Petersburg, 1984–88 (in collaboration with F. Yeloyeva, E. Perekhvalskaya, see Yeloyeva/Rusakov 1990) and 1996.

The phonological system of NRRD is practically identical to that of Russian. The interference in the grammatical system is manifested by the following: a) changes in meaning of forms of already existing morphological categories; b) structural reshaping of the forms of already existing morphological categories according to the Russian models; c) borrowing of Russian grammatical markers. Such borrowings sometimes are and sometimes are not accompanied by change in the system of grammatical categories.

0.3. The dialect shows a very high degree both of code switching and of code-mixing phenomena. We have cases, when the one-to-another language switch appears on the boundaries of sentences or of syntactically independent parts of one sentence – the situation typical of classic C-S cases (Russian elements are in bold).

(1) ***Oni to obn'ali jejo i nachali plakat'***: *so tusa kerd'ape, mri chajori* 'They embraced her and began to cry: what happened to you, our daughter'.

However, more numerous are the situations, when Romani lexical elements, Russian adapted lexical elements and Russian unadapted lexical elements are mixed without any apparent order.

(2) ***Da*** *nat, me **prosto** na **dum**ind'om, so me tut date **vstrecu*** 'No, I didn't just think, that I would meet you here'.

Some scholars distinguish such cases from pure code switching cases as well as from the lexical borrowings. The most convenient term for these phenomena is "code-mixing" (Bokamba 1988; Hock 1986). Unlike the code switching cases, here we have the speaking processes in the same language, that is the same language code. However, the great number of elements from another code may be included.

The NRRD presents an interesting difference in interpretation of Russian nouns on the one hand and of Russian verbs on the other hand. It is well known that very strong mechanisms of adapting the borrowed words work in all Gypsy dialects.

Usage of some special morphemes, inserted between the stem and the flexion of a borrowed lexeme, makes these lexemes a particular component of the lexicon, quite different in comparison with the inherited words.

The Russian nouns as well as the adjectives are usually used in the NRRD in the adapted form as well as in the other Romani dialects.

(3)   ***drug***-*o* (< Russ. *drug*)   'friend'
      strashn-*o* (< Russ. *strashnyj*)   'terrible'

    Joj dzhala de foro peskire (peskirenca) ***podrug***-*en-ca* 'She goes to the town with her girl-friends'.

On the contrary, the Russian verbs are used mostly in the unadapted forms and are conjugated according to the Russian model.

(4)   *Me tas'a* ***pojedu*** *de foro* 'Tomorrow I'll go (by the train) to the town'.

The question arises, in what manner we should interpret the differences between the usage of Russian verbs, where we see a typical case of code mixing, and of adapted nouns and adjectives. Most probably, in both cases one and the same mechanism permitting NRRD native speakers to use almost any Russian word in their Romani speech is used. But in the case of the nouns the NRRD native speaker grammar has an additional rule, which acts probably on the level of the sentence, and not on the level of lexicon. In the case of verb grammar this rule is not applied however. Another question is that of the cause of such difference. It is possible that the reason of it is more primitive nature of noun adaptation mechanism, than that of the verbs (on this problem see also Rusakov, in print).

Thus, not only the possibility of the usage of an unadapted word but rather the very possibility of unrestricted usage of alien language lexicon in speech processing is very important.

1.0. Nominal system of NRRD is quite consistent in preserving its "common-Romani" features: Both set of grammatical categories and the way they are expressed can be found in other Romani dialects as well. A noun in NRRD is characterized by the categories of number (singular and plural), gender (masculine and feminine), animate/inanimate opposition and a case. The typical for Romani dialects "New Indo-Arian" "two-level" character of the structure of the nominal form is well preserved. This kind of construction is very well described in modern literature (cf. Matras 1997; Elšik 1997). Not mentioning various theoretical approaches to these phenomena we may distinguish seven cases in NRRD: Nominative, Accu-

sative, Genitive, Dative, Instrumental, Ablative, and Locative.[1] The only nominal grammatical category, which was typical, as it seems, for common-Romani language and which was drastically reduced in NRRD is the category of definiteness/indefiniteness.[2] Moreover, NRRD can be called rather conservative, when we speak about preservation of Romani noun structure. It shares this quality with the other dialects of the Northern dialect group – both Baltic dialects and Sinti dialects (cf. Matras 1997). This conservative character is of a special interest if the high level of interference in NRRD is taken in consideration (it is very well in accordance with what Matras wrote about nominal system of Sinti, cf. Matras 1996: 405).

This conservativness is demonstrated, first of all, in the very fact that all the noun cases are used quite regularly, which is typical not for all Romani dialects (cf. Matras 1997). Besides this, NRRD demonstrates a consistent opposition between animate and inanimate nouns. Among these two kind of nouns we can find a distribution, characteristic for "classical" Romani dialects: animate nouns in accusative (common Romani feature) and in locative (a feature which can be observed only in a few Romani dialects) have special endings, while inanimate nouns have the form which is homonymic or identical to the nominative form.

Complete formal description of NRRD noun system can be found in scientific literature (Sergiyevsky 1931; Ventzel 1964). But when a researcher looks at this system at function, he faces very serious questions. To answer these question is important for understanding the nature and the character of interference processes, which take place in the dialect:

1. To which extent peculiarities of the usage of certain inflected forms of nouns can be explained by Russian influence?
2. In which way NRRD is influenced by Russian language? Is this influence reflected in the borrowing of certain lexical models (government schemes of certain words – verbs, etc.) or it acts on a more abstract level?
3. Is there any difference between use of inflected forms of inherited and borrowed nouns?
4. The most difficult question is what is the relationship between interference processes which take place right in the moment of speech production and those interference processes which have already penetrated the language system of the dialect?

To answer these questions, we will try to analyse the material on the noun forms in NRRD.

---

1   There is a special vocative form in NRRD as well.

2   As it was many for times mentioned in the scientific literature, an article is preserved in NRRD as a relic, and it is virtually impossible to define the grammatical conditions in which it appears (cf. Ventzel 1964: 95). Masculine forms are, as it seems, used with the article o (singular and plural), feminine ones with the article *e*, though our very limited material does not allow us to consider this distribution to be trustworthy. We can suppose that presence/absence of the article is determined by stylistic reasons, in particular it is determined by genre and rhythmical properties of the sentence. However, once again we do not have enough material to verify this assertion. The original distribution of forms with an article, when they are agglutinated to a preposition, is very obscure (see below).

1.1.1. Accusative case

The lexical material we have obtained confirms the importance of opposition between animate and inanimate nouns in NRRD. All the occurrences of animate nouns are characterized by special form of Accusative, while inanimate nouns have a form which is homonymous to Nominative.[3] The pronouns are always characterized by the accusative ending. It seems that our examples do not allow us to construct a consistent gradual distributive hierarchy of the nouns depending on the character of the ending (cf. the different situation in some other Romani dialects: Matras 1997: 72–78). For example, the names of animals behave as animate nouns:

(5) *zapr'ók   e   gré-s*
    he harnessed   DEF   horse-ACC
    'he harnessed the horse'

the names of organizations, public establishments and parts of a body behave as inanimate ones:

(6) *gaʒén-ge   že   čéjna útrom   bánza   otkryváť*
    Russians-DAT but   should in.the.morning shop.NOM=ACC to.open
    'Russians must open the shop in the morning'

(7) *Ták na číne man-ge   vastá*
    so   no cut me-DAT hands.NOM=ACC
    'don't cut off my hands'

However, we don't have enough material to answer this question in a more definite way.

In the existing grammatical descriptions of NRRD the authors note, that the forms of Accusative are used in the negative constructions of possession; these Accusative forms correspond to Russian Genitive forms used in such a construction. In this case animate nouns and pronouns are used with the special Accusative endings, and inanimate nouns are used in the form which is homonymous to Nominative.

(8) *iš'ó   rakl-és   na sýs adal-és*
    yet   man-ACC   no was this-ACC
    'this man was not here yet'

---

3   Matras (1997) treats these cases as an direct use of Nominative forms. We prefer to view this form as a special form of Accusative, homonymous to the Nominative form. Our preference is determined by several reasons. First of all, it is more expedient to proceed from a conjecture that the principal function of the Accusative is that of the marking a direct object. Second, it is supported by a certain parallelism with Russian nominal system, which is also characterized by homonymy of some case forms. This homonymy, as we will see below, has rather strongly influenced the function of NRRD nominal system. However, we should admit that the use of the terms in this case (as in every linguistic research, which is not based on an experiment) is absolutely conventional.

(9) *á   o   vastá   nané la-te*
    and DEF hands.NOM=ACC no.is she-LOC
    'she hasn't hands'

There can be no doubt, that in this case we deal with a very good example of an interference influence of Russian. This interference is manifested in the two different ways. On the one hand, the very use of non-Nominative forms in these constructions can be considered as a result of Russian influence. On the other hand, the choice of a definite case form in NRRD is most probably also determined by Russian influence. As we know, it is typical for Russian language, that the forms of Genitive and Accusative are homonymous in many noun classes: animate nouns of the second declension type (the vast majority of masculine nouns) in the singular and all the animate nouns in the plural. It seems, that because of the Russian influence, in NRRD the Accusative form of animate nouns is identified with the Russian Genitive form. This identification was then transferred onto inanimate nouns, where the Accusative form homonymous to the Nominative one, also was also identified with Russian Genitive.

This hypothesis is also supported by a very peculiar construction, the examples of which can be encountered in our materials. An Accusative form identical to that of Nominative of inanimate nouns is used to express the meaning of partitive, the latter being expressed by Genitive in Russian.

(10) *kaná lél   kokoró gráfo naľivájet lés-ke   fužéro brav'ínta*
     now   takes himself count pours   he-DAT glass   vodka.NOM=ACC
     'then the Count takes and pours out by himself a glass of vodka'

(11) *lyjá   krajúška maró*
     he.took piece   bread.NOM=ACC
     'he took a piece of bread'

If one observes the material of other Romani dialects, he would expect to find Genitive or Ablative rather than Accusative construction in above mentioned examples. In principle, this construction could be considered as an example of apposition and then be described as a relic Balkan form (cf. several similar constructions which are widely used in Albanian). However, taking in account the examples of negative possession construction mentioned above, we can suppose, that in this case we deal again with interlingual identification of Russian Genitive and NRRD Accusative and, thus, the shift of the use of NRRD Accusative is caused by the influence of Russian Genitive. In this connection some other points could be mentioned:

The NRRD Genitive forms do not participate in this identification. As it will be discussed below the NRRD Genitive forms drift slowly to the adjectives; this fact can be explained, in its turn, by the influence of possessive adjectives frequently used in Russian.

We deal with the case of "unprecise identification", the phenomenon quite typical for the situation of language contacts (cf. Boretzky 1986: 373–374; Sobolev 1990). Indeed, homonymy in the system of Russian nouns was "misapprehended" (from the point of view of a formal grammatical description!) by the NRRD speakers, which led to the identification with a "wrong" noun form.[4]

It is interesting, that the use of personal pronouns in the corresponding syntactic positions always with the Accusative ending, which is actually common for Romani dialects, can be as well supported by the Russian influence. In Russian personal pronouns do not have the category of animatedness/inanimatedness, and do not demonstrate the homonymy of Nominative and Accusative.

(12) *Avéna   slúg'i   l-es   kxárna*
    they.come servants he-ACC they.call
    'servants come and call him'

The words borrowed from Russian, in general behave in the same way as inherited Romani words, that is the animate ones take the Romani flexion of Accusative, inanimate are used in the form, which is homonymous to Nominative.

(13) *célo   **n'iď éľa**   svátaľi*
    whole week.NOM=ACC asked.to.marry
    'they tried to marry her for the whole week'

(14) *tájnes   pr'ijižžáit jóv de pésk'iro zámko ... i r'ik'írla lés   de tájno zálo,*
    in.secret comes   he to his   castle and keeps   he-ACC in secret hall

    *da   Pétr-os,   **xudóžn'ik-os***
    this Petr-ACC painter-ACC

    'he comes in secret to his castle ... and keeps him in a secret hall, this Petro, an artist'

It is interesting, that in the speech of a female informant Z. A. Grokhovskaya Russian animate feminine nouns in the Accusative have a special marker — last syllable is stressed.

(15) *kandén'ťe **mamá***
    listen   mother.ACC
    'listen to the mother'

---

4   See a resembling example in the answers to the questionnaire:

   Tú dólgo   pašló   sán? —   Nát, tr'ín dyvés
   you long.time lay.PART you.are – no   three day.ACC=NOM
   'Were you laid up for a long time? – No, for three days', where Russian Genitive after the numeral *tri* 'three' ("counting form") is interpreted as a Romani Accusative form

(16) *jów lejá   znáčit **služanká***
    he   he.took well   maidservant.ACC
    'well, he took a maidservant'

Rare cases of the use of Russian inanimate feminine nouns with the Russian Accusative ending, can be interpreted as the examples of pure code switching. All of these noun forms directly follow unadapted Russian verb forms:

(17) ***podognáľi   mašýn-u***
    they.drove   car-ACC
    'they drove a car'

(18) *jój   **nap'isála   ť iľigrámm-u***
    she   wrote   telegram-ACC
    'she wrote a telegram'

1.1.2. Genitive case

Genitive has a special status in NRRD case system first of all because of its ability to agree with the noun being defined.

    In our material, all the Genitive forms are of animate nouns and have the function of an attribute. This fact confirms the mentioned above idea, that they are identified rather with Russian possessive adjectives than with Russian Genitive forms. It should be emphasized, that unlike Russian Genitive forms of nouns, those of Romani (which are extremely rare in our recordings) are used mainly in the preposition to the noun. This structural feature also brings them closer to the adjectives:

(19) *í   dobrálas'   ke pšalés-k'iro   kxér*
    and she.reached to brother-GEN house
    'and reached the brother's house'

Moreover, these forms can be substantivized:

(20) *ko?∗dá jóv sys   máľin˺ko dá rakloró, nu   ľét   móžyt vós'im ďés'iť lés-k'e   sýs,*
    when   he was little   this boy   well years maybe eight   ten   he-DAT   was
    adá car'ós-k'iro ...
    this king-GEN
    'when he was little, this fellow, well, he was eight or ten, this king's (son)' ...

It is interesting that Accusative forms of inanimate nouns with attributive meaning discussed above (see (10) – (11)) are placed in the postposition to a noun which is defined, as well as the Russian Genitive forms with attributive meaning.

There are, however, the facts which imply that the process of "adjectivization" of the Genitive forms is not completed yet. Genitive form may have, for instance, an attribute itself:

(21) *adavá p'is'mó nap'isál pšál   m'ir'iá-k'iro mamá-k'iro*
      this   letter   wrote   brother my-GEN   mother-GEN
      'My mother's brother wrote this letter'

It's interesting to note that in this example the attribute in the Genitive is in postposition[5].

Genitive forms of 3rd person pronouns are rather frequently used in the dialect. Syntactically they are absolutely similar to the possessive pronouns of the 1st and the 2nd person. Usually, they are used in preposition:

(22) *fédyr mán-ge   otčingír m'iré vastoré*
      better me-DAT   cut.off   my   hands
      'you'd better chop my hands off'

(23) *tyr'í   romný b'ijan'ďá dujé ... čavor-én*
      your.SING wife   gave.birth two   boys.ACC
      'your wife gave birth to twin boys'

The postpositive use may be explained by stylistic reasons:

(24) *á,   kodová sy pšál   tumaró, o   kák   tumaró*
      and that   is brother your.PL DEF uncle your.PL
      'and, that is your brother, your uncle'

As for 3rd person possessive pronouns, here also a certain affinity with Russian may be observed. On the one hand, in Russian language as well as in the Romani dialects Genitive forms of the corresponding personal pronouns are used. On the other hand, in Russian dialects and in colloquial speech there is a strong tendency for adjectivization of these forms (Russian *jevo* 'his', Genitive of *ja* 'I' – *jevonnyj* 'his', colloquial adjectivization of *jevo*). These adjectivized forms are, naturally, included in the system of possessive adjectives. In NRRD 3rd person possessive pronouns can be used both in preposition:

(25) *i   adá rakloró popyjá kak-ráz de lén-g'iro   gáf*
      and that fellow   he.got   exactly to they-GEN village
      'and this fellow was sent exactly to their village'

---

5   Here it is also possible to see a certain structural parallelism with Russian language. When it is necessary in Russian language to add an attribute to the word corresponding to possessor, a possessive adjective in preposition automatically is replaced by a postpositive Genitive construction:
      mamin brat –   brat moyey mamy
      'mother's (adj.) brother – the brother of my mother'.

and in postposition:

(26) *bagáslav'iľi la   xáj   o   raďiťiľi lés-k'ire*
     blessed   she.ACC as.if DEF parents he-GEN
     'as if his parents blessed her'

It's interesting that there are some examples, when possessive pronouns of the 3rd person and reflexive possessive pronouns (which are actually Genitive forms of the corresponding pronominal forms) are declined according to the so-called "full" declension of adjectives, which emerged, in its turn, under Slavic influence (Boretzky 1986: 372):

(27) *mé   kamjóm fstr'éťicca dadavés pes-k'ir-én-ca   dúj drugén-ca*
     I   wanted   to.meet   today   self-GEN-PL-INSTR two friend-INSTR
     'I wanted to meet two my friends today'

Genitive forms of the names of the seasons regularly used in NRRD have now adverbial character:

(28) *xoďíne jój p'ír   adá véš,   pútaitca čoror'í, no lynás-k'iro   že*
     walks she through this forest wanders poor   but summer-GEN though
     'she walks in this forest, she doesn't know the way, poor girl, but it's in the summer'

It is interesting that these forms can be formed from Russian borrowings as well: *vesn'akiro* 'in spring'.

1.1.3. Dative case

Most frequently Dative is used to express the meaning of the indirect object:

(29) *dyjá   dá-ke   dor'ík*
     gave.she mother-DAT there
     'she gave the mother [a telegram] there'

(30) *pšál   lá-ke   n'ičí   na pxen'ďá pxen'-áke*
     brother she-DAT nothing not told   this sister-DAT
     'the brother didn't tell her, the sister, anything'

Dative is also quite often used to express the meaning of subject (after the verbs of necessity etc.):

(31) *gažén-ge   že čéjna útrom   bánza   otkryváť*
     Russians-DAT but it.should in.the.morning shop.ACC=NOM to.open
     'Russians must open the shop in the morning'

All these functions of Dative can be also found in Russian, but they are widespread from typological point of view, and therefore they can scarcely be treated as the result of interference processes. It may be, that the following function of Dative was influenced by Russian:

(32) *móžyt staršonés-ke sýs   ľéd   dvʼináccyť*
      maybe elder-DAT   was years eleven
      'maybe the eldest was about twelve years old'

as well as the usage of Dative in negative construction of possession, maybe with additional expressive meaning:

(33) *gožonén-ge   báxt   nané*
      beautiful.Pl-DAT fortune no.is
      'beautiful people have not good fortune'

The example of the same government of pronoun can be found with as well:

(34) *pʼír   adá véš skʼitálasʼe, nʼi   lá-ke   nʼí   dromoró, nʼičí na, na sýs*
      across this forest she.wandered neither she-DAT neither road   nothing no was
      'she wandered in this forest, she had not any road, there was not anything'

In our recordings we can hardly find the examples of Dative forms of inanimate nouns. This fact can be explained, first of all, by the very meaning of the Dative (see below on the use of constructions with the preposition *ke* in NRRD, which can be examined in the context of Dative meanings).

Russian borrowings are regularly used in the Dative with Romani case flexion:

(35) *pr'ikázyváit* **pr'islugénge** *zaprʼéč zolotúju karʼétu, sámuju nʼi   lútšuju*
      he.ordered   servants-DAT harness golden carriage most   neither best
      'he ordered the servants to harness the golden carriage, the best'

1.1.4. Instrumental case

One of the most usual meanings of the Instrumental in NRRD is the sociative meaning. In the texts of 1984, 20 cases out of 33 when the Instrumental was used had the sociative meaning. In Russian sociative meaning is expressed by the following construction: preposition *s* + instrumental case. NRRD (unlike many other Romani dialects; cf. Matras 1997: 83–84) does not borrow the prepositions with the sociative meaning. Therefore, we have a very clear correspondence: Russian construction with preposition *c* + *Instrumental case* – NRRD instrumental case.

(36) *jój   žinʼďá óčinʼ málo lé-sa*
      she lived   very little he-INSTR
      'she lives with him for the short time'

(37) *mé xoďíla raklorʼjén-ca užé*
      I   went   girls-INSTR already
      'I have already walked with the girlfriends'

The examples where instrumental case is used to express the meaning of possession are very near to those mentioned above:

(38) *žuvlý-to   vastén-ca*
    woman-but   hands-INSTR
    'this woman has the hands'

Among the answers to the questionnaire, several examples of Russian adverb *vmesťe* 'together' can be found, which is the first part of a compound Russian preposition *vmeste s* 'together with'. This preposition is used to express the emphasized sociative meaning:

(39) *avén   vméste   amén-ca*
    come   together   we-INSTR
    'come with us'

Curiously enough, the second part of the preposition turns out to be redundant, and it is not borrowed by NRRD.

    In our recordings we can also find some examples of instrumental meaning:

(40) *i   čuďá   po p'én'o adá vastoré pesk'iré, i   ulyjá   tevérésa   i   čing'irďá*
    and she.put on stump these hands her   and he.took axe-INSTR and he.chopped.off

    saré dúj lá-ke   k'ís'ťi, otčing'irďá
    all   two she-DAT hands chopped.off

    'and she put her hands on the stump, and he and chopped off both her hands with the axe, chopped off'

In NRRD there are numerous examples when the Instrumental is used in locative or temporal meaning, which is typical for Russian, but is also represented very well in other Romani dialects (Boretzky):

(41) *iť   kxélnas   beľvelén-ca*
    but   they.had.danced evenings-INSTR
    'they had danced in the evenings'

(42) *save drome-sa   tu   džasa po počta*
    what way-INSTR you go   to   post
    'what way you go to the post office

In the descriptive studies of NRRD it was often noted that "under the influence of Russian language [Instrumental] is often used as a part of compound nominal predicate." (Ventzel 1964: 53) The examples of this can be found in our records:

(43) *žáva ... ke tú   pastuxó-sa*
    I.go   to you.SING shepherd-INSTR
    'I'll work for you as a shepherd'

Somewhat similar phenomenon can be observed in the examples where Instrumental is used with several transitive verbs in the function of second object. This construction is usual in Russian language:

(44) *me   tút   keráva baré manušésa*
     I   you.SING make   great man-INSTR
     'I make you a great person'

Finally, several examples in NRRD are obtained when Instrumental appears, as it seems, under the influence of certain Russian constructions which govern Instrumental case. For example, Instrumental is used in the function of an "attributive object" after the adjective forms:

(45) *ne   rán'še ... sýs fedýr dolésa,   so   sys ... veselo*
     well before   was better that-INSTR that was   jolly
     'before it was better, because it was jolly

Or it may appear under the influence of concrete Russian words:

(46) *nát, me tú-sa   n'isoglásno*
     no   I   you.SING-INSTR disagree
     'no, I don't agree with you', (cf. Russian *net, ya s toboy* (INSTR*) ne soglasen*),

(47) *oné sýs   syr pšál   pxen'-ása*
     they were like brother sister-INSTR
     'they were like a brother and a sister', (cf. Russian *oni byli kak brat s sestroy* (INSTR))

(48) *dúj pašé-sa   bérš*
     two half-INSTR   year.NOM=ACC (cf. Note 4)
     'two years and a half' (cf. Russian *dva s polovinoy*(INSTR*) goda*)

It is interesting that in last three examples the correlation between NRRD Instrumental and Russian prepositional phrase *s* + Instrumental can be observed. This observation supports the idea consistent character of this interlingual correspondence, which is actualized also in the situations of loan-translating of certain lexical models.

Instrumental forms can also be encountered in Russian bound phrases, which were loan-translated:

(49) *zaľiváicca jasvénca*
     he.bursts   tears-INSTR
     'he dissolves into tears'.

Both animate and in inanimate nouns have Instrumental forms in NRRD. Russian borrowing are regularly used in Instrumental with Romani flexion.

1.1.5. Ablative case

The most frequent is pure ablative meaning, spatial and temporal, and then causal meaning. Thus, ablative forms in NRRD generally correspond to Russian construction with the prepositions *iz*, *ot*, *s*. The ablative can be formed both from animate and inanimate nouns as well as from pronouns.

(50) *mé v'irnúlas' forós-tyr peskr'ijá-tyr podrugá-tyr'*
    I   returned   city-ABL my.own-ABL girlfriend-ABL
    I returned from the city from my girlfriend'.

(51) ***ták áke s étava dn'á,*** *kadá devesés-tyr*
    so (RUSS) so from this day (RUSS) this day-ABL
    'thus, from this day'

(52) *izdrála straxátyr*
    he.trembles fright-ABL
    'he shivers with fright'

NRRD lacks prepositions, either Russian or common Romani, with ablative meaning. In this respect NRRD is close to Leshaki dialect, which is also included into the Baltic group (Matras 1997: 85). One of the most frequent contexts where ablative is used in the dialect is that with adjectives in the comparative or superlative degree.

(53) *tú javésa barvaledýr maýn-dyr'*
    you.SING will.be richer   me-ABL
    you'll become richer than me'

(54) *mé výše sarén-dyr, stárše sarén-dyr sómas*
    I   taller all-ABL   older all-ABL I.was
    'I was taller than all the others, older than all the others'

It is interesting that this use of Ablative corresponds to Genitive forms in Russian language. Thus, the above mentioned correlation between Russian Genitive and NRRD Accusative is violated. Presumably, semantic factors turn out to be more important than the formal correspondence (Russian Gen. – NRRD Acc.) in this case. This discrepancy may be interpreted in the other way, though. It is very probable, that in this case Romani language experienced a strong influence of Russian dialectal constructions with adjectives in the comparative and superlative degree, for example, *ona starshe za menya* 'she's older for me' or *ona starshe ot menya* 'she's older from me'.

In NRRD there are also some examples of pure attributive meaning of the Ablative, which corresponds to Russian form with the preposition *ot*:

(55) *kľučí syz banzá-tyr láte*
    keys were shop-ABL she-LOC
    'she has the key of the shop'

1.1.6. Locative

The locative in NRRD can be formed from animate nouns and from pronouns.

The principal meaning expressed by Locative forms in NRRD is the meaning of possession. The meaning of possession in this case can be positive

(56) *i   lés-te   sýs,   raklor'í (i)   rakloro*
    and he-LOC were girl   (and) boy
    'and he has a daughter and a son'

or negative.

(57) *Dykxéla lá-te   dúj vastá nané.*
    he.sees   she-LOC two hands not.are
    'he sees that she has not both of her hands'

It can also be the meaning of so-called "external possession":

(58) *dáj   lén-de   jeg ɤʒiný*
    mother they-LOC single
    'their mother is single'

(59) *staďína naxmúr'inna lés-te*
    cap   pulled   he-LOC
    'he has the cap pulled over his eyes'

The locative can be also used in the meaning close to that of *dativus ethicus*:

(60) *i   tú   mán-de dólžyn de saré r'igá te žás mán-ca   de saré fór'ja*
    and you.SING me-LOC should to all   places to go me-INSTR to all   cities
    'and you must go with me to all the places, to all the cities'.

All these cases are united by the fact that they correspond to the Russian prepositional construction *u* + the Genitive.

There are also examples when the Locative used without a preposition expresses purely locative, circumstantial, meaning.

(61) *jóv léste   proslužýl dv'ináccyť ľét   ke da gráfo kaló*
    he   he-LOC served   twelfe   years by this count black
    'he served for Black Count twelve years in his (Black Count's) place'

There are some examples when NRRD Locative correspond to the Russian construction *u* + Genitive and the usage of this construction is determined by the government of certain Russian words:

(62) *no   mán-de   n'i polučílos'*
    but me-LOC no it.came.out
    'but I could not do it'

The following example is very interesting:

(63) *áke   ačápe   kadá dyvés amén-de   tú-sa*
    thus remained this   day   we-LOC you.Sing-INSTR
    'thus this day is for us (lit.: for us with you)'

Here NRRD construction Locative + Instrumental corresponds to Russian phrase *u nas s toboy* 'for us and you'. In the Russian phrase the combination of the personal pronoun of the 1st person plural with the preposition *s* followed by the other pronoun in Instrumental form is grammaticalized way to express sociative meaning. This construction is loan-translated in NRRD, but all the forms with prepositions are consistently changed to the "corresponding" forms without a preposition.

NRRD Prepositional constructions with Locative will be discussed below.

In general we should remark, that in our texts locative forms of pronouns are used more often than those of nouns. It is interesting, that some other dialects belonging to the Baltic group (cf. Leshaki, see Matras 1997: 87) almost lack locative forms. We can suppose that the preservation of the locative forms without a preposition can be explained by its inter-lingual identification with Russian prepositional construction *u* + Genitive.

2. PREPOSITIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS

Prepositional constructions are rather wide-spread in the dialect, though we should state that in out texts the number of nouns (and pronouns) used in prepositional constructions is less than the number of nouns used in oblique cases without a preposition.[6] This is an evidence to the fact that synthetic declension is still being preserved in the dialect.[7] Moreover, we should mention that the number of prepositions, actively used in NRRD, is rather limited. Some prepositions which are wide-spread in other dialects do not occur in our texts. First of all, it applies to *(ka)tar*, a very common preposition with an ablative meaning. Let us examine, one by one, the prepositional constructions found in our recordings.

---

6   In the records of 1984 we have ca. 180 examples of prepositional phrases and ca.. 340 examples of noun and pronoun in indirect cases used without a preposition.

7   Theoretically we can suppose that the degree of preservation of synthetic forms. in the nominal system can be supported by the synthetic character of declension in the language of surrounding population. We should note, that the ratio of prepositional forms to those used without prepositions in NRRD seems to be less than that of Russian. This fact is determined, most probably, by the following correspondences: Russian *c* + Instrumental – NRRD Instrumental; Russian *iz*, *ot*, *c* + Genitive – NRRD Ablative; Russian *u* + Genitive – NRRD Locative.

2.1. Preposition *dre/dro/de/do* 'in, to' (Common Romani *andre*)

First of all, a high degree of phonetic variability of the preposition can noticed. Moreover, there is no apparent rule determining the distribution of the variants. The following facts can be mentioned: Forms without *r* are more frequently used than (more archaic) forms with *r*. For example, one of the two informants whose texts were recorded in 1984 does not use the forms *dro/dre* at all. Another informant, Z. A. Grokhovskaya, used this form only once, in a phrase *dro véš*, which, maybe, is a bound phrase. As for the last vowel (which can be traced back to the definite article agglutinated to a preposition), it is impossible to define the grammatical context in which it appears. It seems, that forms with *e* are more widely used.

The preposition *de* has locative meaning and, in general, corresponds to the Russian preposition *v*. As in Russian, this preposition can be used to express both the meaning of the direction of the motion and the meaning of the stative location:

(64) *žinˈďám de šátry*
　　 we.lived in tents
　　 'we lived in the tents'

(65) *raťkˈírnas   de davá fóro, tasˈá   tradénas de javˈír fóro*
　　 had.spent.night in   this   city, tomorrow had.went   to other   city
　　 'we had spent the night in one city, tomorrow had went to another city'

In the vast majority of cases this preposition (because of its meaning) is used with inanimate nouns. Therefore, in all these cases a noun is used in the form homonymous to the Nominative one. In our records there is no cases when this preposition is used with a pronoun. There is only one case when the preposition *de* was used with the Locative form of an animate noun:

(66) *mán-ge   sýs óčinˈ nˈiprˈivýčno ... obrašˈácca de gažén-de*
　　 me-DAT was very unusual   circulate   in, to Russians-LOC
　　 'it was very unusual for me to circulate among Russians'

Curiously enough, this example cannot be associated with any similar Russian construction with the preposition *v* 'in, to'. In this case we should rather use Russian preposition *sredi* 'among.' This example, however, is unique, and it is rather difficult to make any conclusions based on it.

In general we can say that the distribution of the preposition *dre/de* (in the meaning of stative location) is similar to that of Locative constructions without a preposition with purely locative meaning:

(67) *i   živéla lén-de   dásvo čavoró*
　　 and lives   they-LOC this   boy
　　 'and this fellow lives at their place'.

The only evident difference in these distribution is that there are a lot of examples when Locative forms of the animate nouns as well as of the corresponding pronouns are used, while the preposition *de/dre is* used only with inanimate nouns.[8]

2.2. Preposition *pe/po* 'on, upon'

Like the previous preposition, this one has phonetic variants, distribution of which does not seem to be systematic. There are some examples, which allow to suppose that the original distribution might have been also determined by the form of the article:

(68) *me soglásno sóm po da zakládo   i   pe da igrá, so kučedýr*
    I   agree   am on this mortgage and on this game that more.expensive

    po svéto   sy kap'itálo
    on world is capital

    'I bet that money is the most valuable thing in the world'

However, contrary examples also exist. In general, it seems that *po* is more frequently used. Maybe it is determined to a certain extent by the phonetic identity with Russian preposition *po*. In general, the preposition *pe/po* corresponds to Russian preposition *na*. Very different shades of meaning can be expressed by the Romani preposition, but in general the specter of the meanings corresponds to that of the Russian one.

(69) *la   ulyžá   po Urálu*
    her.ACC he.drove.away to Ural
    'he drove her away to Ural' (cf. Russ. *na Ural*)

(70) *jój besťá   po samoľótu*
    she set.down on plane
    'she got into the plane' (cf. Russ. *na samolet)*

(71) *pr'iglašáit les   moskófsko kn'ag'ín'a po bálo*
    she.invites them-ACC Moscow's princess   to party
    'the Moscow princess invites him to the party' (cf. Russ. *na bal*)

(72) *kučedýr   po svéto sy kap'itálo*
    more.expensive on world is capital
    'the capital is the most valuable thing in the world' (cf. Russ. *na svete*).

There are also the examples when the use of this prepositional phrase is determined by peculiarities of the government of certain Russian verbs:

---

8   It is interesting, that in NRRD as it seems there is no opposition between incorporative and non-incorporative prepositions, though this opposition exists in other Romani dialects (see Matras 1997: 62–72).

(73) *učícca   jój   gyjá   pe prodafš'íca-te*
     to.study   she   went   on shop-girl.LOC
     'she went to study to be a shop-girl' (cf. Russ. *poshla uchiťs'a na prodavshchicu*)

or by the tendency of certain Russian nouns to be used with the Russian preposition *na*:

(74) *jóv terdó   sy po v'erándo*
     he   sitting is at verandah
     'he is at the verandah' (cf. Russ. *na verande*)

(75) *kxelďá   pe   g'itára*
     he.played   on   guitar
     'well, before he played the guitar' (cf. Russ. *na gitare*)

However, there are also several examples when the Romani preposition *po/pe* rather corresponds to Russian preposition *po* 'on, by':

(76) *romá   bešté   po kxám*
     gypsies were.sitting by sun
     'gypsies lived according to the sun' (cf. Russ. *zhiť po solncu*)

It is quite feasible that in this case we deal with the contamination of the Romani and the Russian prepositions. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that in these cases the preposition is practically always used in *po* form. In some cases it is difficult to understand which preposition was used, the Romani one or the Russian one. It is especially difficult if a Russian noun has an Russian dative ending (we have the possibility, indeed, to see here a code switching):

(77) *žála   po g'íľz'iji*
     he.goes on gildia
     'he behaves like a person of high society';

or the ending *-u*, which is a phonetic variant of the Romani ending *-o*, but, at the same time, it is phonetically identical to the Russian Dative ending of the second declension (which can, at least, favor the use of *po* form of the preposition): (70)

   The preposition *pe/po* is used both with animate (in Loc.) and inanimate nouns (in a form homonymous to Nominative), and sometimes (though more rare) with personal pronouns in the form of Locative:

(78) *jój xazdyjápe   p adá raklor'játe*
     she grew.angry on this girl-LOC
     'she grew angry with this girl'

(79) *i   podykxné pe   léste*
     and   looked   on   he-LOC
     'and they looked at him'

It is interesting, that in the speech of one of our informants a noun with the preposition *pe* is governed by the verb *te rak'iráv*:

(80) *rak'írla   láke,   pe pxen'áte*
    he.speaks she-DAT on girl-LOC
    'he speaks with her, the girl'

(81) *cár'o rak'írla, pe, pe pésk'i   romn'á-te*
    king   speaks   on on his.own wife-LOC
    'the king speaks to his wife'

This kind of government (which is not characteristic to modern Russian colloquial speech) is widely used in texts in the Romani dialect very close to NRRD recorded by V. N. Dobrovolsy in Smolensk region in the end of the 19th century:

(82) *rak'írla   pe lés-te*
    he.speeks on he-LOC
    '(he) tells him'(Dobrovolsky 1908: 9)

It is interesting that in *Russian* texts, recorded by Dobrovolsky from Gypsies, this kind of government does not occur. Neither it can be detected in the North-Western group of Russian dialects. Possibly, this kind of government appeared under the influence of the Russian verbs *obraschaťsja k komu* 'to address someone', *pisaťk komu* 'to write to someone.'

2.3. Preposition *ke/k* 'to, at'

The *ke* form is used commonly with those words that start with a consonant, while the *k* form is used with the words, which have vocal anlaut. However, the contrary examples are also obtained.

    The preposition *ke* holds a very special position among other Romani prepositions, because it governs nouns and pronouns in their direct form (Nominative). This may be explained by its history (cf Boretzky: *ke* = dat *-ke,* 1989: 371–372). These peculiarities of the preposition *ke* can be observed in our texts too.

    In general the preposition corresponds to Russian preposition *k* 'to' in its locative meaning (direction). That is why it often combines with the verbs of motion:

(83) *pr'ijéxaľi ke romá ... barydyrá*
    came   to gypsies authorities
    'local authorities came to gypsies'

There are examples when the use of *ke* is determined by governmental properties of a verb (like in Russian):

(84) *mán-ge sýs óčin' trúdna   te pr'isykľováv ke romaný číb*
    me-DAT was very difficult to get used   to Romani language
    'it is difficult for me to get used to Romani language' (cf. Russ. *privyknuť k*)

In our texts we have an interesting example (61), when the combination *ke* + animate noun is "synonymous" to the locative form of a pronoun in a construction with the meaning of stative location:

    There are similar examples in our syntactic questionnaire:

(85) *Raspxén mán-ge, sýr tu   žin'ďán ke péskr'i   bába*
    tell   me   how you.SING lived   at her.own grandmother
    'tell me, how did you live in her grandmother's place'.

It seems that these examples are very well in accordance with the distributive hierarchy developed by Matras: pronouns (Locative) – animate nouns (*ke* + Nominative). However, this hypothesis is should be proved correct on the NRRD material.

2.4. Preposition *pal* 'behind, about'

Generally the use of this preposition corresponds to the use of Russian prepositions *za* and *o*, even in rather specific lexical contexts:

(86) *so   pal   tr'ín bérš   jóv výučil   po baré manušeste*
    thus about three year.NOM-ACC he teached   on great man-LOC
    'in three years he made (him) a great person' (cf. Russ. *za tri goda*).

The original meaning of the preposition was, most probably, locative ('behind'), while the meaning 'about' developed under Slavic influence (North-Western Russian dialects, dialect of Pskov?)

(87) *me   tú-ke   raspxenáva pal   pésk'iro ďéctvo*
    I   you.SING-DAT tell.FUT   about my.own childhood
    'I'll tell you about my childhood' (cf. Russ. *rasskazhu za*).

Perhaps, this meaning influenced the governmental properties of the verb *te rovés* in the following example, though, it may be just a loan translation of a Russian dialectal word *plakať* 'to cry, to weep' with its specific government *za kem* 'for whom' (cf. Russian dialectal *plakať za kem*, *skuchať za kem*):

(88) *Rovéla,   pál   dá raklorés-te*
    she.cries about this boy-LOC
    'she cries for the fellow'

There are examples with the meaning 'behind somebody':

(89) *da   béš   pal   lés-te   de kar'éta*
    and sit.down behind he-LOC in carriage
    'and sit down behind him in the carriage'

Pal is used with Locative in combination with animate nouns and pronouns, and with a form homonymous to Nominative when it is used with inanimate nouns.

    Pale róm is an adverbial phrase which appeared, possibly, under the influence of the Russian adverb *zamuzh* '(to get) married':

(90) *sr'édn'e pxén vygejá   pale   raklés-te pale   róm*
    second   sister went.out behind man-LOC behind man
    'the second sister has married a fellow', cf.

(91) *jój-to p'ir'ižyváit pale   romés-te*
    she   worries   about man-LOC
    'she worries about her husband' (Cf. Russian: *za muzh – za muzha*).

2.5. The use of other prepositions in our texts is of an occasional character.

The preposition *p'ir'i/p'ir/pere* 'on, upon, across, through.'

(92) *p'ir'i   gáv   žána*
    through   village they.go
    'they go through the village'

One of our informants Z. A. Grokhovskaya used it few times and only with the noun *véš*.

(93) *kar'ík me žáva p'ir   adá véš*
    where   I   go   through this forest
    'where can I go through this forest'

The preposition *paš* 'near, next to':

(94) *čuvéla l-es   paš   fénster, adá Petr-ós*
    he.set   him-ACC near window this Peter-ACC
    'He made this Petro sit down by the window'

Both prepositions can be found in our texts in combination with inanimate nouns in the form homonymous to Nominative.

    There is also only one reliable example of the preposition *vaš* 'for' which is used with Dative:

(95) *vaš   tu-ke doj   amé sunasa muzyka kxélna*
    for   you.SING-DAT we   hear   music   they.play
    'Is it you for whom the music that we hear play?'

In our texts there is only one example of a Russian preposition (*m'éždu* 'between') being used:

(96) *i   kaná rak'írna   m'éždu   pés-te*
       and now   they.talk between self-LOC
       'and they talk between themselves'

It is worth mentioning that the reflexive pronoun was used here in the form of Locative and not Instrumental as it would be in Russian.

In the answers to the questionnaire one can encounter several more cases when Russian prepositions are used, but these prepositions are identical to those used in Russian sentences.

(97) *m'ímo amaró dvór progyjá n'eznakómo manúš*
       by   our   yard passed   unknown   man
       'unknown man passed by my house'

It is interesting that Russian prepositions also preserve Romani government (the form homonymous to the Nominative for inanimate nouns).

3. SOME CONCLUSIONS

Returning to the questions formulated in the beginning of the article, we can note the following:

1. There are strict correspondences between "components" of Russian case system and those of NRRD. These correspondences can be of two kinds:
    Russian case form – NRRD case form
    Russian prepositional phrase – NRRD case form
The correspondences are rather of formal than of semantic nature. For example, Russian combination of the preposition *u* + Genitive always corresponds to NRRD Locative, no matter what is the actual meaning of a certain Russian combination.

There are some cases when semantics does influence the character of the interlingual identification, but these cases are extremely rare.

The correspondences are unidirectional, namely this direction is from the dominant language (Russian) to the subdominant one (NRRD); thus, for example, a combination of Russian preposition *s* + Instrumental always corresponds to the NRRD Instrumental, while the opposite is not true .

Sometimes an identification is based on the interpretation of dominant language forms, which does not match with the formal grammatical interpretation (see above). We can suppose that NRRD native speakers do not distinguish the homonymous forms of Russian

Genitive and Accusative. As a result Russian Genitive is almost always rendered as NRRD accusative.[9]

2. The above mentioned correspondences are actualized both on the "level" of prototypical case meanings and on the level of concrete words' government. Peculiarities of the government of numerous words in NRRD lead us to the supposition that governmental patterns of certain Russian words are loan-translated.

3. It is practically impossible to answer the question about the relationship between those interference processes which take place right in the moment of speech, and those which are part of language system. The very steady and constant character of the inter-lingual correspondences does not allow us to say in every concrete case, whether a NRRD native speaker is loan-translating a concrete Russian phrase right in the moment of speech, or he extracts a nuclear word with its pattern of government from a lexicon. It may be, that the high level of interference with Russian language somehow makes this problem irrelevant. NRRD native speakers, having a high degree of language competence in Russian, can borrow Russian syntactic and word-formation models directly in the moment of speech. Thus, their "Romani competence" includes not the concrete models, borrowed from Russian, but the possibility of this kind of borrowing itself (cf. Rusakov, in print).

We should note that there are examples (81)-(83) which cannot be interpreted as loan-translations in the moment of speech. Most probably, in these cases interference influence took place earlier and then became a part of the language system (cf. similar cases with prefixed verb formations, Rusakov in print).

4. We can say, that, in general, case system of NRRD (in its prepositional part) seems to be poorer than that of Russian. It is determined by general characteristics of Romani dialects'

---

9 In general the scheme of the correspondence between Russian case forms (the most important for our material Russian case forms with preposition are also included) and NRRD basic forms can be represented like this:

RUSSIAN		NRDD
GEN.		ACC.
	GEN	
	ABL	
u + GEN		LOC
ot, *iz*, *s* +GEN		ABL
ACC		ACC
DAT		DAT
INSTR		INSTR
s + INSTR		INSTR
PREP		(LOC)

prepositions + LOC(anim.)/NOM(inanim)

functioning. In any case, NRRD native speaker can use in his speech any Russian preposition; this tendency is widely represented in the answers to our questionnaire.

5. We can suppose, that the regular system of inter-lingual correspondences in the sphere of noun forms can contribute to the preservation of NRRD case system. At the same time this preservation is also provided by structural affinities between Russian and NRRD case systems.

6. Russian nouns are almost always used in NRRD speech in adapted form and behave almost the same way as inherited lexics do. The exceptions are those of the nouns which are used in the idiomatic adverbial and prepositional phrases.

(98) ***so vremenem*** 'as the time passes by', ***rano utrom*** 'early in the morning', *rundya* ***golosom*** 'yelled, lit. cried with the voice', the use of nouns in oblique cases in the meaning of adverbs; also the cases when nouns are used with Russian numerals:

(99) *jov dodzhindya* ***do sta let*** 'He lived till he was one hundred years old'

It is possible that quite a complicated distribution of case forms after various numerals in Russian might have determined this way of using the numerals.

However, in these cases it is rather difficult to distinguish these phenomena from those of code-switching (cf. Rusakov 1998).

REFERENCES

Bokamba, E. G.	1988	Code-Mixing, Language Variation and Linguistic Theory, *Lingua* V.76.
Boretzky, N.	1989	Zum Interferenzverhalten des Romani, *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 42/3: 357–374.
	1994	*Grammatik des Kalderash Dialekts mit Texten und Glossar*, Berlin.
Dobrovolsky, V. N.	1908	*Kiselevskije Cygane*, St. Petersburg.
Elšik, V.	1997	Towards a morphology-based typology of Romani, in: Matras, Y./Bakker, P./ Kyuchukov, H. (eds.) *The typology and Dialectology of Romani*, Amsterdam: 23–60.
Hock, H. H.	1986	*Principles of Historical Linguistics*, Berlin.
Matras, Y.	1997	The typology of case relations and case layer distribution in Romani, in: Matras, Y./Bakker, P./Kyuchukov, H. (eds.) *The typology and Dialectology of Romani*, Amsterdam: 61–94.
	1997a	Review of Holzinger, D. (1993): Das Rómanes: Grammatik und Diskursanalyse der Sprache der Sinte, *Linguistic Typology* I: 404–409.
Rusakov, A. Y.	1998	Severnorusskij dialect cyganskogo jazyka. Interferencija I perekluchenije kodow, in: *Etnolinguisticheskije issledovanija. Vzaimodejstvije jazykov I dialektov*, S.-Petersburg: Institut lingvisticheskih issledovanij RAN.
	(in print)	*North Russian Romani Dialect: Interference and Code Switching.*

Sergijevskij, M. V.   1931   *Cyganskij jazyk*, Moscow.

Sobolev, A. N.   o.J.   Zametki o padezhnyh sistemah serbohorvatskih kontaktnyh zon, *Juzhno-slovenskij filolog* XLVI: 13–28.

Ventzel, T. V.   1964   *Cyganskij jazyk (severnorusskij dialekt)*, Moscow.

Yeloyeva, F. A./Rusakov, A. Y.

1990   *Problemy jazykovoj interferencii. Cyganskije dialekty Jevropy*, Leningrad.

Alexandre Rusakov
Olga Abramenko
St. Petersburg