

TALLINN UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES
ESTONIAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

Anette Ross

ESTONIAN LOTFITKA ROMANI

Master's thesis

Supervisor: Professor Anna Verschik

Tallinn 2017

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
1 Roma Groups and Romani dialects in Estonia.....	5
1.1 The Lajenge Roma (Laiuse Roma).....	5
1.2 The Lotfitka Roma (Latvian Roma).....	6
1.3 The Laloritka Roma (Estonian Roma).....	7
1.4 The Xaladytka Roma (Russian Roma).....	7
1.5 Language proficiency and language use among Roma in Estonia.....	8
2 Research on Estonian Romani dialects.....	11
3 Data collection.....	13
3.1 Informants.....	14
3.2 Transcriptions of the samples.....	14
4 Romani linguistics and language contact.....	16
4.1 Language contact and multilingualism.....	16
4.2 The genetic model and the geographic diffusion model.....	17
5 Phonology.....	19
5.1 Vowels.....	19
5.2 Consonants.....	21
5.3 Historical phonology.....	25
6 Morphology.....	28
6.1 Nominals and adverbs.....	28
6.1.1 Vocative case marking.....	29
6.1.2 Case agreement of adjectives and head nouns.....	30
6.1.3 Comparatives and Superlatives.....	31
6.1.4 Local adverbs and adverbials.....	32
6.1.5 Temporal adverbs and adverbials, time expressions.....	32
6.1.6 Numerals.....	35
6.1.7 Reflexives and Clitics.....	36
6.1.8 Demonstratives and deictics.....	37
6.1.8.1 Location deictics.....	38
6.1.8.2 Comparative deictics.....	38
6.1.9 Interrogatives.....	39
6.1.10 Indefinite pronouns.....	40
6.1.11 Articles.....	42
6.2 Verbs.....	43
6.2.1 Verb inflection—Present: Person Concord.....	43
6.2.2 Loan verbs—Personal concord.....	43
6.2.3 The future marker <i>-a</i>	46
6.2.4 The remoteness marker <i>-as</i>	47
6.2.5 Tense and Aspect—functions.....	48
6.2.6 The imperative form.....	53
6.2.7 Non-finite forms.....	54
6.2.8 Transitive derivations.....	58
6.2.9 Intransitive derivations.....	60
6.2.10 Aktionsart prefixes.....	62
6.2.10.1 Latvian aktionsart prefixes.....	63
6.2.10.2 Slavic aktionsart prefixes.....	64

6.2.10.3 Fusion.....	65
6.2.11 Verbal particles.....	68
6.2.12 Modals and Auxiliaries.....	68
7 Syntax.....	72
7.1 Prepositions.....	72
7.1.1 Prepositions of space and location.....	72
7.1.2 Temporal prepositions and conjunctions.....	76
7.1.3 Other prepositions.....	79
7.2 Subordination.....	81
7.2.1 Adverbial clauses.....	81
7.2.2 Relative clauses.....	83
7.2.3 Embedded questions.....	84
7.3 Complementation.....	85
7.4 Utterance modifiers.....	87
7.5 Absence of the copula.....	89
8 Influence of Russian language and Xaladytka Romani on Estonian Lotfitka Romani.....	90
9 The Estonian Lotfitka dialect compared to Latvian Lotfitka.....	94
9.1 Innovations.....	95
9.2 Retentions.....	95
9.3 Option selection.....	96
9.4 Inter-dialectal influence.....	97
9.5 Influence of contact languages.....	97
Conclusion.....	99
References.....	100
Eestis kõneldav roma keele Lotfitka murrak.....	104

Introduction

The main focus of this work is Lotfitka Romani spoken in Estonia by both the Lotfitka and Laloritka Roma. It belongs to the Northeastern Romani branch (hereafter NE) of the language tree and is genetically most closely related to the Latvian Romani dialect spoken in Latvia.

The aim of this thesis is to offer more detailed information about the Estonian Lotfitka dialect (hereafter EL), as more data has been collected in past years. Anton Tenser (2008) has given a detailed overview of the NE Romani group (Polish, Russian, Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian Romani) in his PhD dissertation, and the goal of this thesis is to complement his data on the EL dialect. Tenser draws attention to potential sub-groups, innovation areas, and features of the group as a whole dialectological unit.

In addition, the objective of the thesis is to compare EL to its closest related Romani dialect, Latvian Lotfitka (hereafter LL), and analyze the influence of Estonian Xaladytka (hereafter EX), another NE dialect that is also spoken in Estonia. The material on EX is presented together with material on its Latvian counterpart, Latvian Xaladytka (hereafter LX) to give more detailed insight into changes happening in a small language community where speakers of different dialects are involved in intensive interaction.

The first part of the thesis offers a brief insight into Estonian Romani dialects, research on Estonian Romani, and a sociolinguistic background of Estonian Romani speakers. The second part is a grammatical description that includes phonology, nominals and adverbs, verbs, and syntax. The grammatical description is followed by a discussion on the Russian influence on the Estonia Lotfitka dialect, and on the conservative features in EL compared to LL. The discussion on the Russian influence focuses on the recent Russian influence in EL that is not demonstrated in LL.

The Estonian Roma community is relatively small and is estimated to consist of 500 to 1,100 Roma. Romani is an oral language, and very few recorded or written examples of Romani language have been collected in Estonia. The Estonian Romani community is active and finding ways to preserve their culture and language as well as motivated to develop written materials for children and youth on local Romani dialects. The current thesis may be helpful in documenting the dialect and emphasizing the features that are particularly characteristic to EL compared to LL and EX.

1 Roma Groups and Romani dialects in Estonia

Until the Second World War, three Romani dialects were spoken in Estonia: Lajenge, Lotfitka and Xaladytka. Lajenge (Laiuse) Romani belonged to the North-western group of Romani dialects, but all the speakers were killed by the Nazi regime in 1939. Today, two NE dialects remain. Other speakers of the NE group in the Baltics and surrounding areas are the Ruska Roma (also known as the Xaladytka), the Polska Roma (in the northern areas of Poland), the Litovska Roma in Lithuania and the Lotfitka Roma (Tenser 2008: 12).

Today some Lotfitka speakers divide themselves to two groups, the Lotfitka Roma or 'Latvian Roma' and the Laloritka Roma or 'Estonian Roma'. In the description of the dialect, the examples are marked with the endonyms of the speakers as Lotfitka or Laloritka, but the dialect as a whole is referred to as Lotfitka following Mānušs (1997). The Latvian Roma activist and linguist Leksa Mānušs (1997: 6) divides the Lotfitka dialect in Latvia into the Vidzeme, Kurzeme and Latgale subgroups and highlights some of the differences. In this work this classification is not used due to a small number of data on EL.

In the following sections I will briefly describe the four Roma groups that are now living in Estonia or have lived in the area in the past and their dialects: the Lajenge, Lotfitka, Laloritka and Xaladytka Roma. Paragraph 1.5 describes the language knowledge and language use of the Roma in Estonia.

1.1 The Lajenge Roma (Laiuse Roma)

Lajenge Romani belonged to the Northwestern group of Romani dialects and was more closely related to the dialect spoken in Sweden and Finland (Ariste 1940a: 21–25; Matras 2002: 10). The Lajenge Roma migrated to the territory of what is today Estonia through Sweden or Finland some time after 1600 (Ariste 1940a: 1–5). In 1839 the Russian emperor demanded that all Roma become settled, and Roma from Baltics were concentrated in the Laiuse area in 1841–1844 (Ariste 1940a: 10; Blomster 1999).

Examples of Lajenge Romani are presented in August Friedrich Pott's (1844) work *Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien: ethnographisch-linguistische Untersuchung, vornehmlich*

ihrer Herkunft und Sprache, nach gedruckten und ungedruckten Quellen. Paul Ariste collected language data from the Lajenge Roma from the 1930s until the Second World War. Unfortunately, all of the speakers of the Lajenge dialect were killed in the Second World War. (Kukk 1983: 434) By the time Ariste interacted with the Lajenge Roma, their dialect had been strongly influenced by Estonian (Ariste 1940a: 20).

After the Second World War, there were no samples collected from the Lajenge Roma in Estonia, and it is not certain if there are any Lajenge speakers or descendants that would have some knowledge of the dialect. According to the information gathered during my fieldwork among some Laloritka Roma, Lajenge has become a designation for Roma who are losing their culture and language and have become detached from the Romani way of life.

1.2 The Lotfitka Roma (Latvian Roma)

Before the Second World War, most itinerant Roma in Estonia came from Latvia in the 19th and 20th century (Lutt et al. 1999: 334). After the Second World War, only 10% of Roma of all origins survived (ibid.: 335). Continuous migration occurred from Latvia to Estonia during the Soviet era and after both states regained their independence in 1991.

The EL Roma usually see themselves as the Roma of Estonia. Still, they have retained the ethnonym Lotfitka Roma, which means Latvian Roma in the Romani language and is derived from the Polish word *Łotwa* for Latvia. The Estonian Roma identified the main differences between EL and LL Roma to be the birthplace and the country where education is obtained. By their own understanding, the main linguistic differences in the speech of the LL and EL dialects were intonation and loanwords—Latvian loans in the speech of LL and Estonian loanwords in EL. (Ross 2013: 16–17)

In 2016 according to the Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia, 5,297 Roma were registered to live in Latvia (Table ISG07). The figure includes different Roma groups, e.g. Lotfitka Roma, Xaladytka Roma, Polish Roma, etc. The most recently available information on Romani spoken among the Roma are from the Latvian Population Census of 2000, according to which 5,637 Roma out of a total of 8,205 spoke Romani as their mother tongue. Latvian was spoken as the mother tongue by 1,670 Latvian Roma and Russian by

574 Roma. 324 Roma have a mother tongue other than Romani, Latvian or Russian. Unfortunately, there is no additional data on the language skills of the Roma.

1.3 The Laloritka Roma (Estonian Roma)

The Laloritka Roma are a group of Roma speaking the Lotfitka dialect. Although the dialect they speak seems to be the same as that of the Lotfitka Roma, they prefer to refer to themselves with another ethnonym. Their endonym is derived from the name given to Estonians by the Latvian Roma—*Laloritka* ‘Estonian’. It originates from *laloro* ‘mute’, but the original meaning seems to be lost as the interviewed Roma couldn’t identify any other meanings of *laloro* besides ‘Estonian’. Mānušs (1997: 6) was also familiar with the endonym Laloritka Roma.

Similarly to EL Roma, the Laloritka Roma distinguish themselves as people born and having obtained education in Estonia. The Laloritka Roma differentiate themselves from the Lotfitka Roma the same way as the EL Roma do from the LL Roma. Both groups distinguish their culture from the LL Roma, which is visible in the way the Lotfitka are described. The Laloritka claim to have a stronger influence from Estonian language and the Lotfitka more from Latvian. The differences are said to be in the vocabulary and the accent.

Further research must be carried out to clarify if the two groups are uniform in the matter of culture or if they move in two different spheres, with the Lotfitka keeping stronger ties with Latvia and the Laloritka being more influenced by Estonian culture. Linguistically it seems that the differences are strongly present in idiolects, but based on current data, it is not possible to see outstanding distinctions. The differences might grow in time, and therefore I have marked the ethnonyms in the language examples.

1.4 The Xaladytka Roma (Russian Roma)

The Xaladytka Roma are Roma living in Estonia and speaking the Xaladytka Romani dialect (North Russian Romani), which belongs to the same dialect group as Lotfitka Romani. According to Lutt et al. (1999: 335), before the First World War there were around

10 families of Russian Roma travelling in eastern Estonia. Between the world wars the population of Russian Roma in the eastern part of Estonia increased, but the Second World War had a devastating impact on the Xaladytka Roma and for the rest of the Roma population as well. The migration from the east continued throughout the Soviet period. Some of the Russian Roma migrated to Estonia from Petseri County when it became part of Estonia in 1920 (Ariste 1967).

1.5 Language proficiency and language use among Roma in Estonia

According to the 2011 Estonian Population and Housing Census, there are 482 Roma living in Estonia. Data for the census is voluntarily given by Roma themselves, and data about the mother tongue, foreign languages and ethnicity are given by Roma according to their interpretation and understanding. Within the framework of the census, no data differentiating the Roma groups has been collected and made available.

According to the census data from 2011, Romani is spoken as the mother tongue by 339 Roma, but no data is available how many people speak Romani as a foreign language. Romani dialects are not differentiated in the data. In 2000 there were 426 Roma out of 542 Roma who spoke Romani as their mother tongue and 50 who named Romani as one of the foreign languages they speak.

Table 1. **Mother tongues of Estonian Roma according to the 2000 and 2011 Estonian Census.** (Estonian Population and Housing Census 2000 [Table RL225]; Estonian Population and Housing Census 2011 [Table RL0442])

	Total	Romani	EST	RUS	LAT	Ukrainian	English	Finnish	Other	Un-known
2000	542	426	45	59	9	1	0	0	0	2
2011	482	339	44	83	-	1	1	1	8	5

The most common languages spoken by Estonian Roma beside Romani are Russian, Estonian and Latvian. According to the census (Estonian Population and Housing Census 2011), Russian is spoken by 329 Roma and Estonian by 263 Roma. According to the census taken in 2000, there were 120 Roma out of 542 Roma living in Estonia who spoke

Latvian. The Estonian Lotfitka and Laloritka Roma usually speak Estonian and Russian and have knowledge of Latvian to some extent.

The knowledge of Latvian depends on the strength of family relations and on the period of emigration from Latvia. The EX Roma speak Russian as a second language and the younger generation born and raised in Estonia has some knowledge of Estonian.

Romani is listed as a foreign language in the data if it is not identified as the mother tongue by the speaker. Therefore, the feature includes people who have identified themselves as Roma but have listed some language other than Romani as their mother tongue.

Table 2. Foreign languages spoken by Estonian Roma according to the 2000 and 2011 Estonian Census (Estonian Population and Housing Census 2000 [Table RL226]; Estonian Population and Housing Census 2011 [Table RL0443])

	2000	2011
Romani	50	-
Estonian	312	263
Russian	409	329
Latvian	120	-
Finnish	24	34
English	40	87
Does not know any other language	23	26
Unknown	42	30
Total number of Roma	542	482

According to Ross (2013), Romani is mostly spoken amid family members, relatives and friends of Romani origin. Romani is used in few everyday and family life activities. Public materials are not produced in Romani and no regular official activities are held in Romani for children or adults. This restricts the language use only to family and friends of Roma origin and also motivates speakers to switch to using Estonian and Russian while discussing more complex topics.

The main influence reducing the use of Romani for the younger generation is schooling—

in Estonia no education is provided in Romani nor there are any textbooks or learning materials provided by the state. There are no Roma with teaching skills who could run the schooling programs for Sunday schools and mother tongue lessons. The task to bring Romani to formal education is even more complicated as the local Romani dialects are not standardized.

Section 5 of § 21 *Language of instruction* of the *Estonian Basic Schools and Upper Secondary Schools Act* (2010) states that if at least 10 pupils studying at a school have a native language other than the language of instruction, the school shall organize language and culture teaching. There is not any competence of Romani either among teachers and researchers outside the community who could support the initiative to teach the language and culture in the official framework.

Estonia provides support to Sunday schools for minorities, but the teacher has to meet requirements that a member of the Roma community may not meet. Also, the members of the community are widely dispersed, and therefore it is difficult for them to regularly gather in one location with a sufficient number of repeat participants.

Estonia has Estonian- and Russian-medium primary schools and language immersion schools. Young Roma study in Estonian- and Russian-medium schools depending on the region and origin of their family. It is important to and natural for the families to teach both local languages—Estonian and Russian—to the next generation. This claim is also supported by the data collected by Lutt et al. (2011) for a review on Romani in the Estonian education system. According to their data, out of 57 children between the ages of 7–18 28 are already speaking Romani, Estonian and Russian, while 16 children speak only Romani and Estonian, and 13 speak Russian and Romani (ibid.: 15–16).

2 Research on Estonian Romani dialects

Research on Romani in Estonia has been unsystematic and can be summed up in three periods. Otto Wilhelm Masing and Carl Schultz collected samples of Romani speech in the beginning of 19th century (Ariste 1962: 609–610). The second period ranges from the 1930s, when the Estonian linguist Paul Ariste collected samples from the Lajenge (Laiuse) Roma (Ariste 1940a, 1967, 1984) and Lotfitka Roma (Ariste 1958, 1964, 1969, 1973, 1983). Some of his findings were published between the 1930s and the 1980s, but much of the material went missing during the Second World War. The most recent period concerns Tenser's PhD dissertation *The Northeastern Romani dialect group* defended in 2008, which is based on linguistic questionnaires. The data used for the project was collected by Katrin Hiietam for the Romani Morpho-Syntax (RMS) Database project. In 2013 nine 3–4-hour long translated questionnaires were collected for a University of Helsinki project called *Finnish Romani and other northern dialects of Romani in the Baltic Sea area*.

The first data collected in Estonia was from the Lajenge Roma. According to Ariste (1962: 609–610), fieldwork was initiated by history professor Friedrich Kruse for August Friedrich Pott's work (published in 1844) and carried out by Otto Wilhelm Masing and Carl Schultz. The data was also used by Franz Miklosich in his work about Romani dialects (1872–1881), by Finnish Romani researcher Arthur Thesleff in his Finnish Romani dictionary (1901) and by Siegmund A. Wolf in his Romani dictionary (1960).

Ariste has published articles on Romani loanwords in Estonian (Ariste 1983), Finnish Romani place names (Ariste 1940b), the linguistic features of Lajenge (Laiuse) Romani (Ariste 1940a), the intonation of Romani (Ariste 1978) and Romani folklore (Ariste 1961). He also did fieldwork among the Lajenge and Latvian Roma. Additionally, he collected folk tales from young Latvian Roma in Tartu, and some of them are published under the title *Romenge paramiši (Romani Folk Tales)* (Ariste 1938). Romani was one of Ariste's big interests, and therefore the topic was covered with many different articles, but no comprehensive work was published on the Estonian Roma. In 1939 the Nazi regime killed all the Lajenge Roma (Ariste 1984: 223) and the consequences of World War II stopped Ariste from going into with the topic as deeply as he wished (Ariste 1967). The remaining material collected by Ariste is stored at the Estonian Folklore Archives (ERA, *Mustlase*) in

two collections called *Mustlase I (Gypsy I)* and *Mustlase II (Gypsy II)*. According to Kukk (1983: 434), the original material of these collections was gathered in two sets: *Cingarica I*, containing material from the Latvian Roma and *Cingarica II*, containing material collected from the Lajenge Roma in Estonia and the Finnish Roma in Finland. The *Cingarica II* set disappeared during World War II. Ariste's articles in Estonian and a reprint of *Romenge paramiši* are collected into the book *Mustlaste raamat* (Ariste 2012).

Tenser's dissertation (2008) is a detailed work on the NE dialect group and also contains information on Estonian Lotfitka. The other dialects belonging to the group are spoken in Poland, Russia, Lithuania and Latvia. In Tenser's dissertation EL is analyzed under the name Estonian Romani. It is the only systematic work concerning Romani spoken in Estonia today and covers the linguistic features of the dialect well. As the material is collected from six speakers living in the same town, Kohila, the data does not fully cover the range of features among Roma living in Estonia, but it is still a very wide overview of the current state of the dialect.

Matras (1999) gives an overview of the NE dialect spoken by the Polska Roma and discusses Polska Romani features in the general context of the Northern and Central dialects. A more detailed description of the NE dialect, Xaladytka (North Russian) Romani is available from Ventzel (1983). An etymological dictionary of the LL dialect compiled by Mānušs (1997) includes some notes on the dialect and a short grammatical description. The dictionary itself offers good insight into the lexicon of the dialect.

Recently, Ross (2013) gave a small-scale overview of the multilingualism among the Estonian Roma, focusing on language usage and language proficiency.

3 Data collection

The Estonian and Latvian data used in the thesis was collected within the *Finnish Romani and other northern dialects of Romani in the Baltic Sea area* research project in 2013 by Anton Tenser, Roman Lutt and Zalina Dabla and in 2015 by Anette Ross and Zalina Dabla. There were nine interviews recorded in the first period and two interviews in 2015.

Data was collected based on the linguistic interview designed by Yaron Matras and Viktor Elšík for the Romani Morpho-Syntax Database (Matras, Elšík 2001a)¹. The questionnaire includes separate lexical items, verb conjugation and sentences that are translated into Romani. The Estonian informants have translated the samples from Estonian or Russian and the Latvian informants from Latvian or Russian. The Estonian Romani samples were transcribed by Anton Tenser, Dainis Krauklis and Anette Ross. The Latvian Romani samples were collected and transcribed by Anton Tenser and Dainis Krauklis. The author of the thesis has reviewed the transcriptions and transcribed all five interviews with the Laloritka Roma and one interview with a member of the LL Roma.

The interviews recorded were 3–4 hours long and covered the whole linguistic questionnaire. One interview with a member of the Laloritka Roma covered half of the questionnaire and lasted for 1.5 hours.

Background information on the speaker, on the relevant dialect and on Romani and the Roma in Estonia were gathered during the collection of samples.

The RMS questionnaire has a standardized format with 240 lexical items, 100 verb conjugation items and over 700 phrases. (Tenser 2008: 15) The RMS database was initiated in 1998 to provide a tool for analyzing the language from historical, typological, contact-theoretical and dialectological perspectives—therefore, to compare dialect-specific innovations, to examine the structural representation of functions across a sample of dialects, to examine contact influences, and to examine the link between innovations and their geographical distribution. (Matras; White; Elšík 2009)

As indicated by the creators (Matras; White; Elšík 2009) of the RMS Database, a comparative approach to the diverse dialects of Romani is essential in the absence of

1 The RMS database is accessible on the web page <http://romani.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/rms/>.

written documentation on earlier stages of the language. The comparative sample provides an opportunity to observe regularities of structural change. Also, the applied questions of language codification, standardization and the mutual comprehensibility of Romani dialects are best addressed by comparing lexical and grammatical structures.

3.1 Informants

Estonian Romani language samples have been collected from 7 Lotfitka speakers, including 5 Laloritka Roma and two Lotfitka Roma, and from 4 Xaladytka Roma. Latvian Romani samples were collected from 14 Lotfitka speakers and 3 Xaladytka speakers.

The Laloritka Roma interviewed currently live in Paide, Pärnu and Tapa. They have also lived in Elva, Tartu, Rakvere, Viljandi, Tallinn and in small villages around these towns. The samples were collected from four women and one man between the ages of 25 and 65.

The two Estonian Lotfitka Roma interviewed currently live in Pärnu and Tapa and have also lived in Rapla, Kohtla-Järve, Rakvere and Kohila. Both are female and around 30 years old. One of the Lotfitka Roma interviewed was born in Latvia and moved to Estonia in early childhood.

The Estonian Xaladytka Roma live in Tapa, Kohila, Narva and Tallinn. Two were born in Russia and migrated to Estonia at the age of 7 and 18, respectively. Three of the informants are female and one is male. One of them is around 25 and the three other speakers from 60 to 75.

3.2 Transcriptions of the samples

The transcription of the Romani samples varies based on the area from which the sample has been collected. I have marked long vowels with double letters in EL, e.g. *aa* and with a macron on a single letter as used in the Latvian language for LL, e.g. *ā*. The palatalization is marked either with an apostrophe in some words to keep the structure similar and easy to compare, and usually with the letter *j* in the example sentences. In the example sentences, especially in the Xaladytka dialect, palatalization is often not marked. As Romani is an oral

language and samples have been collected from different locations, the transcriptions are often based on the orthography of the contact languages and not fully accurate, i.e. palatalization of affricates is not always marked; long consonants are either marked with a single or double letter; and differences in vowel distinction, especially the differentiation of /a/, /æ/ and /e/ are not always made.

4 Romani linguistics and language contact

This chapter gives a brief overview of certain topics that are relevant for Romani linguistics, language documentation and language contact.

4.1 Language contact and multilingualism

Roma in Estonia that have maintained their mother tongue Romani are multilingual. As Matras (2002: 191) stated, multilingualism is common for Roma in general if they still speak Romani as their mother tongue. In the case of the Estonian Roma, all individuals beside young children actively use at least one local language on an everyday basis. The situation is more complex when we take a look at the language skills of individual people. Most of the Estonian Roma speak Romani and Russian, but not all of the Estonian Roma are multilingual in the same languages, i.e. only some of the Estonian Roma have proficiency in Estonian and Latvian. The language contact between Romani and Estonian or Romani and Latvian could be described as a ‘contact situation in which at least some people use at least more than one language’ (Thomason 2001: 1).

In the case of Romani in Estonia we can refer only to the spoken language. The language used today is written down in personal interactions on social media, but the written form varies highly. Analyzing the language data and describing the features of the specific dialect, it is a question whether the forms that appear in individuals’ speech are established among more speakers or are an individual innovation. Weinreich (1953: 11) sees it as distinguishing speech and language: ‘in speech it [interference] occurs anew in the utterances of the bilingual speaker as a result of his personal knowledge of the other tongue’. In language the interference phenomena have become habitualized and established as frequently occurs in the speech of bilinguals (*ibid.*). Backus (2013) points out in his article on the usage-based approach to borrowability that it is important to see how many people use innovative forms, i.e. how conventionalized they are in the speech community, and how entrenched a particular unit is in the linguistic competence of the individual speaker. The frequency of innovative utterances in the speech is one way to estimate the degree of the cognitive entrenchment of the utterances.

In documenting and describing the ongoing changes, my focus is on the changes that are

conventionalized by the community, i.e. accepted and used by various members. Still, in this analysis with its limited amount of data, it is hard to distinguish between the individual language choice that might not be consistent and permanent, and between changes that are taking place in the whole speech community. Romani has had limited usage as a language of informal interaction, and borrowings of Latvian, Estonian and Russian are part of everyday language use. The speakers of Romani in Estonia must adapt their speech according to the interlocutor's knowledge of local languages and Romani dialects. In the case of the current data, the language of elicitation might play a role as well. Therefore, in drawing attention to new linguistic features in the dialects I have tried to focus on the features that are present in the speech of several informants a number of times. Still, when describing the plurality of variants for expressing some grammatical categories or meanings, some of the choices might be specific to the individual speaker.

The contact-induced language change in the case of Romani has taken place in the language maintenance situation described by Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 37), i.e. Romani has been spoken by generations of Roma people and maintained as their mother tongue while the language has changed through the borrowing of foreign elements. In the framework of Thomason and Kaufman, the influence of different contact languages could be evaluated on different levels based on the length and intensity of the contact. A more detailed view on the influence of Russian, Latvian and Estonian languages on EL Romani is given by the author of this thesis in a separate article (Ross 2016).

4.2 The genetic model and the geographic diffusion model

In research on Romani language it is important to pay attention both to the genetic model and the geographical diffusion model. The genetic model divides the Romani dialects into branches that developed after the Roma migrated from the Southern Balkans during the Early Romani period (roughly the Byzantine period) (Matras 2002: 215). According to the geographical diffusion model, innovation is introduced in one location and then spreads gradually (ibid.: 265).

Both models are relevant as Romani is a non-territorial language and the speakers have followed different migration routes without forming a geographical continuum. This leads

to a situation where some speakers of a specific dialect located in different areas still maintain ties with each other, and in some locations different dialects are spoken simultaneously. Innovations are then spread among dialects that are part of the same sub-branch and the speakers in different locations continue to maintain ties, and among neighbouring dialects that are not related genetically. (ibid.: 214–216)

In the case of Romani dialects spoken in Estonia, innovations are possibly spread in accordance with both models. Lotfitka speakers in Estonia and Latvia maintain ties, and therefore innovations could spread from LL to EL or vice versa. The EX dialect, which is genetically more distant, shares innovations with EL as these language communities exist beside each other and there is interaction between the two groups.

5 Phonology

This chapter discusses some important features of the vowels, consonants, and sound changes in EL and neighbouring dialects. The section on historical phonology sheds some light on more widespread changes in the NE group.

The NE dialects form a geographical continuum from Poland to Estonia, i.e. the local Roma groups are mostly settled in certain areas, interact with the closest neighbouring communities and do not move around in the whole area. Some of the phonetic changes are analyzed in the context of the whole continuum. Other changes are compared in Estonian and Latvian context, in which Lotfitka and Xaladytka dialects do not form a geographical continuum, but are two more distantly related dialect spoken in the same area.

In the chapter on phonology and elsewhere, the data is not connected to certain speakers; therefore it is important to know that more conservative forms are produced by older speakers and by speakers who do not communicate in Romani with a wide audience and are located in areas with fewer Roma. The features seem to be more dependent on the remoteness of the speaker than their age. The reason why these characteristics are not mentioned in examples is the lack of sufficient data from the region.

Tenser (2008: 282) lists features that are common for Latvian Romani as an isolate within NE dialects. Phonological features are metathesis of *pšal* > *špal* and voicing of *ph-* in *phuč-* > *buč-* ‘ask’. Although LL and EL share many of the features these are the ones in which EL is not participating. In addition the contraction in *dyves* > *dyis* ‘day’ and difference in interrogative *sav-* > *saj-* ‘which’. These two changes are shared with Sinti dialect that belongs to Northeastern dialects. Another feature that Tenser (ibid.) lists is contraction of personal markers *ker-av-as* > *ker-aas* ‘I have done’ that is triggered by phonological change discussed in this chapter as well.

5.1 Vowels

In addition to the inherited Romani vowels /a, e, i, o, u/ (Matras 2002: 58), the borrowed vowels in EL are /ɨ, ɔ̃, ä, ö/ and /ü/ (IPA ɨ, ɤ, æ, ø, y). The back-central vowel /ɨ/ is present in Russian borrowings, e.g. the Russian prefix *ɨl-* and the mid-back vowel /ɔ̃/ in Estonian borrowings, e.g. *põõzi* ‘bushes’. The Estonian vowels /õ, ä, ö, ü/ appear in the

loanwords, e.g. *õpetaja* ‘teacher’, *ämm* ‘mother-in-law’, *küla* ‘village’. Latvian has the vowel [æ] (*ä* in written Estonian) as well, which is marked the same as vowel [e] with the grapheme *e* in written Latvian.

The vowel [æ] is to some extent present already in LL—in some lexical items, speakers pronounce /e/ lower, like [æ], e.g. *vavir* > *veer* or *væær* ‘other’. The appearance of /æ/ might be triggered by the Latvian language or be an internal language change. Mānuš (1997: 8) connects the appearance of the long /æ/ that appears in assimilation of /v/ between two vowels with the speech of the Vidzeme Roma. In the speech of the Kurzeme Roma, the assimilation of *v* in *VvV* to *VV* becomes long /a/, e.g. *vavir* > *vaar* ‘other’; *javela* ‘goes’ > *jaala*. In EL data in these lexical items, the Kurzeme long /a/ is not present. In EL the long /a/ appears only when both vowels next to assimilated /v/ are /a/.

In the Lotfitka group of dialects—LL and EL—the long vowels /a, e, i, o, u/ appear as mentioned by Tenser (2008: 22). Lengthening follows the system similar to Latvian Romani—in monosyllabic masculine nouns and in bisyllabic lexemes, where the second syllable has only one consonant as its onset (*ibid.*). In addition, in EL are the long vowels /õ, ä, ö, ü/ in Estonian loanwords as in *sünnipääv* (Estonian *sünnipäev*) ‘birthday’, *põõzi* (Estonian *põõsas*) ‘bush’. Due to Latvian influence, long vowels appear when /v/ is preceded by the vowel /u/ in the end of a word or before a consonant in inherited lexicon, e.g. *džuvli* > *džuuli* ‘women’, *phuv* > *phuu* ‘earth’. When /v/ is preceded by the other vowels /a/, /e/, /i/ or /o/, it results in the creation of the diphthongs [au], [eu], [iu], [ou] or vowel and semivowel compounds [aw], [ew], [iw], [ow], e.g. *lav* > *lau/law* ‘word’, *devles* > *deules/dewles* ‘god.ACC’, *dživdžom* > *džiudžom/džiwdžom* ‘I lived’, *džov* > *džou/džow* ‘wheat’. Mānuš (1997: 7) describes in more detail how the Kurzeme Roma pronounce /av/ as [ou], e.g. *lav* > *lou* ‘word’.

The vowels are also long in two morphemes, the vocational *-ar-*, e.g. *pošta* ‘post’ > *pošt-aar-is* ‘postman’ and the diminutive *-or-*, e.g. *džukel* ‘dog’ > *džukl-oor-o* ‘puppy’ (Tenser 2008: 22). The lengthening of the diminutive marker *-or-* is common in most of the lexemes where it occurs, like in *muršooro*, *džuklooro*, or *phalooro*. There is a difference, however, on the lengthened vowel in one lexeme, *chavoro*. In EL it is pronounced *čhaavoro* and has its first syllable lengthened because that is where the stress falls.

The long form of the genitive case is lengthened as well and the secondary stress of the lexemes falls on the lengthened *i* phoneme *-kiro* > *-kiiro* as in *lengiiro*, *linaskiiro*, or

bimboroskiiro. The lengthening of the penultimate syllable is also present in the genitive second-person plural pronoun *tumaaro*.

There are also diphthongs present in both Latvian and Estonian loanwords: from Estonian, for example, *lõuna* ‘midday, lunch’, *reizinena* ‘they travel’ and from Latvian *nuokeraa* ‘I will finish’, *draugos* ‘friend’, and *iedikhaa* ‘I like’.

Vowel raising is common for the *o*-ending Masculine nouns, e.g. *baaro* > *baaru* ‘big.M’ as mentioned in Tenser (2008: 23) and Mānušs (1997: 7). According to Tenser (2008: 36), ‘the NE group is also quite uniform in the centralization of *a* > *y* in words such as *syr* ‘how’ < *sar*, the Ablative case marker *-tyr* < *-tar*, remoteness marker *-ys* < *-as*.’ Centralization of *i* > *y* in *dykh-* ‘to see’ < *dikh-*, *kolyn* ‘breast’ < *kolin*, *dyves* ‘day’ < *dives* and in the feminine noun and adjectival ending *džuvly* ‘woman’ < *džuvli*, *tykny* ‘small’ < *tikni*. In Latvia and Estonia, as the second language is either Latvian or Estonian for the younger generation, the vowels are pronounced closer to *i* than to *y*.

Vowel raising is also common for *e* > *i* as for complementizer *te* > *ti* and in the Polish borrowing *kiedy* > *kidi* ‘when’. The 3SG feminine pronoun *joj* has an unlauded variant *jej* in all of the NE dialects except for Polish Romani (Tenser 2008: 88). This phenomenon is well attested in Romani (Elšík 2000b: 75 via Tenser 2008: 88). The Latvian verbal prefix *pār-* and adverbial *pār* are found as *pir*, *per*, *por* and *pur*.

5.2 Consonants

In the section on consonants, several sound changes that have taken place in the NE group and particularly in EL and LL are discussed.

As mentioned by Tenser (2008: 24), in the Lotfitka subdialects, as in other NE dialects, is the ongoing process of ‘sibilantization’ which concerns the phonemes /ph/ as in *phal* ‘brother’ and /kh/ as in *khil* ‘butter’. The process is further developed in LL and usually the more conservative forms are found in EL. In LL the changes have been followed the path *ph* > *pš* > *šp* and *kh* > *kš* > *šk*, while in EL most of the observed words have retained the word’s initial phonemes *kh* or *kš*, and *ph* or *pš*, but metathesis has been limited in a very small number of lexical items.

Five of the Estonian Laloritka Roma use the form *phal* ‘brother’, two of them use *pšal* as a parallel form of the word and two of Laloritka Roma use only the form *pšal*. The last form

is the only one used by EX speakers. From the gathered data, the noun *khil* ‘butter’, which takes forms *kšil*, *škil* and *šil* is the most prone to changes. As can be seen, it has gone through the metathesis that is common in LL: *šk-* < *kš-*. Three Laloritka and one EL Roma have retained the *ph-* phonemes in words such as *phiiro* ‘open’, *phirel* ‘walk, wander, travel’ and *philel* ‘push’ and three speakers also use the forms *pšiiro*, *pširel* and *pšilel*. EX speakers use the forms *ks’il* and *ps’irel*.

Out of 14 LL speakers, only one speaker uses the initial phoneme *ph-* for *phal*, *phiiru*, *phirel* and two speakers use the phoneme *pš-* for the same words. The word *khil* has gone through sibilantization and metatheses for all of the speakers and is only present in the form *škil*. As an exception, the form *ajs-philel* ‘to mend’ appears in the data of one LL speaker. LX speakers use the same forms as EX speakers—*ks’il* ‘butter’ and *ps’irel* ‘to walk’, and the form *pšal* for ‘brother’.

Among the EL Roma the phoneme *kh* has not gone through phonetic changes and is used as *kh* in *kheer* ‘house’ and in the palatalized form as *dikh’a* ‘he/she saw’.

There is no outstanding difference in the *ph-* and *pš-* variation between EL and Laloritka Roma as it seems to be up to speaker either to use only one of the forms or use the forms in variation. There is, however, a considerable difference compared to LL, in which the metathesis of *pš-* > *šp-* is present in all forms for most of the speakers. The phoneme *kh* also has more conservative forms in EL compared to LL.

Table 3. **Developments of /ph/ and /kh/**

	<i>phal</i> ‘brother’ (< <i>phral</i>)	<i>phiiro</i> ‘open’	<i>phirel</i> ‘walk’	<i>khil</i> ‘butter’	<i>dikh’a</i> ‘he/she saw’	<i>kher</i> ‘house’
Estonian Laloritka	<i>phal</i> <i>pšal</i>	<i>phiiro</i> <i>pšiiro</i>	<i>phirel</i> <i>pširel</i>	<i>kšil</i> <i>škil</i> <i>šil</i>	<i>dikh’a</i>	<i>kheer</i>
Estonian Lotfitka	<i>phal</i> <i>pšal</i>	<i>phiiro</i> <i>pšiiro</i>	<i>phirel</i> <i>pširel</i>	<i>kšil</i> <i>škil</i>	<i>dikh’a</i>	<i>kheer</i>
Latvian Lotfitka	<i>špal</i>	<i>špiiru</i>	<i>špiiraw</i>	<i>škil</i>	<i>dikh’a</i> <i>dikša</i>	<i>khēr</i>
Estonian Xaladytka	<i>pšal</i>	-	<i>ps’irel</i>	<i>ks’il</i>	<i>dixt’a</i>	<i>kher</i>
Latvian Xaladytka	<i>pšal</i>	<i>ps’iuro</i>	<i>ps’irel</i>	<i>ks’il</i>	<i>dikh’a</i> , <i>dixt’a</i> <i>dikxa</i> <i>diks’a</i>	<i>ks’er</i> <i>kher</i>

In addition to the metathesis *pš* > *šp* and *kš* > *šk*, Mānušs (1997: 8) also mentions other metathesis in LL, i.e. *tj* > *ft* as in *lotfos* > *loftos* ‘Latvian (person)’, *ļēņivo* > *nēļivo* ‘lazy’ from Polish *leniwy* ‘lazy’, *vadviļo* > *vadļivo* from the Polish *wadliwy* ‘defective, faulty’. In the current data, examples only show the change from *tj* > *ft*. The new form with metathesis is present only in one word in LL, i.e. *loftos* ‘Latvian (person)’, and not at all in EL. Even the ethnonym *Lotfitka* has not been modified this way by the current informants, although it is one of the examples that Mānušs (1997: 8) identifies. In *Lotfitka* another change has taken place that is not mentioned by Mānušs, i.e. *tk* > *kt* as *Lotfitka* > *Lotfikta*. This metathesis is also present only in LL, but in more lexical items, i.e. other words with the ending *-itko* as in *bumbieritku kašt* > *bumbieriktu kašt* ‘pear tree’ and *bogitku* > *bogiktu* ‘poor’. In the speech of some LL Roma the consonant cluster in *-itko* has been assimilated to *-iko*. The marker *-itko* is more widespread in LL and the corresponding meanings are provided with other means in EL, e.g. *bimboroskiiro kašt*, *bumberengi kašt* ‘pear tree’ and the inherited *čoororo* ‘poor’. The consonant cluster *-kt-* is also present in LL in the German loanword *riktige* < *richtig* ‘correctly, properly’, which is present in EL in form *rittige*.

In the *Lotfitka* dialects, a process of affrication of palatalized *d*, *t* and *kh* has occurred. The change has occurred in Polska Romani (Matras 1999: 8) and Lithuanian Romani and has spread in LL and EL. It is more thoroughly developed in Latvia compared to EL. The trigger for the affrication is palatalization and it is easily observed in verbs with the perfective marker *-j-*.

The palatalized *d*’ becomes a palatalized *dž*’ as *ripird’a* > *ripirdž’a* ‘he/she remembered’ and *kerd’a* > *kerdž’a* ‘he/she did’. The palatalized *t*’ becomes *č*’ as *lat’a* > *lač’a* ‘he/she found’. The same occurs with *kh*’ > *kš*’ in LL as *dikh’a* > *dikša* ‘he/she saw’ and *mukh’a* > *mukša* ‘he/she left’, but this shift has happened separately from the EL dialect, and no examples of these forms are present in the EL data. Matras reports the change *t*’ > *č*’, e.g. *dikča* < *dikht’a* ‘he/she saw’ in Polish Romani (1999: 8), but according to the Lithuanian Romani examples, the form is *dykxja* or *dyxja*. Therefore, there is no obvious geographical continuum in all changes in the speech of the Roma in the Polish, Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian territories. It is not certain if it has spread from Polish Romani to LL or is an independent change in LL.

In LL in some occasions the aspirated consonant *th* becomes affricate *č* or aspirated affricate *čh*, e.g. in LL *vārthal* > *vārčal* ‘elsewhere’, *vārčane* ‘otherwise’. In EL only the

form *veerthal* ‘elsewhere’ is attested. Another example is *lathel* > *lač(h)el* ‘to find’. In EL the aspirated consonant *th* is present, but in LL mostly the affricate can be seen.

In EX and LX we can also see the changes in verbs with the perfective marker *-j-* triggering the change *kh’* > *ks’* as in *dyks’a* ‘he/she saw’. In EX the initial phoneme *kh* is retained in *kher* ‘house’, while in LX it has the forms *kh’er* and *ks’er*.

Table 4. Developments of *d’*, *t’*, *kh’*, *ph* and *th*

	<i>d’</i> > <i>dž’</i> <i>kerd’a</i> ‘he/she did’	<i>t’</i> > <i>č’</i> <i>lat’a</i> ‘he/she found’	<i>t’</i> > <i>č’</i> <i>rat’a</i> ‘nights’	<i>ph</i> > <i>pš</i> > <i>šp</i> <i>phal</i> ‘brother’ (< <i>phral</i>)	<i>kh’</i> > <i>kš</i> <i>khil</i> ‘butter’	<i>th</i> > <i>č(h)</i> <i>lathel</i> ‘to find’
Polish Romani	<i>kerdž’a</i>	<i>raxča</i> <i>rakča</i>	<i>rača</i>	<i>pšal</i> <i>phał</i>	<i>kšil</i> <i>khil</i>	<i>rakheł</i>
Lithuanian Romani	<i>kerdž’a</i> <i>kerdz’a</i> <i>kerd’a</i>	<i>lačha</i> <i>last’a</i>	<i>rača</i> <i>rat’a</i>	<i>pšal</i>	<i>kšil</i> <i>ksil</i>	<i>lat(h)el</i> <i>lastel</i>
Latvian Lotfitka	<i>kerdž’a</i>	<i>lačha</i>	<i>rača</i>	<i>špal</i>	<i>škil</i>	<i>lač(h)el</i>
Estonian Lotfitka	<i>kerdž’a</i>	<i>lača</i>	<i>rača</i>	<i>pšal</i> <i>phal</i>	<i>šil</i> <i>škil</i> <i>kšil</i>	<i>lathel</i>
Estonian Xaladytka	<i>kerd’a</i>	<i>lat’a</i>	<i>rat’a</i>	<i>pšal</i>	<i>ks’il</i>	<i>lakhel</i> <i>lastel</i>

* Examples of Polish and Lithuanian Romani are taken from the RMS Database.

The changes with palatalized *d* and *t* is present in plural forms of lexical items that become palatalized, e.g. *id’a* > *idž’a* ‘clothes’, *rat’a* > *rač’a* ‘nights’. Here we can also see that in some words the innovations are spread in Latvia, but not further to Estonia, e.g. *jake* > *džike* ‘so, very’, from which only *jake* is attested in EL, but both forms in LL. In Polish and Lithuanian Romani we find the forms *d’ake*, *adža*, *dža*, *džake*.

Mānušs (Mānušs et al. 1997: 7) refers to the changes *d’* > *dž*, *t’* > *tš* and *s’* > *š* in the preface of his Romani dictionary, but not to the change from *kh’* > *kš*. The phonetic changes concern a variety of lexical items in which a consonant becomes palatalized, but as the changes are ongoing, it depends on the word how widespread the new form is. For example, in LL the parallel forms *dikh’a* and *dikša* exist and only rare instances of *mukša* appear beside the more common *mukh’a*.

5.3 Historical phonology

Tenser (2008: 36) states that ‘the historical processes that affected the phonology are fairly uniform across all of the NE dialects’. Therefore, only a few of the features that show more conservative forms or high variation will be covered. In this section of historical phonology, the appearance of the voiced velar fricative, the word initial *a-* and the prothetic *v-* will be covered.

As written by Tenser (2008: 29), for Latvian Romani, in the EL dialect the voiced velar fricative is typically in the word initial position, e.g. *ghad-* ‘lift’, *ghucho* ‘tall’ and *ghaara* ‘long ago’, but there are some exceptions, e.g. *peghent* ‘nut’. In the syllable final position the voiced velar fricative is replaced by a voiceless velar fricative, e.g. *kaxny* ‘chicken’.

The inherited word initial *a-* has high variability in EL. In these words in the NE group in which the word initial *a-* is retained, there are parallel forms existing in four cases out of five lexical items. Only the preposition *angil* ‘in front’ has one variant and the *a* is preserved. The other two strategies are the jotation *ačh-* > *jačh-* ‘to stay’ or truncating the word initial *a-*, e.g. *akana* > *kana* ‘now’. One stable form is *kana* ‘now’, which has lost the initial *a-*, and there is no variation among speakers. The word *(j)ačh-* ‘to stay’ varies in the data. The word *(j)av-* ‘to come’ is fully jotated in LL and EL, but the variant *av-* is present both in EX and LX. In Tenser’s data (2008: 38) *avel* had both forms—jotated and with the initial *a-*—in Estonian Romani, but it was most probably due to heavy Xaladytka influence on the Lotfitka speakers or due to the inclusion of EX speakers in the corpus of Estonian Romani. Similar to LL, the current data shows that the pronoun *ame* ‘we’ is present both with and without the word initial *a-* in EL, which is different from Tenser’s data that included only the form *ame* for EL.

Out of the common prothetic consonants in the NE Romani dialects, the prothetic *v-* and *gh-* are present in the Lotfitka dialects in the inherited lexicon. The forms vary in the dialects and lexical items. All the following words have been a vowel initial, and the forms with the prothetic consonants are innovative forms.

Table 5. **Word initial /a-/ vs. jotation vs. a-truncation**

	Estonian Lotfitka	Latvian Lotfitka	Estonian Xaladytka	Latvian Xaladytka
<i>angil</i> ‘in front’	<i>a-</i> (<i>angil</i>)	<i>a-</i>	<i>a-</i>	<i>a-</i>
<i>ame</i> ‘we’	<i>a-</i> (<i>ame</i>) <i>Ø-</i> (<i>me</i>)	<i>a-</i> <i>Ø-</i>	<i>a-</i> <i>Ø-</i>	<i>a-</i> <i>Ø-</i>
<i>av-</i> ‘to come’	<i>ja-</i> (<i>jav-</i>)	<i>ja-</i>	<i>a-</i> <i>ja-</i>	<i>a-</i> <i>ja-</i>
<i>ačh-</i> ‘to stay’	<i>ja-</i> (<i>jačh-</i>) <i>a-</i> (<i>ačh-</i>)	<i>ja-</i>	<i>ja-</i> <i>a-</i>	<i>ja-</i> <i>a-</i>
<i>an-</i> ‘to bring’	<i>ja-</i> (<i>jan-</i>)	<i>ja-</i>	<i>ja-</i> <i>a-</i>	<i>ja-</i>
<i>akana</i> ‘now’	<i>Ø-</i> (<i>kana</i>)	<i>Ø-</i>	<i>Ø-</i>	<i>Ø-</i>

The prothetic *v-* is said by Tenser (ibid.) to be regular in the NE dialects in *vavir* ‘other’. In EL and LL the shortened form *veer/væær/vaar/voor* is used. In EX, however, out of four speakers, two use *avir* instead of *vavir*. So, this innovation has not spread to these EX speakers. The form with the prothetic *v-* is also used by LX speakers.

The prothetic *v-* is stable in the EL and LL dialects and the Xaladytka dialect in the word *vangar* ‘coal’. The word *ušt* ‘lip’ and *urden* ‘wagon’ lack the prothetic *v-* in the same dialects. This is consistent with Tenser’s data (2008: 39) with a minor change: in EL the inherited word *ušt* is not present at all in the current data and the Latvian origin borrowing *lempa* ‘lip’ is used instead.

The prothetic *v-* is present in other NE dialects in *ušt* ‘lip’ and *urden* ‘wagon’ (ibid.), so two of the words—*vangar* ‘coal’ and *vavir* ‘other’—have the innovative form as in NE dialects other than Xaladytka and two have maintained the conservative form with the initial vowel. As all these forms are uniform in the Estonian and Latvian dialects, it is hard to say if the initial *v-* will spread or the current distribution will remain.

In the NE group the modal *ašti* ‘can, may’ shows significant variation (Tenser 2008: 39). In the Estonian context we see variation between two forms, the more conservative *ašti* and the form with the prothetic *v-*, which is *vašti*. In LL the form *vašti* is used by most speakers, but there are two speakers who use *ašti* beside the more common *vašti*. EL speakers prefer the more conservative form: three speakers use only the conservative form *ašti* and four either use the two forms equally often, or the conservative *ašti* is preferred. In

EX dialects the verb is replaced with borrowing as in Tenser’s data (2008: 39), but in LX the form with the initial voiced velar fricative *ghašty* is present. Another conservatism in the Estonian data is the form *učo* ‘tall’ in the speech of two EX Roma, while in other dialects in Estonia and Latvia it is *ghučo*.

Table 6. **Prothetic consonants in *učo* ‘tall’, *ašti* ‘can’, *vavir* ‘other’**

	Estonian Lotfitka	Latvian Lotfitka	Estonian Xaladytka	Latvian Xaladytka
<i>(γ)učo</i> ‘tall’	<i>ghučo</i>	<i>ghučo</i>	<i>učo</i>	<i>ghučo</i>
<i>ašti</i> ‘can’	<i>ašti/vašti</i>	<i>vašti/ašti</i>	N/A	<i>(ghašty)</i>
<i>vavir</i> ‘other’	<i>veer</i>	<i>vaar</i>	<i>vavir/avir</i>	<i>vav’ir/av’ir</i>

The EL and LL dialects are more conservative compared to Polish and Lithuanian Romani dialects concerning prothetic *v-* —the preserved conservative forms *urden* ‘wagon’ and *ušt* ‘lip’, as well as the vowel initial *ašti* ‘can’ beside the more innovative *vašti*. Still, the Xaladytka dialect is more conservative and stays away from some of the changes that have happened in other NE dialects or preserves the older form beside the new one, e.g. the vowel initial *učo* ‘tall’, *avir* ‘other’ and *an-* ‘to bring’. EL shows some more conservative features compared to LL, i.e. the vowel initial form retained in *ačh-* ‘to stay’, and a higher rate of the conservative form *ašti* ‘can’.

6 Morphology

The section on morphology is divided into two parts: 5.1. covers nominals and adverbs and 5.2 covers verbs. In both of the sections, issues that offer new information about EL or more widely on Estonian and Latvian Romani dialects are covered in more detail. Tenser has given a detailed overview on the derivation and inflection of nouns, adverbs and verbs in the NE Romani group, so these topics will not be fully covered in the current work. The aim of this chapter is to add more relevant data to the already existing framework without fully describing that which has already been covered by Tenser (2008).

For a comprehensive overview of Romani morphology, see Matras (2002) and Elšík and Matras (2006). Elšík (1997) gives a typological description of Romani in his article in the book *The Typology and Dialectology of Romani*. For a better overview on the NE dialects, see Tenser's (2008) overview of the dialects. For the morphology of individual NE dialects, see Ventzel (1983) on North Russian Romani (Xaladytka), Mānušs et al. (1997) for LL and Matras (1999) for Polish Romani.

Tenser (2008: 282) names some morphological features that are specific for the Estonian and Latvian subgroup within NE dialects. These are masculine singular noun loan marker *-os* instead of *-o*, e.g. *foor-os* instead of *for-o* 'town', plural reflexive pronoun base *pen-* instead of *pes-*, contraction of personal markers *ker-av-as* > *ker-aas* 'I have done', and loss of participles in *-ime(n)*. As will be discussed in this chapter, the marker *-ime(n)* seems to be lost only in LL. These features are shared with Northwestern dialects and the first two features also with Central dialects.

6.1 Nominals and adverbs

In this section, a variety of topics on nominals and adverbs will be covered. Different issues are discussed in the subsections that are more relevant to the EL dialect and more important in the comparison with the neighbouring dialects. Among other topics, more emphasis is given to case agreement; local and temporal adverbs; adverbials, demonstratives, and deictics; and indefinite pronouns.

One way of describing the Romani nominal morphological system is to divide it into three distinct layers. In Romani three case layers occur: Layer I, where inflective elements

function as nominative and oblique endings and express gender, status and thematic status; Layer II, where agglutinative markers express the case; and Layer III, where markers are analytic adpositions. (Matras 2002: 78–80) Romani distinguishes masculine and feminine grammatical genders and common plural markers.

In Lotfitka the oblique masculine endings are *-es* (*-as*, *-os*, *-us*) for singular words and *-(j)en* (*-an*) for plural words, and they are followed by a case ending, e.g. *rom* ‘man.NOM’ > *rom-es-* ‘man-OBL’ > *rom-es-te* ‘man-OBL-LOC’ *rom-en* ‘men-OBL’ and *rom-en-de* ‘men-OBL-LOC’. For feminine words, the oblique endings are *-(j)a-* in the singular form and *-jen-* in the plural form. The oblique ending expresses the accusative case, e.g. *romni* ‘women.NOM’ > *romn-ja* ‘women-ACC’. Adjectives get the oblique marker *-e* for both genders and the plural form, e.g. *tikn-o čaavor-o* ‘small boy (small-M boy-M)’ > *tikn-e čaavor-es* (small-OBL boy-OBL). (Tenser 2008: 52–56)

Romani has seven cases, six of which are added to the oblique ending (genitive [*-kir-*, *-kr-*, *-k-*, *-gir-*, *-gr-*, *-g-*], dative [*-ke*, *-ge*], accusative [*-Ø*], locative [*-te*, *-de*], ablative [*-tir*, *-dir*] and instrumental case [*-sa*, *-ca*]). The vocative case endings are added to the nominal base without the oblique ending, e.g. *daj* ‘mother.NOM’ > *daj-e* ‘mother.VOC’.

The peculiarities of the adoption of Estonian nouns are described in the article on Estonian Lotfitka and its contact languages (Ross 2016: 167). The nouns are adapted to the feminine or masculine class and the marker is adapted to the Estonian stem vowel.

6.1.1 Vocative case marking

Compared to other cases that have uniform endings in both Lotfitka and other NE dialects, different strategies are used to indicate the vocative case. According to Tenser (2008: 56), the vocative case is in decline throughout the NE dialects and in EL the vocative case is mostly left unmarked. The vocative markers in the NE group are the masculine *-eja*, *-o*, *-e* and *-a*, the feminine *-e*, *-o* and *-ije*, and the plural *-ale*. Instead of vocative markers, possessive pronouns are occasionally used with nouns left in the nominative case (ibid.). This is sometimes also the case in the EL dialect.

- (1) *Jaw, mi phen, daari!* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 come.IMP my.F sister here.ALL
 Sister, come here!

There are a few cases where the vocative markers are still present. The masculine noun *murš* ‘man’ gets the plural vocative marker *-ale* as in *murš-ale* ‘men-VOC’, which is shortened to *-al* as in *murš-al* ‘men-VOC’ in the speech of one Laloritka. Two masculine nouns that occasionally show the vocative ending are *dad* ‘father’ > *dad-a* ‘father-VOC’ and *phal/pšal* ‘brother’ > *phal-a/pšal-a* ‘brother-VOC’.

The vocative marker *-a* for the masculine gender, *-e* for the feminine and *-ale* for the plural and the strategy used to indicate possessive pronouns are described by Mānušs et al. (1997: 325). Out of these two strategies, possessive pronouns are highly favoured in LL.

Though the most common strategy for the Estonian Romani dialects is to leave the vocative case unmarked, the data shows that EX more frequently uses the plural vocative case marking *-ale* as in *čajale* ‘girls.VOC’, *čavale* ‘boys.VOC’ and *muršale* ‘men.VOC’.

LL speakers more regularly use possessive pronouns with nominative nouns to express the vocative. LX has the marker *-e*, which is sometimes used with the nouns *dad* ‘father’ > *dad-e* ‘father-VOC’ and *daj* ‘mother’ > *daj-e* ‘mother-VOC’. The plural marker *-ale* is not present in the LL and LX data.

6.1.2 Case agreement of adjectives and head nouns

Tenser (2008: 67) describes the phenomenon of full case agreement between the adjectives and their head nouns in the NE dialects. This phenomenon is very common in Russian Romani and can occasionally also be found in Latvian and Estonian Romani.

In NE Romani generally numerals, adjectives and demonstratives are marked with an oblique ending and only the head noun takes the case ending as in Example 3.

According to current data, case agreement with head nouns (Example 2 and 4) is a common phenomenon in EX and LX, but still rare in the EL and LL dialects. It is most probably used by Lotfitka and Laloritka Roma due to strong contact with Xaladytka speakers.

- (2) *Da na barja-te džuwł'a-te tr'in čavore.* (Estonian Xaladytka)
 this NEG big-LOC woman-LOC three children
 This little woman has three children.

(3) *Da tikni romn'orja-te si trin čaavore.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
this small.F woman-LOC is three children
This little woman has three children.

(4) *Jow dikhja phur-en murš-en.* (Estonian Laloritka)
he saw.3SG old-ACC.PL man-ACC.PL
He saw the old men.

6.1.3 Comparatives and Superlatives

The most common way to form comparatives in Lotfitka and Romani in general is by using the suffix *-edir* (*-edīr* in LL). As all other NE dialects, EL has the interrogative *sir* 'how' and its variant *si* as the comparative preposition 'than'. (Tenser 2008: 71)

(5) *Leskiiro kheer baar-edir si miiro kheer.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
his.GEN house big-COMP than my.M house
His house is bigger than my house.

Beside *sir/si* the Russian borrowing *чем* is used. The Latvian semi-calque *ne-si* (Latvian *nekā* 'than') that is used among LL speakers is not present in Estonia. Tenser (ibid.) connects the Latvian *kā* with the Romani *so* 'what' that has gone through reduction *o > y* and formed *ne-si*. The form *si* is commonly used in the meaning 'how', so it seems that the interrogative *sir* 'how' has been shortened to *si* and it corresponds to the Latvian *kā* 'how' in *ne-kā* 'than' > *ne-si*.

Superlatives in EL are expressed in three ways. Using the Russian adjective *сам-* 'most' (Russian *самый старьй* 'oldest') together with the comparative, e.g. *samo phuuredir* 'oldest' or the basic form of adjective, e.g. *samo baaro* 'biggest', or using the Latvian prefix *vis-* (Latvian *visvecākais* 'oldest') together with the comparative form of the adjective, e.g. *visbaaredir* 'biggest'.

Tenser (2008: 73) mentions the same three ways of expressing superlatives in LL. The new material complements his data, which showed only the Latvian prefix *vis-* used in EL.

6.1.4 Local adverbs and adverbials

In this section conservative forms of local adverbs with the old ablative suffix *-al* are presented. Both the EL and LL dialects have preserved more of these forms compared to the other NE dialects. In addition, Latvian- and Russian-origin local adverbs and adverbials that have spread to the dialect are introduced.

Tenser (2008: 76) points out that many of the conservative adverbs are preserved in the NE dialects compared to other Romani dialects. Tenser identifies the most common, *pal-al* ‘behind’, which is retained most commonly in the NE dialects, and the rarer *pir-d-al* ‘around/across’, *maškir-al* ‘in the middle, between’, *truj-al* ‘around’, and the more common form *paš-il* ‘nearby, towards’ (ibid.).

The current data expands on Tenser’s data and shows examples of all these adverbs in EL, LL, EX and LX. In LL the last syllable is often lengthened, e.g. *maškirāl* ‘in the middle, between’, *trujāl* ‘around’, *pir-dāl* ‘around/across’, *palāl* ‘behind’. In EL some speakers have remnants of the suffix *-al*, e.g. *maškira-a*, in their speech.

In addition, a form of *tal-al* ‘under’ is found in the speech of Estonian Laloritka speakers and in the form *tal-āl* in LL. In LL *aurāl* ‘outside’ is an additional form. In the speech of EX speakers examples of *dur-al* ‘from far away’ and *avr-al* ‘outside’ also appear.

Local adverbs are also commonly borrowed from Russian and Latvian. Common Russian loans include *вокруг* ‘around’, *через* ‘across, through’ and *напротив* ‘opposite’. From Latvian has been taken the local adverb *blakam* ‘next to’ from the Latvian *blakus*, and *preču* ‘opposite’, which is, according to Mānušs (1997: 104), a contamination of the Latvian *pret*, *pretī*, *pretim* ‘against, opposite’ and the Polish *przeciw*, *przeciwko* ‘against’. There is also the German loan *durch* ‘through’ retained in the forms *durx* or *drux* in the EL and Laloritka samples.

6.1.5 Temporal adverbs and adverbials, time expressions

The relative temporal adverbs that are uniform throughout the NE group are *dadiis* ‘today’, *taša* ‘tomorrow; yesterday’, *paltaša* ‘day after tomorrow; day before yesterday’, *kana* ‘now’ and *ghara* ‘long ago’ (Tenser 2008: 76–77). In the current data, there is also the form *kana-pa(t)*, which has the meaning ‘just now’. The suffix *pat* seems to be the Latvian-origin word ‘even’, e.g. Latvian *nu-pat* ‘just now’ < *nu* ‘now’, *tūliņ pat* ‘straightway’ <

tūliŋ ‘straightway’. More about the suffix *pat* can be found in the section about location deictics and utterance modifiers.

Tenser states that ‘temporal adverbials denoting the time of the day and of the year take various suffix markers within the dialects of the NE group’ (ibid.: 77). In the following paragraphs the suffixes in relevant dialects are listed with the common lexical items in which they appear.

The old Romani locative marker *-e* is common with the temporal adverbials *diise* ‘during the day’ and *belvele* ‘in the evening’ (ibid.). In addition, the shortened form *belle* ‘in the evening’ appears in EL.

Seasons are expressed with the genitive ending *linaskiuro* ‘in the summer’ and *žimakiuro* ‘in the winter’ as commonly in other NE dialects (ibid.). Also, among the Laloritka Roma, the idea ‘on Sunday’ is expressed with the genitive marker *-kir-* as *kurko* ‘Sunday’ > *kurkeskiuro*. In EL there are no other examples of this type of genitive derivation with temporal adverbials (*belvela-ke* ‘in the evening’ *rača-ke* ‘during the night’ *vendž-ake* ‘during the winter’) that are described by Tenser (ibid.: 78).

Calques from Russian are used to derive temporal adverbials using Slavic case markers with the instrumental case marker *-sa/-ca*, e.g. the Russian *ymp-om* ‘in the morning (morning-INST)’, *večer-amu* ‘in the evenings (evening-INST.PL)’, the Polish *wieczor-ami* ‘in the evenings (evening-INST.PL)’, and the locative *-te* or ablative *-tir* that often replace the Russian genitive marking, e.g. *c ymp-a* ‘from the morning, in the morning (morning-GEN)’ > Romani *tašarla-te*, *tašarla-tir* (ibid.).

In EL the locative case is used in the plural form to express only the meaning of repetitiveness as in *tašarlen-ca* ‘in the mornings’ and *belvelen-ca* ‘in the evenings’. Locative and ablative cases are used with the word *tašarla* ‘morning’ and result in the forms *tašarla-te* (morning-LOC) and *tašarla-tir* (morning-ABL) ‘in the mornings’. As in other NE dialects, the meaning ‘in the night’ is present as *rati*.

In LL examples of the instrumental case marker with the word *belvel* ‘evening’ > *belvelen-ca* (evenings-INST) appear, but not with the word *tašarla* ‘morning’, as the same idea is expressed in the plural with the ablative case marker *tašarlen-dir* ‘in the mornings (mornings.ABL)’. An example of instrumental case in the plural is ‘on weekends’ *kurkenca* (weekends-INST):

- (6) *Me laču xāben kērasam kurk-en-ca.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 we good.M food cook.1PL weekend-OBL.PL-INST
 We cook ourselves nice meals on weekends.

Days of the week are either loans from Russian or Estonian with the exception of Sunday, which is a Greek loan and most stable in the NE dialects (ibid.: 80). Greek loans for Friday and Saturday that are present in Lithuanian and Polish Romani in Lithuania are not retained in Estonian Romani dialects (ibid.) and that also can be affirmed with the current data.

Russian weekdays that are masculine get the Romani masculine ending *-o* or *-os* among EL and *-o* among EX—*pan’idel’nikos*, *četvergos*. Russian weekdays with the feminine ending keep their original nominative ending *-a* as *sr’eda* ‘Wednesday’.

Adverbials derived from weekdays typically lack prepositions and appear in the nominative case. Estonian loans keep their original nominal form as they could also be used in spoken Estonian, such as *esmaspäv* ‘Monday’, *esmaspäev* in standard Estonian, or with the last consonant of word *päev* ‘day’ dropped, as in *kolmapä* ‘Wednesday’. All variants are common in spoken colloquial Estonian with native speakers as well.

Among the Laloritka Roma the Estonian adessive case ending *-l* is sometimes present, e.g. *teisipäeva-l* ‘on Tuesday’. Russian loans are used in the nominative case e.g. *sreda* ‘on Wednesday’, rarely with the original case ending. Usually the Russian-origin weekdays lack the preposition *v* ‘in’, so instead of the Russian *v subbotu* ‘on Saturday’, the forms in Romani are *subbotu* ‘on Saturday’ and *pjatnicu* ‘on Friday’. One EL speaker uses the preposition *an* ‘in’ with all weekdays, e.g. *an sr’eda*, *an četvergos*, *an pjatnica*. The Greek loan *kurko* ‘Sunday’ has the genitive case marker *kurkes-kiiro* as an adverbial.

EX speakers also use Russian loanwords for weekdays, but they use the preposition *de* ‘in’ < *ande* and the word in the nominative case *de subbota* ‘on Saturday’. The same pattern is also used with the Greek loan *kurko* in EX, e.g. *de kurko*, but LX speakers use the old Romani locative marker *kurke*, beside using preposition *de* and the nominative form *de kurko* ‘on Sunday’. More about temporal prepositions is discussed in the Section 7.1.2.

LX speakers use only Latvian loans using the Latvian-origin adverbial forms *pirmdien* ‘on Monday’ < *pirmdiena* ‘Monday.NOM’. LX speakers use the preposition *de* as EX and

leave the word in the nominative form.

Among LX and Latvian Polish Romani speakers, the Greek-origin infix *-on-* is used as in *chvartk-on-e* ‘on Thursday’ and *pon’idz’alk-on-e* ‘on Monday’. This form is not seen in any of the Lotfitka-type dialects but is common in Lithuanian and Polish Romani to derive temporal adverbs from the nouns for the day of the week (Tenser 2008: 81).

6.1.6 Numerals

The numerals are fairly stable in the NE dialects (Tenser 2008: 82) and only some minor details are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The numerals from ‘11’ to ‘14’ are compounded from the word *deš* ‘10’ and the digits using the marker *-u-*, e.g. *deš-u-jekh* ‘11’ and for numerals ‘15’ to ‘19’, the same system is applied without the marker *-u-*, e.g. *deš-pandž* ‘15’ in Latvian and Estonian Romani according to Tenser (ibid.) This is not totally stable and we can also find forms like *deš-u-šow* ‘16’, and some speakers use the marker *-u-* only for ‘11’ and use the following forms *dešduj* ‘12’, *deštrin* ‘13’, *dešštaar* ‘14’. LL also includes speakers who use no marker *-u-*; some use it for numbers such as ‘15’ and ‘16’, and some use it inconsistently— not for *dešjek* ‘11’, but then for the following numbers.

The compound numerals higher than ‘30’, unlike in other NE dialects, are formed with the marker *-te-* ‘and’ (Tenser 2008: 83). The forms are recorded by Tenser (ibid.) as *trijanda-te-jek*, but are assimilated in the speech of EL and LL speakers as *trijantejek* or *trijantijek*.

For the numeral ‘1000’, the Latvian loan *tūkstotis* (*tuukstuotis*) is used both in EL and LL, and either the Russian *тысяча* or *bar* (literally ‘stone’) in EX. One EX speaker also used *šel-deša*, in which *šel* means ‘100’ and *deša* ‘10s’ and one Estonian Laloritka *šel-te-deš*. Mānušs et al. (1997: 338) identify *deš šel/ deš šela* and *bar*.

Speakers of EL and Laloritka use the marker *-var-* ‘time(s)’ for tens up from ‘40’, e.g. *štal-var-deš* ‘four-times-ten’ as written in Tenser (2008: 83) but also use shortened variants of it, e.g. *štalvarš* or *štalvaš*. The lexical item *var* ‘time’ is not retained in the Lotfitka dialects and is replaced with the German loan *mal* > Romani *molos*.

The numerals in the NE group are typically inflected like adjectives through the use of the oblique adjectival suffix *-e* according to Tenser (2008: 85). This was the case also in Early Romani and in most of the Romani dialects (Elšík, Matras 2006: 163). This is not the case

for EL and LL, in which numerals don't get any suffix but remain in the same form as in the nominative case.

(7) *Me dijum tumaare štaar gren-ge nabuut maaro.* (Estonian Lotfitka)

I gave.1SG your.PL.GEN four horses-DAT some bread

I gave some bread to your four horses.

(8) *Joj ripirla trin džүүл'en-gi lava.* (Estonian Laloritka)

she remembers three women-GEN names

She remembers the names of three women.

The use of the oblique adjectival suffix *-e* is present with numerals in EX and LX. As in EL, in LL the numerals are not inflected. Here is an example from a Xaladytka speaker.

(9) *Me rodava tr'in-e terne muršen trandun'asa.* (Estonian Xaladytka)

I look for three-OBL young.OBL men.ACC cart.INST

I am looking for three young men with a cart.

According to Tenser (2008: 85), numerals take the full noun inflection to agree with their head noun for the case in Xaladytka as well as in Lithuanian Romani, LL and EL. In EL it is not present in the current data.

(10) *Me dyxt'om la po večer'inka duj-enca čaj-enca.* (Estonian Xaladytka)

I saw.1SG her at partytwo-INST girl-INST

(11) *Me dikhjom la pu večerinka peski duj draudzen-enca.* (Estonian Laloritka)

I saw her on party RFL two friend-INST

I saw her at the party with two of her friends.

6.1.7 Reflexives and Clitics

Reflexive personal pronouns in the Lotfitka dialect are the singular *pe(s)* and plural *pen*. The plural reflexive *pen* exists only in Lotfitka, while other NE dialects use the form *pes* for all persons (Tenser 2008: 89).

Following the Russian and Polish system, the enclitic reflexive forms are used to modify verbs. There are two paradigms of enclitics in the NE dialects in competition with one another. The first one involves the impersonalized reflexive *pe(s)* being used for all persons; the second paradigm involves making use of personal independent oblique forms for the first and second person, and using the impersonalized reflexive form as the third person enclitic. (Tenser 2008: 90) These two paradigms are both in use in EL.

Tenser’s data shows that EL has a mix of the two paradigms, where the personal forms are used only with the first-person singular and plural verbs, but not with the second person (Tenser 2008: 91). In the current data, the personal forms are also used with the second-person singular and plural and the variation with *pe(s)* and *pen* gives three different ways using reflexive pronouns. The plural form of the reflexive pronoun *pen* is used in EL and is present in all informants’ speech.

Table 7. **Reflexive enclitics in Estonian Lotfitka**

	Impersonal reflexive enclitic <i>pe(s)</i>	Personal oblique forms + 3PL <i>pe(s)</i>	Personal oblique forms + 3PL <i>pen</i>
1SG	<i>pe(s)</i>	<i>man</i>	<i>man</i>
2SG	<i>pe(s)</i>	<i>tut</i>	<i>tut</i>
3SG	<i>pe(s)</i>	<i>pe(s)</i>	<i>pe(s)</i>
1PL	<i>pe(s)</i>	<i>men</i>	<i>men</i>
2PL	<i>pe(s)</i>	<i>tumen</i>	<i>tumen</i>
3PL	<i>pe(s)</i>	<i>pe(s)</i>	<i>pen</i>

The person marked paradigm in LL is an exclusive system according to Tenser (2008: 91) and this is also supported by the current data. EX and LX speakers use the reflexive pronoun *pe* for all persons.

6.1.8 Demonstratives and deictics

The demonstratives are mostly used in short forms *da(a)* < *dava* ‘this.M’, *daja* ‘this.F’, *dale* ‘these’; and *do* < *dova* ‘that.M’, *doja* ‘that.F’, *dole* ‘those’ in EL as pointed out by Tenser (2008: 94). They can be inflected in gender, number and case (ibid.: 93). Demonstrative determiners are sometimes inflected in Xaladytka, following the pattern of case agreement of adjectives and numerals agreeing with the head noun. The

demonstrative pronouns are usually inflected in EL.

- (12) *Me buttir na kamaw dales-tir ti šunaw.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
I more NEG want.1SG this-ABL COMP hear.1SG
I do not want to hear about it anymore.

- (13) *Me dyxtjom dal-es murš-es pe aviro dyves.* (Estonian Xaladytka)
I saw.1SG this-ACC man-ACC on other.M day
I saw the same man the next day as well.

Tenser (2008: 93) indicates that there is also a preference for forms without the initial *a-* in all of the NE dialects except for Russian Romani, but EX speakers use only the forms without the initial *a-*. LX speakers do commonly use the forms with the initial *a-* as in Russian Xaladytka, but they also use the forms without it.

6.1.8.1 Location deictics

In the NE dialects, the location deictics show a 2-way distinction based on proximity: ‘here’ and ‘there’ and are distinguished through the carrier vowel *-a-* and *-o-* (Tenser 2008: 95). In examples of EL there were the same forms present as in LL— *daj* ‘here’, *doj* ‘there’ for stative; *daari(g/k)* ‘to here, from here’ and *doori(g/k)* ‘to there, from there’ for ablative; and both forms for allative. Rarely forms with the initial vowel *a-daj* ‘here’ and *o-doj* ‘there’ appear. In addition, the forms *doj-pa* ‘just there’ and *daj-pa* ‘just here’ were present in some speakers’ interviews. The clitic *-pa(t)* in *daj-pat* ‘here’ and *jake-pa(t)* ‘there’ emphasizes the word, allowing it to take on the meaning ‘just here’ and ‘just so’, and is of Latvian origin, that is, Latvian *šepat* ‘just here’ < *še* ‘here’ and *tepat* ‘just here’ < *te* ‘here’. The form *daj-pa(t)* and *doj-pa(t)* are also present in the LL samples.

6.1.8.2 Comparative deictics

Tenser (2008: 99) identifies three types of comparative deictics—quantitative, qualitative and manner, and points out that there are only two forms found in Latvia and Estonia that correspond to the qualitative and manner deictics. The quantitative comparative deictic ‘so many, so much’ is expressed analytically by combining the manner deictic *jake* ‘so’ with

but ‘much’ (ibid.). It follows the way it is expressed in Latvian, *tik daudz*, and Estonian, *nii palju* ‘so much/many’.

The qualitative comparative deictic is expressed as in other NE dialects—*dasav-*, and in addition to the mentioned forms *dasav-*, *j-* initial *jasav-* and *jas-* and the uninflected *jasaj* according to Tenser (2008: 98–99). Additionally, the forms *daso-* and *dasaj* are also present in the current samples. *Jake* is additionally used to compare the qualities of nouns and adjectives. The manner comparative deictic is expressed by *jake* ‘so’, as mentioned earlier.

6.1.9 Interrogatives

In EL ‘how many?’ and ‘how much?’ are asked either using the interrogative *cik* ‘how?/how much?/how many?’ or *buut* ‘much, many’ as in LL. In EL *cik buut* is also used. It may be based on the Latvian *cik daudz* ‘how much?/how many?’, *cik* meaning ‘how’ and *daudz* ‘many, much’, or on the Estonian way of asking *kui palju?* ‘how much?/how many?’, *kui* meaning ‘how’ and *palju* meaning ‘much, many’. Other NE dialects use either *kicyk* or *kicy* ‘how many?’ (Tenser 2008: 103).

6.1.10 Indefinite pronouns

Table 8. Indefinite pronouns in Estonian Lotfitka

	Specific	Negative	Free-choice	Universal
Determiner	<i>saj-ta</i> <i>saw-ta</i> 'some'	negative copula <i>ni-jek</i> 'no, none'	<i>l'uba</i> 'any'	<i>s(v)ako</i> 'every' <i>saare</i> 'all' <i>cel-</i> 'the whole'
Person	<i>kon-ta</i> 'somebody'	<i>ni-kon</i> 'nobody'	<i>kon-n'ibut'</i> 'anybody'	<i>saare</i> 'everybody'
Thing	<i>so-ta</i> 'something'	<i>ni-so</i> (<i>ničhi</i>) 'nothing'	<i>so-n'ibut'</i> 'anything'	N/A 'everything'
Location	<i>kaj-ta</i> <i>vari-kaj-ta</i> <i>vari-kaj</i> <i>kaarik-ta</i> (ABL) <i>vari-kaarik-ta</i> (ABL) 'somewhere'	<i>ni-kaj</i> <i>ni-kaarik</i> (ABL) 'nowhere'	<i>kaj-n'ibut'</i> 'anywhere'	N/A 'everywhere'
Time	<i>kidi-ta</i> 'sometimes'	<i>ni-kidi</i> <i>nigdi</i> 'never'	<i>kidi-n'ibut'</i> 'anytime'	<i>sajek</i> (<i>sajk</i> , <i>saj</i>) 'always'
Manner	<i>sir-ta</i> <i>vari-sir-ta</i> 'somehow'	N/A 'in no way'	N/A 'in any way'	N/A 'in all ways'

*The concept of the table is used by Tenser (2008) and in the RMS database (Elšik, Matras 2001a).

In Estonian Laloritka the most common marker for a specific category of indefinite pronouns is the Russian indefinite marker *-to* (Russian *где-то* 'somewhere', *что-то* 'something'), and occasionally an older Romanian-origin indefinite marker *var(i)-* is used. The marker for a free-choice category of indefinite pronouns is usually the Russian indefinite marker *-нибудь* (Russian *кто-нибудь* 'anybody' *что-нибудь* 'anything'), but some speakers mark the free-choice category as specific-category indefinite pronouns with the marker *-to*, e.g. *so-ta* means both 'something' and 'anything', *kon-ta* 'someone/anyone'.

The marker choice is speaker specific. Therefore, there are speakers who prefer the Russian marker *-нибудь* to mark the free-choice category while some prefer to use the specific category for the free-choice indefinites as well. The specific marker *vari-* is applied only by some speakers.

LL has the indefinite type 'X na/ni X', where *na* is the Early Romani indefinite particle **ni*

(Tenser 2008: 108). This kind of indefinite is used as specific and free-choice indefinite pronouns and is seen in the forms *kon-na-kon* ‘anyone (who-na-who)’, *so-na-so* ‘something (what-na-what)’, ‘anything’, *kidi-na-kidi* ‘anytime (when-na-when)’ and *kaj-na-kaj* ‘somewhere, anywhere (where-na-where)’. The Russian free-choice marker *-нибыдѣ* is not used in LL; instead the ‘X na X’ type indefinites or specific indefinites are used for the free-choice category. The specific category marker *var(i)- (vaj-)* is rarely present. The indefinite pronoun ‘anytime’ is expressed with the specific determiner *saw* ‘what/which’ as *saw molos* ‘any time’.

In LL the indefinites *vārčane* ‘otherwise’ and *vārčal < vārthal* ‘elsewhere’ are present. In EL only examples of *veerthal* ‘elsewhere’ can be seen.

LL has the borrowed *vienmēr* ‘always’, *brīžiem* ‘sometimes’, *jebkurš* ‘any’ and *vienalga* ‘whatever’ in the meaning ‘any’. Also, *jek bax saj* is used for ‘any’, which is a compound of *jek* ‘one’, *bax* ‘luck’ and *saj* ‘some, any’ meaning ‘whichever’. Additional negative indefinites are *ni jekfar* ‘not once’ in the meaning ‘never’ and *ni-jek* in the meaning ‘no one’ or ‘any one’. Tenser (ibid.) refers to *ni-jek* used as an indefinite negative determiner, although more rarely than in the first meanings. In EL the indefinite *ni-jek* is present only as a determiner.

Indefinite pronouns in EX typically follow the same pattern. However, for a specific category, only the marker *-ta* and not *-var(i)* is used. The indefinite pronoun ‘every’ is expressed with *každo/kažno* and ‘always’ is expressed with the Russian borrowing *всегда* and with *usa* by one speaker. The indefinite pronoun ‘any’ is expressed by *save kames* ‘which one you want’ beside the Russian loan *люб-* ‘any’.

In LX the definite marker *var(i)-* is retained and is used either as only the marker *vari-so* ‘something’ or as a double marking with the marker *-to* as in *var-so-ta* ‘something’ or *vary-kaj-ta* ‘somewhere’. Instead of *ni-so* ‘nothing’ the older *ničhi* is used. *Ničhi* is a combination of the older Romani *čhi* ‘nothing’ and the negative marker *ni* (Tenser 2008: 106). The indefinite pronoun ‘always’ is mostly expressed as *saro vrem’a* ‘all the time’ beside the Russian *всегда*.

6.1.11 Articles

Tenser (2008: 110) indicates that the indefinite article *jek(h)* ‘one’ is used in LL and EL to some extent. In addition, sometimes inflected forms of prepositions are used with the ending *e* for the feminine and *o* for the masculine as in *pal-e/pal-o* ‘behind’ (ibid.: 111). The indefinite article *jek(h)* is more often used by Estonian Laloritka speakers than EL speakers. It is most probably influenced by the Estonian *üks* ‘one’, which can occur in the position of an indefinite article (Pajusalu 2000: 103ff), but this could also be the result of an independent process.

- (14) *Ta kõndis ühe mehe taga.* (Estonian)
3SG walked.3SG one.GEN man.GEN behind
He was walking behind a man.

- (15) *Jow phirdža pal jekh muršeste.* (Estonian Laloritka)
he walked.3SG behind one man.LOC
He was walking behind a man.

For marking definiteness in Laloritka and Lotfitka Romani there is a tendency to use short forms of demonstratives. In Estonian definiteness is also expressed with the demonstrative *see* ‘this’. It can rarely be interpreted as an article, though. The tendency towards the re-emergence of the definite article in the form of the short demonstrative *da* is also seen by Matras (1999: 11) in the speech of Polska Roma.

- (16) *Da skoolotaja sikadža da nejeegenge da bildi.* (Estonian Laloritka)
this teacher showed.3SG these children.DAT this pictures
That teacher showed pictures to the students

- (17) *Me dolijom da mantel’l’a latir.* (Estonian Laloritka)
I got.1SG this coat her.ABL
I got the coat from him.

Demonstratives are also used in LL to show definiteness, but not as commonly as in EL.

- (18) *Vedekla, zakuopin da khēr!* (Latvian Lotfitka)
daughter-in-law clean.IMP this house
Daughter/daughter-in-law, clean the house!

6.2 Verbs

The section on verbs covers some issues on verb inflection; verb derivation; relevant markers on verbs, such as the future marker, the remoteness marker and the loan adaptation marker; and tense and aspect marking. The topic of aktionsart prefixes and verbal particles is covered in more detail.

6.2.1 Verb inflection—Present: Person Concord

The present tense personal markers in EL are uniform within the NE group: 1SG *-av*, 2SG *-es*, 3SG *-el*, 1PL *-as*, 2PL *-en*, 3PL *-en*.

The rare 1SG marker *-m* that concerns only two verbs, *kam-am* ‘I want’ and *džin-om* ‘I know’, is generally not present in EL as Tenser (2008: 117) states. There is one Laloritka and one EL Roma who use the form *kam-om* ‘I want’ a few times in the sample. This is most probably an influence from EX as the this speech reflects more features influenced by the Xaladytka dialect. EX speakers use only the form *kam-am* with the 1SG marker *-m*. The marker is common in EX with the verb ‘know’ *džin-om* ‘I know’. There is one EX speaker who uses only *džin-aw*, while three other speakers use only a few examples of *džin-aw* and mostly use the form *džin-om*. The 1SG marker *-m* is an older form with the verb stem *džin-* for Xaladytka in Russia according to Tenser (2008: 117).

LL speakers use no forms of either *kam-am* or *džin-om*, although in Tenser’s data rare examples of *kam-am* in LL were seen. LX speakers use only *kam-am* as well, but showed no use of *džin-om* and only follow the more regular pattern that is common to Lotfitka *džin-av*. Among the samples there is only one Latvian Polish Romani speaker who used the form *džin-am* a few times.

6.2.2 Loan verbs—Personal concord

In this section four different variants of personal markers in loanwords are presented.

Variants differentiate between choosing the third person singular marker *-el* or *-i*; omitting the personal marker in the third person singular; or omitting the Romani loan verb adaptation marker *-in-* when the third person singular marker *-i* is used. In addition, examples of leaving loan verb unintegrated are also discussed.

Loan verbs usually take the same personal concord markers as the inherited verbs, e.g. 1SG *-av*, 2SG *-es*, 3SG *-el*, 1PL *-as*, 2PL *-en*, 3PL *-en*. Loan verbs are adapted to Romani with the loan adaptation marker *-in-*. Therefore, the personal markers follow the adaptation marker *-in-*, e.g. *brauc-in-el* (ride-LOAN-3SG) ‘he/she rides’ from Latvian *braukt* ‘to ride’. As some dialects in the NE group, the EL and LL dialects sometimes omit the personal markers in the third-person singular and plural. (Tenser 2008: 119)

In addition to the common third-person marker *-el*, there is an additional third-person singular marker *-i*, e.g. *brauc-in-i* (ride-LOAN-3SG) ‘he/she rides’. The marker *-i* derives from the Greek third-person singular present tense ending (Matras 2002: 160). The suffix was borrowed from the Greek in Early Romani and was probably used with athematic (xenoclitic, borrowed) short non-perfective forms (Elšík, Matras 2006: 134).

Examples of the third-person singular marker *-i* in EL are *bejdzini* ‘ends’ Lat. *beigt*, *čemmini* ‘combs’ Lat. *ķemmēt*, *kraasini* ‘paints’ Lat. *krāsot*, and *polzini pe* ‘uses’ Rus. *пользоваться*.

- (19) *Mange dičola si saku **duf-in-i** fin’u vaš peske.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 me.DAT seems COMP all think-LOAN-I only for RFLX.3PL
 Everybody seems to be thinking only of themselves.

The third-person singular marker *-i* is also present in EX.

- (20) *Joj nasvaly i **kašl’-in’-y**.* (Estonian Xaladytka)
 she sick.F and cough-LOAN-3SG
 She is sick and coughs.

In the EL dialect, the marker *-i* is also present in borrowed modal verbs in the impersonal form, such as *patik-i* ‘is/are liked’ from the Latvian *patikt* ‘to like’ and the Polish loan *čeb-i* ‘is necessary, needs, has to’ from *trzeba*. In these constructions in Estonian and Latvian the agent is in the dative case and the verb in the third person.

- (21) *Mulle meeldib piim.* (Estonian)
me.DAT like.3SG milk.NOM
- (22) *Man patīk piens.* (Latvian)
me.DAT like.3SG milk.NOM
- (23) *Mange **patiiki** thuud.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
me.GEN likes milk
I like milk.

Sometimes the third person is left unmarked in borrowed verbs, i.e. no personal marker follows the loan adaptation marker *-in-*, e.g. *brauc-in* ‘he/she rides’. In Estonian Laloritka this variant is rarer than with the present tense marker *-i*. The same tendency seems to be present in LL, although there are also examples of forms without the final *-i*.

- (24) *Me našti ti krāsinaw khēr gādžu **krās-in-i** an mu štetus.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
I can’t COMP paint.1SG house non-Roma paint-LOAN-3SG in my.M place
I can’t paint the house; a non-Gypsy man paints it for me.

- (25) *Me našti krāsinaw mu khēr, gādžu **krās-in** an mu štetus.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
I can’t paint.1SG my..M house non-Roma paint-LOAN in my.M place

In Latvian Romani there are many examples of not using the verb adaptation marker *-in-*, but instead the recent loanwords are treated as inherited ones or end with the marker *-i*. Here is an example of the perfective marker and personal marker added to the recent Latvian loanword *notikt* ‘happen’:

- (26) *So-ta **nuotika-d-ija?*** (Latvian Lotfitka)
something happen-PRF-3SG
Has anything/something happened?

The following examples illustrate the two strategies—having the marker *-in-* and the third-person marker or omitting the loan adaptation marker *-in-* before the third-person singular marker *-i* in the Latvian verb *pieđer* ‘belongs’ in LL.

(27) *Da khēr pieđer-in-i mi špaleske.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 this house belongs-LOAN-3SG my brother.DAT

(28) *Da khēr pieđer-i mi špaleske.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 this house belong-3SG my brother.DAT
 This house belongs to my brother.

In the past tense the verbs with ending *-i* have different formations, e.g. *čeb-andij-a*, *čeb-adij-a*, *sis čebno*, *čebin’a* and in the EL also *čeb-sadij-a*.

As described by Tenser (2008: 121), in Russian Romani (Xaladytka) and in its satellites loan verbs are often not integrated. The same occurs in EX and, probably due to the influence of Russian Xaladytka, also in EL.

(Estonian Xaladytka)

(29) *Me ghal’uvaa so kažno dumajet tol’ka pal peste.*
 I understand.1SG what everyone think.3SG only about RFLX.3SG
 Everybody seems to be thinking only of themselves.

(30) *Me l’ubl’u utrosa te pjaw kof’e.* (Estonian Xaladytka)
 I love.1SG morning.INST COMP drink.1SG coffee
 I like to drink coffee in the morning.

(31) *Nikon dava uže ne ispoljuzjet.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 noone this anymore NEG use
 No one uses this anymore.

6.2.3 The future marker *-a*

The future marker *-a* has an extension *-m* in 1PL throughout the whole of the NE group (Tenser 2008: 136). Out of seven EL and Laloritka speakers, six speakers add *-m*

exclusively and only one generally uses the 1PL future marker *-a*, in some cases adding the additional *-m*. The more common form would be with *-m*, as in *ker-as-a-m*, compared to *ker-as-a* ‘we will do’. Out of four Xaladytka speakers, two prefer the form without *-m*, but they use both variants and two use the extension *-m* exclusively.

All LL informants use the additional *-m* exclusively. LX speakers do not use the additional *-m* at all and express only forms like *kerasa* ‘we will do’, or *džasa* ‘we will go’.

6.2.4 The remoteness marker *-as*

In Romani the remoteness marker is expressed with the marker *-as*. It usually functions in Romani as the imperfective, pluperfect and politeness categories (Tenser 2008: 138). Elšík and Matras (2006: 181) explain that ‘The remoteness marker *-as/-ahi/-s* derives the remote tenses imperfect (from the present) and pluperfect (from the perfective) as a demarcation strategy, separating the depicted event from the context of speech.’ Matras (2002: 153) says that the distance that the remoteness marker creates in the interactional context has the effect of neutralizing the potentially manipulative significance of the request within the speech context.

The imperfect is derived from the subjunctive or subjunctive-present form when the remoteness marker is added, e.g. in EL *kerav* ‘I do’ > *kerav-as* ‘I was doing/I would do’. The pluperfect is derived from the preterite forms with the remoteness marker, e.g. *kerdjom* ‘I did’ > *kerdjom-as* ‘I had done/I would have done’. (Elšík, Matras 2006: 192).

The remoteness marker *-as* in EL sometimes appears in the form *-is* following the vowel change that has been mentioned before. In the Latvian and EL dialects the marker *-as* is contracted with the singular first-person case marker *-av* taking the form *-aas* as *džavas* > *džaas* ‘I was going’.

In EL the habitual category is in a few cases marked with the remoteness marker *-as*, but is usually marked with present/future marker *-a*.

(Estonian Laloritka)

- (32) *Jej jēla sajek ke me, a nikidi na phen-ela kidi jēla.*
she comes always to me but never NEG say-3SG.FUT when comes
He visits me often, but he never lets me know when he is coming.

- (33) *Si me somas terni ti dž-aas sajk pu targos.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 how I was young COMP go-1SG.REM always to market
 When I was young, I used to go to the market very often.

6.2.5 Tense and Aspect—functions

Table 9. Tense and aspect in Estonian Lotfitka

Current Categories	Formation		Examples
Future	present personal concord + a		<i>ker-a(v)-a</i> ‘I will do’
Present progressive			<i>ker-a(v)-a</i> ‘I am doing’
Present		Present personal concord	<i>ker-a(v)-a</i> ‘I do’ <i>džin-aw</i> ‘I know’
Subjunctive			<i>(džinaw te) ker-aw</i> ‘(I know to) do...’
Perfective	Perfective personal concord		<i>kerdj-om</i> ‘I did’
Imperfective (Habitual) (Progressive)	Present personal concord + as		<i>ker-a(v)-as</i> ‘I was doing’
			<i>ker-a(v)-as</i> ‘I am doing’
Counterfactual Polite	Perfective personal concord + as		<i>na kerdj-om-as</i> ‘I would never do’ <i>kamj-om-as</i> ‘I would like to’
Pluperfect	Perfective personal concord		<i>kerdj-om-as</i> ‘I had done’

The conservative way of expressing present tense with the long form (*ker-av-a* instead of *ker-av* ‘I do’) of verbs is retained to some extent in the Xaladytka dialect, and to a greater extent in the LL dialect, specifically in the progressive constructions (Tenser 2008: 140). According to Tenser, LL and EL use long forms of verbs in the present, specifically in the present progressive and in the future tense. According to current data, the long form *-ava* (*-aa*) is quite common in present simple as well, as in following sentences:

- (34) *Me ghaljuv-aa vašso jow gija krik.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 I understand-1SG.FUT why he went away
 I understand why he left.

(35) *Me dumin-aa si jow džuwdža uže jun'atir daj.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 I think-1SG.FUT that he lived already June.ABL here
 I think he has lived here since June.

(36) *Me ghaljuv-av-a vašso jow ugija.* (Estonian Xaladytka)
 I understand-1SG-F why he left
 I understand why he left.

The two verbs that are not used with the long forms in the present simple in EL are *džinaw* 'I know' and *kamaw* 'I love/I like'. In the Xaladytka dialect these verbs get the different personal marker *-m* in the first person as mentioned earlier. Among LL speakers we also see rare usage of long forms with the marker *-a* with these two verbs:

(37) *Saw xāben kamela ti vīrmāta?* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 which food like-3SG.FUT your.F mother-in-law
 What food does your (pl.) mother-in-law like?

(38) *Me na džin-ā.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 I NEG know-1SG.FUT
 I don't know.

LX speakers rarely use long forms in the present progressive and the simple present and certainly do so less than EX speakers.

According to Tenser (2008: 142), in the NE group some dialects divorce the pluperfect from the counterfactual. The pluperfect can be expressed analytically, using temporal adverbs such as *uže* 'already', with the perfective marking on the verbs.

(39) *Paka me dogijam žinku khēr jej uže otgij-a.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 Until we reached.1PL to house she already AKT.went-3SG
 Before we reached the house, she had already gone.

Tenser (ibid.) adds two ways for expressing the pluperfect in Lithuanian Romani with the gerund form and in Russian Romani with the past participle form. In EL the most common

way to express the pluperfect is to use temporal adverbs with the perfective marking on the verbs, but there are also variants of past participle forms for the pluperfect as in Xaladytka.

(Estonian Laloritka)

- (40) *Do pudel'a sis krig lin-o saw-ta mi draugendir.*
this bottle COP.PST.3SG away took-PART.M some my.PL friends.ABL
This bottle had been taken away by some of my friends.

- (41) *Me somas ugin-i.* (Estonian Laloritka)
I COP.PST.1SG went-PART.F
I had gone out.

Past participle forms are also used in EX in the pluperfect.

- (42) *Me somas ugen-o.* (Estonian Xaladytka)
I COP.PST.1SG went-PART.M
I had gone out.

In LL the most common way to express the pluperfect is with temporal adverbs as in EL, but there are also examples of the Xaladytka way to model it with the past participle form. In addition, few examples of gerund forms in the pluperfect are also found.

Pluperfect expressed with the past participle:

(Latvian Lotfitka)

- (43) *Jow uže sis ajzgin-o si ame u že jawdžam.*
he already COP.PST.3SG went-PART.M COP.3SG we already came.1PL
He had already gone before we got there.

Pluperfect expressed with gerund:

- (44) *Me sumas auri izgij-i.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
I COP.PST.3SG out AKT.went-GER
I had gone out.

In LX the pluperfect is expressed with the perfective form and the remoteness marker *-as*,

but there are also some gerund forms used for the pluperfect in the data. Gerund forms are also found in Lithuanian Romani according to Tenser (2008: 142).

(45) *Me vigij-i.* (Latvian Xaladytka)

I AKT.went-GER

I had gone out.

(46) *Me ug'ij-i somas.* (Latvian Xaladytka)

I AKT.went-GER COP.PST.1SG

I had gone out.

(Latvian Xaladytka)

(47) *Da butylka isys vari-kon lyj-i mire tavariš'ende.*

this bottle COP.PST.3SG someone took-GER my.PL friends.ABL

This bottle had been taken away by some of my friends.

Counterfactual construction is marked with the remoteness marker *-as* in all NE dialects (Tenser 2008: 142). There are two ways in the NE group to construct counterfactual construction. Most of the dialects add the remoteness marker *-as* to the perfective form of the verb like in Early Romani, but Russian Xaladytka speakers add it to the present tense personal marker. In EX and LX the same tendency is present, although LX speakers often choose the conservative way and add the remoteness marker to the perfective form.

In EL the perfective form of the verb is used and the remoteness marker is added to it.

(48) *Me nikidi paš loove na kheldž-um-as.* (Estonian Lotfitka)

I never for money NEG danced-1SG-REM

I would never dance for money!

In EX the remoteness marker is added to the present form of the verb. In Xaladytka dialect the Russian conditional particle is used, see more from Example 51.

(49) *Me by na khel-av-as pale love.* (Estonian Xaladytka)

I PART NEG dance-1SG-REM for money

I would never dance for money!

Influenced by Xaladytka, a few cases in Estonian Laloritka show the remoteness marker added to the present tense personal marker in the counterfactual construction.

- (50) *Me nigdi na **khel-aas** pal loove.* (Estonian Laloritka)
I never NEG dance-1SG.REM for money

In Xaladytka the Slavic irrealis/conditional particle *by* is used in counterfactual constructions. (Tenser 2008: 142–143) In Xaladytka dialects it is used with the verb form present personal concord + remoteness marker *-a* because the remoteness marker is added to the present personal concord as an innovation.

- (51) *Me **by** na **khel-av-as** pale love.* (Estonian Xaladytka)
I PART NEG dance-1SG-REM for money
I would never dance for money!

Influenced by Russian or Xaladytka, the particle *by* is sometimes used in counterfactual constructions in EL, keeping the original perfective form.

- (52) *Me **be** n'ikidi na kheldžumas pal loove.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
(Estonian Laloritka)

- (53) *Me **bi** tutir na puč-um-as ti na džinaw kaj daa*
I PART you.ABL NEG asked-1SG-REM COMP NEG knew.1SG where it
si.
COP.3SG
I wouldn't ask you if I knew where it is.

The pattern for using the Russian irrealis/conditional particle *by* is different in the EX and EL dialects.

In LL the present verb form with the remoteness marker seems to be used as often as the more conservative form. The use of the Slavic particle *by* is not common among LL speakers.

Here is an example of an LL speaker using the Russian model with the verb in present tense to express the counterfactual.

(Latvian Lotfitka)

- (54) *Me tutir na buč-aas me ti džinav kaj dova si.*
I you.ABL NEG ask-1SG.REM I COMP know.1SG where it is
I wouldn't ask you if I knew where it is.

In EX the particle is also sometimes omitted, but not consistently by any speaker.

The politeness category is expressed in the same way as the counterfactual (Tenser 2008: 143). The same is seen based on this data on the Estonian and Latvian dialects. However, sometimes the verb is left in the present or past tense and the remoteness marker is not added.

(Estonian Laloritka)

- (55) *Me kam-aw lestir te pučhaw vasso jow daa kerdža.*
I want-1SG he.ABL COMP ask.1SG why he that did.3SG
I would like to ask him why he did this.

(Estonian Lotfitka)

- (56) *Me kamj-um lestir ti pučava so jow daa kerdža*
I wanted-1SG he.ABL COMP ask.1SG.FUT what he that did.3SG

6.2.6 The imperative form

In the Xaladytka dialect loanwords with the verb adaptation marker *-in-* in the imperative form are marked differently than in other NE dialects—with suffix *-e*—while in other NE dialects they have no marking like a majority of the verbs (Tenser 2008: 145–146). EX follows the same pattern as Russian Xaladytka, and Lotfitka has no marking like the rest of the dialects. In LX there is less use of the final *-e* with adapted verbs, but it is present in the sample.

- (57) *Te tolkn'-in les!* (Latvian Xaladytka)
COMP push-LOAN him
Push him!

- (58) *Toln'-in-e les!* (Latvian Xaladytka)
push-LOAN-IMPER:SG him

According to Tenser (2008: 146), the Xaladytka dialect in Russia and LL do not always use Romani morphology with loan verbs in the imperative form, but instead keep the original one. In Estonia we see the same with local dialects—Xaladytka and Lotfitka—but in both cases the source language is Russian and the morphology of Russian is kept. There are no examples of EL keeping Latvian or Estonian morphology to express imperatives.

(59) *Talkn'i les!* < Russian imperative *толкни* 'push!' (Estonian Xaladytka)
Push him!

(60) *paklanisj, paklanitjesj* < Russian *поклонись* 'you(SG), bow!', *поклонитесь*
'you(PL), bow!' (Estonian Laloritka)

(61) *kumard-in, kumard-in-en* < Estonian *kummarda!* 'bow down!' (Estonian Laloritka)
Bow down!

Two out of four EX speakers attach the Russian plural imperative morpheme *-te* to the 2/3PL marking that is described by Tenser (2008: 147).

(62) *Xa-n'-t'e pšalore!* (Estonian Xaladytka)
eat-3PL-IMP
Brothers, eat!

(63) *Pje-n'-t'e pšalore!* (Estonian Xaladytka)
Brothers, drink!

(64) *Ker-en-t'e bjaw!* (Estonian Xaladytka)
Marry soon!

6.2.7 Non-finite forms

The most common non-finite verb form in EL is the perfective participle form as commonly found in the NE dialects (Tenser 2008: 148). The verb with the perfectivity marker takes the adjectival ending *-o* for the masculine, *-i* for the feminine and *-e* for the

plural. The participles are often formed with the present or perfective copula, but the copula can be omitted.

- (65) *Klejta vimor-d-i.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 dress wash-PRF-F
The dress is washed.
- (66) *Klejta si mor-d-i.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 dress is wash-PRF-F
- (67) *Klejta auri mor-d-i.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 dress out wash-PRF-F
- (68) *Mas isi zapek-l-o.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 meat COP.3SG cook-PRF-M
 The meat is roasted.

Participles of loan verbs are formed with the Greek-derived indeclinable suffix *-ime(n)* (Tenser 2008: 149; Matras 2002: 160). This suffix is also present in the EL, EX and LX Romani dialects, but there is only one example in LL. That partly supports Tenser's claim (2008: 150) that the suffix *-ime(n)* is not found in some of the NE dialects.

An example of a perfective participle from the Latvian verb *ceļot* 'to travel':

- (69) *Ne me ne mi phen būt na sam cel'-ime.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 NEG I NEG my.F sister much NEG COP.1PL travel-PART
 Neither my sister nor I have been travelling much.

The suffix *-ime* is more common in EX and LX. In the Estonian data it occurs in a few examples with Estonian and Russian loanwords.

- (70) *Jow si svat-ime.* < Russian *сват-* 'propose marriage' (Estonian Laloritka)
 he COP.3SG engage-PART
 He is engaged.

(71) *Kheer si ferv-ime.* < Estonian *värvima* ‘to paint’ (Estonian Laloritka)
The house is painted.

(Estonian Laloritka)

(72) *Kheer zakraas-ime.* < Russian *крас-* ‘to paint’; Latvian *krāsot* ‘to paint’
The house is painted.

In EX there are only a few examples as well. In LX the suffix is more productive and used in various loan verbs by different speakers.

(73) *kr’ist’-ime* ‘baptized’ < Latvian *kristīt* ‘to baptize’, Russian *крестить*
vičist-yme ‘cleaned’ < Russian *чистить* ‘to clean’; Polish *czyścić*
žen’-ime ‘married’ < Russian *жениться* ‘to marry’
napoln’-ime ‘filled’ < Russian *наполнить* ‘to fill’
rastro-ime ‘upset’ < Russian *расстроиться* ‘to upset’

There are also a few examples where the suffix *-ime* is used with inherited Romani verbs. Tenser pointed out the same for Russian Romani in his work (2008: 150).

(74) *bikn-ime* ‘sold’ < Romani *bikin-* ‘to sell’ (Estonian Laloritka)
b’ik’-ime (Latvian Xaladytka)

The participles of loan words retain the participle/adjectival morphology of the L2 and add a Romani person marker (Tenser 2008: 150).

(75) *Jow si kixlat-o.* ‘He is engaged’ < Estonian *on kihlatud* ‘is engaged’

In the Estonian data there is only the gerundial marker *-Vndo(j)* and not the indeclinable marker *-i* that is found in Lithuanian and Russian (Xaladytka) Romani. The gerundial verb form is used to express action that is simultaneous to the action in the main clause (Tenser 2008: 150). The gerundial form is more commonly used by LL speakers than EL speakers.

- (76) *Gaba-ndoj jej morla idži.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 sing-GRND she wash.3SG clothes
 Singing, she was washing the laundry.

There is one deverbal genitive derivation found in the EL data that supports Tenser's (2008: 151) claim that the form is very rare. However, in LL we find the form among different speakers and used a bit more commonly.

- (77) *Paani si pii-bnas-kiir-o.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 water is drink-NOMIN.OB-GEN-M
 The water is drinkable.

- (78) *Jow si beš-ibnas-kīr-u.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 he COM.3SG sit-NOMIN.OB-GEN-M
 He is seated.

(Latvian Lotfitka)

- (79) *Isi džin-ibnas-kīr-u si jow si barvalu.*
 COP.3SG know-NOMIN.OB-GEN-M how he COP.3SG rich.M
 It is known that he is very rich.

As the non-finite forms are rather rare and the finite forms are preferred, the phrases that have two simultaneous actions are formed through chaining the phrases or by serialization (Tenser 2008: 152). In the EL dialect the non-finite forms are also quite often replaced by the finite forms. In LL the gerundial marker *-Vnduj* is widely used in these constructions.

- (80) *Beščā paš mende te rovela.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 sat.3SG near us COMP cries
 Crying, she sat down next to us.

- (81) *Jow zarowdža si dikhja la.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 he cried.3SG how saw.3SG her
 He cried at the sight of her.

- (82) *Rovinduj jej bešja blakam menca.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 cry.GRND she sat.3SG next to us
 Crying, she sat down next to us.

Tenser (2008: 153) also mentions a strategy to replace passive phrases that would commonly use the perfective participle with the active ones based on the Slavic model. Instead of using the perfective participle, the verb is in third person as in the next example in which the sentence ‘The boy is being beaten up’ is translated to Romani as ‘(they) are beating the boy’ using the third-person plural.

- (83) *Čaavores mar-n-a.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 boy.ACC beat-3PL-FUT
 The boy is being beaten up.

This is a quite common strategy in EL and EX and also in the Latvian Romani dialects.

6.2.8 Transitive derivations

The transitive markers in the NE group are the fossilized transitive markers *-av-* and *-ar-*, and the productive marker *-kir-* (Tenser 2008: 154–156). Out of two examples of the marker *-ar-*, *dand-yr-* ‘to bite’ and *bist-r-* ‘to forget’, Tenser points out that in the latter one, *bist-r-* ‘forget’, the marker has undergone phonetic erosion. In the EL and LL dialects and in EX the short and full forms of this lexeme are present. The change from *a* > *i/y* has still taken place.

- (84) *Amar’i baba b’ist-yr-ela častes amare lava.* (Estonian Xaladytka)
 Our grandmother sometimes forgets our names.
- (85) *Sajek zabist-ir-la dar ti phandel.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 She always forgets to close the door.
- (86) *Rospheniben isis rosphendlo i zabist-ir-do.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 The story was told and forgotten.

An additional lexical item with the transitive marker *-ar-* is *phag-ir-* ‘to break something’. The intransitive counterpart is not seen in EL but is found in other Romani dialects, e.g. Sinti *phag-* ‘to break’ (ROMLEX).

- (87) *Me phag-ir-džom kruuzin’a.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 I break-TR-PST.1SG little cup
 I broke the cup.

The transitive marker *-ar-* is also present in the word *rak-ir-* ‘to speak, to tell’, but similarly to the previous example, the verb is exclusively used with the marker and there is no intransitive form seen in EL.

In the Laloritka Romani samples there is an example of the marker *-ar-* replacing *-av-*. The marker *-av-* is usually used in the NE group with the lexical item *žang-av-* ‘wake up’, but *žang-ir-* by the Laloritka Roma in EL.

- (88) *Saku tašarlate žang-ir-la peski nejeegen an epta opre.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 every morning wake-TR-3SG RFL children in seven up
 Every morning she wakes up her child at 7 o’clock.

- (89) *Sakku tašarla žang-er-aava pe epta mu nejeegen upre.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 every morning wake-TR-1SG at seven my children up
 Every morning I wake up my child at 7 o’clock.

The transitive marker *-kir-* is the most common synthetic transitive marker of these three markers and it is productive to some degree (Tenser 2008: 156). The marker *-kir-* seems to be productive in Estonian dialects as well. As an example, there is a calque from Estonian to mark *get dirty* as *get black*, motivated by the Estonian adjective *must* that covers both meanings ‘black’ and ‘dirty’. The marker *-kir-* is added to the Romani word *kaalo* ‘black’.

- (90) *Nejeegos kaal’a-kir-la kheer.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 child black-TR-3SG house
 The child makes the house dirty.

6.2.9 Intransitive derivations

The intransitive marker *-(j)o(v)* is found throughout the NE dialects but doesn't seem to be a productive mechanism for deriving intransitive verbs in the NE dialects (Tenser 2008: 158). As in the rest of the NE group, in EL the most productive way to derive intransitives from transitive verbs is through the use of reflexive particles—*pe(s)* for the singular and *pen* for the plural or the personal pronoun forms *man/tut/amen/tumen*. This way of deriving intransitive constructions with reflexive particles is based on the Russian and Polish system (Tenser 2008: 159), e.g. Romani *garavaa* 'I hide (something)' > *garavaa pe/garavaa man* 'I hide myself (hide.1SG RFL)', *tu garavesa* 'you.SG hide (something)' > *tu garavesa pe/tu garavesa tut* 'you.SG hide yourself'.

- (91) *Tiknin'ko nejeegus garadža pe tele pal kašt.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
small.M child hid.3SG RFL under behind three
The little child hid behind a tree.

- (92) *Jone garade xaaben.* (Estonian Laloritka)
they hid.3PL food
They hid the food.

As noted by Tenser (2008: 159), the borrowed verbs that have the reflexive particle in Russian are calqued with the particle into Romani. The reflexive particle is used even if the verb itself is in Romani, e.g. *sa-* 'to laugh' following the Russian model with the reflexive marker *-ся* as in *смеяться* 'to laugh'.

- (93) *Na sa tut pu veer maanušende.* (Estonian Laloritka)
NEG laugh.3SG RFL.2SG at other people.LOC
Don't laugh at other people.

The Russian borrowings that have the reflexive suffix *-ся* are integrated into Romani with the marker *-in-* and the separated reflexive particle is used, e.g. *заблудиться* 'to lose, astray'.

- (94) *Trin mi daadeski draugi **zablund-in-de** pe.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 three my.PL father.GEN.PL friends AKT.got lost-IN-3PL RFL.3PL
 Three of my dad's friends got lost in the war.

The phenomenon is less common in EL than in EX. The reflexive particle was only added by one speaker to the verb *laugh*, but all the other Lotfitka speakers used the verb without it:

- (95) *Na **sa** veer maanušendir.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 NEG laugh.3SG other people.ABL
 Don't laugh at other people.

In many cases EL speakers don't use the reflexive particle, but EX speakers follow the Russian pattern constantly. Here is another example modelling the Russian verb *оставаться* 'to stay' in EX and the variant without it in EL.

- (96) *Joj **ačela** pe ješ'o pe jex dyves.* (Estonian Xaladytka)
 she stay RFL.3SG more for one day

- (97) *Jej **jačhela** iš's'o pu jek diis.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 she stay more for one day
 She is staying for another day.

The same division is seen in LL and LX. Xaladytka calques Russian and Lotfitka speakers, on the other hand, use the verb without the reflexive particle.

- (98) *Joj **jačhel** pe ješ'o po jekh dyves.* (Latvian Xaladytka)
 (99) *Jow **jačela** ošto pu jek dīs.* (Latvian Lotfitka)

On the other hand, there are also some stable lexical items with the reflexive particle in EL and LL that are based on Polish and Russian examples. One of these is 'to fight', which is derived from the verb 'to hit' with the reflexive particle. In Russian the verbs are *бить* 'to hit' and *биться* 'to fight' and in Polish *bić* 'to hit' *bić się* 'to fight'.

(100) *Tu mardžan čaavores kon doj rovela?* (Estonian Laloritka)
you.SG hit.PST.2SG boy.ACC who there cry.3SG
Did you hit the boy who is crying there?

(101) *Jone marna pen vaš paan'i.* (Estonian Laloritka)
they fight.3PL RFL.3PL for water
They fight for the water.

(102) *Jone marna pe vaš pān'i.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
they fight.3PL RFL for water

EL examples of the reflexive particle used with Latvian loan verbs also exist.

(103) *Brišind bejdzindža pes.* (Estonian Laloritka)
rain end.pst.3SG RFL.SG
It stopped raining.

6.2.10 Aktionsart prefixes

The Slavic aktionsart prefixes are commonly used in the NE dialects to modify verbs (Tenser 2008: 160). Matras (2002: 175) proposes a process of establishing a system of today's Latvian Romani verbal prefixes: 'In Latvian Romani, the aktionsart marking is inherited from the forerunner dialect, which emerged in contact with Polish. But the system is further enriched through borrowings of Lithuanian and Latvian aktionsart prefixes (...)' Tenser (2008: 160) mentions only Latvian verbal prefixes in addition to Slavic ones, which is more probable as Lithuanian has had relatively little impact on Romani (Tenser 2005: 1). Ariste (1973) exhibits some of the Latvian verbal prefixes and the Slavic verbal prefixes that he has attested in Lotfitka dialect.

As mentioned by Rusakov (2001: 315), for the North Russian Romani (Xaladytka) dialect, the prefixed and simple forms sometimes have no obvious difference in meaning. The same is seen in the Estonian and Latvian Romani dialects with both Latvian and Russian aktionsart prefixes.

Slavic and Latvian verbal prefixes can attach to inherited and borrowed verbs. The borrowed verb can be modified the same way with verbal prefixes as in the source

language. With an inherited lexicon, it is enough to establish the equivalence in the two different languages. (Tenser 2008: 161–162) As the prefixes are modelled on individual Russian verbs, Rusakov (2001: 316) draws the conclusion that ‘grammatical changes in the sphere of aspect representation are brought into NRRD [North Russian Romani dialect] by “lexical means”’.

6.2.10.1 Latvian aktionsart prefixes

In the LL and EL dialects, Latvian aktionsart prefixes are present. In the Estonian data they are less frequently used, but examples of the Latvian verbal prefixes *aiz-* ‘under, toward, away’, *ap-* ‘around, about’, *at-* ‘away, open’, *ie-* ‘in, into’, *no-* ‘from’, *pār-* ‘over’ and *uz-* ‘on, onto’ are seen. Similarly to the Slavic aktionsart prefixes, Latvian prefixes are used with Latvian loan verbs or with Romani verbs calquing the Latvian equivalent. As in Latvian the verbal prefixes are often used to express new meanings using the stem from Romani and prefix from Latvian. Ariste (1973) discusses the Latvian verbal prefixes *no-*, *uz-* and *ie-* in his article on Latvian verbal prefixes in the Lotfitka dialect.

The verb *aizd-* ‘to lend’ is modelled after the Latvian *aiz-do-t* (out-give-INF) ‘borrow’. The aktionsart prefix is borrowed in the same form, but the verb stem is translated into Romani, i.e. the Latvian *dot* ‘to give’ to the Romani verb *d-* ‘to give’.

- (104) *Tu vašti ajz-d-es mange da mašin’a po vixadnije?* (Estonian Laloritka)
 you.SG can AKT-give-2SG me.DAT this car on weekend
 Can you lend me a car for a weekend?

Here is an example of borrowing the Latvian verb stem and the prefix as a whole unit and integrating the verb with the marker *-in-*. The Latvian form to mark ‘to guess’ is *uzminēt*.

- (105) *Me so-ta lačom, uz-min’in so dova?* (Estonian Laloritka)
 I something found.1SG guess.IMP what that
 I found something—guess what it is!

In EL the Latvian aktionsart prefixes are most often used to calque Latvian verbs, and the main strategy is to translate the verb to Romani. There is one example in EL of a stable

lexical item used with the Latvian prefix. The verb from *nuo-peja pe(s)* ‘happened’ is used beside the form *popeja pe(s)* and in LL beside the Latvian loan *nuotikandija* < *notikt* Latvian ‘to happen’. It is a combination of the Latvian aktionsart prefix *no-* based on the Latvian verb *notikt*, the Romani verb *peerel* ‘to become’ following the Polish logic *stawać się* ‘to become’ and *stać się* ‘to become, to happen’, and adding the reflexive particle *pes* modelling the Polish or Russian *случилось* ‘to happen’.

- (106) *Niso na nuo-peja pes.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 nothing NEG AKT-happened.3SG RFL.3SG
 Nothing happened.

Tenser (2014) points out that in EL there are no Baltic prefixes found with imperatives, and either adverbials or Slavic prefixes are preferred.

6.2.10.2 Slavic aktionsart prefixes

Polish and Russian prefixes occur with a borrowed lexicon and due to calquing Slavic verbs: the Romani verb stem is compounded with the Slavic prefixes, as is common with the Latvian calques. In the following example, the Russian verb *угадать* ‘to guess’ is borrowed and adapted with the loan adaptation marker *-in-* into Romani.

- (107) *Me so-ta lastjom, u-gad-in so daa si!* (Estonian Laloritka)
 I something found.1SG AKT-guess-IN.IMP what it is
 I found something—guess what it is!

An example exists of using the Slavic *roz-/raz-* verbal prefix *raz-* and the Romani stem *mard-* ‘to hit’ to calque the Russian or Polish verb ‘to break’. In Russian the verb ‘to break’ is expressed with the prefix added to the verb ‘break’ as Russian *бумь* ‘to hit’ *разбумь* ‘to break’. The Romani verb meaning ‘to hit’ is *mar-*.

- (108) *Me ruz-mardžum kruuza.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 I AKT-broke.1SG cup
 I broke the cup.

Another example shows the process of giving a new meaning to a verb is found with the Russian verbal prefix *raz-* and the Romani stem *phen-* ‘to say’ used to express meaning ‘tell (a story)’, which is modelled after Russian *рассказать* ‘tell (a story), *сказать* meaning ‘to say’.

(108) *Lija ti ras-phenel peski džiiipen.* (Estonian Laloritka)

(109) *Jej lija ti rus-phenel mange paasana.* (Estonian Lotfitka)

She started to tell a story.

Russian and Polish verbal prefixes are often used to mark the perfective aspect in Romani. The verbs *rakir-* ‘to tell’ and *bistir-* ‘to forget’ are marked with the Slavic prefix *po-* to express the perfective aspect. The prefix *za-* is added, modelling the Russian verb *забывать* ‘to forget’.

(110) *Doj pa-rakirla doj pa-zabistirde.* (Estonian Laloritka)

this PA-speak.3SG this PA-forget.3PL

The story was told and forgotten.

6.2.10.3 Fusion

Rusakov’s (2001: 317) data on the North Russian Romani dialect contains some examples of prefixed verbs that are not constructed directly from Russian as calques, i.e. there is no equivalent in that form in the source language from where the verbal prefix and the stem could be borrowed as a compound set. Rusakov suggests that in these cases the lexical identification was done at an earlier stage of dialect development, perhaps in the environment of another Slavic language. Rusakov (ibid.: 318) also guesses that some forms might be ‘lexical residues of earlier calques of certain words of another dialect or chronological variants of Russian, which thus reflect the preceding stages of NRRD (North Russian Romani dialect) language contacts’. Another explanation provided by Rusakov is that the prefixing system is productive and ‘speakers use the strategy of constructing new verbs with the help of borrowed prefixes according to productive models’.

Matras (2002: 227) suggests the term fusion, defining it as ‘the non-separation of languages for a particular category’, a term that is also used by Tenser (2005, 2008). The

productivity of the Slavic aktionsart prefixes is clear for Russian Romani, Polish Romani and Lithuanian Romani (Tenser 2008: 163).

Tenser (2005: 41) has listed examples with common Russian prefixes used in Lithuanian Romani on Romani verbs that are the results of fusion, naming the phenomenon semantic integration. The Russian prefix *za-* forms *za-xačkir-* ‘to burn something’ and the Russian equivalent would be *pod-pal-*. Another example provided by Tenser is *po-dykh-* ‘to see’, having the Russian equivalent *u-vid-*.

To show the richness and variability of the system, this verb takes the prefix *uz-* (this prefix is present in the Latvian *uz-* ‘on, onto, over, above’, but not compounded with *redzēt* ‘to see’) by one EL and two Laloritka Roma as *uz-dikh-* while other speakers leave it free of verbal prefixes. LL speakers sometimes use the prefix *ie-* e.g. *ie-dikh-* ‘to see’, which in other cases gives new meaning ‘to like’ following the equivalent in Latvian *ieredzēt* ‘to like’. EX and LX speakers use the Russian verbal prefix *u-* (*u-dykh*) as in Russian *u-vid-*. This example illustrates the high variation of verbal prefixes among closely related dialects that are spoken in the same region and alludes to the use of independent productive models.

(111) *Jesl'i tu jeesa me tut uz-dikhaa.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 if you.SG come.2SG I you.ACC AKT-see.1SG

(112) *Ja tu atjāsa ti me tut ie-dikhā.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 if you.SG come then I you.ACC AKT-see.1SG
 If you come, I shall see you.

Another example by Tenser (2005: 41) is *vy-bičh-* ‘to send’ compared to Russian *ot-prav-*, but that could be formed following Polish *wy-słać* ‘to send’. It is used by a single Estonian Laloritka speaker while other speakers use the verb without the verbal prefix.

Therefore, in the Lotfitka dialects it is possible to trace back Polish, Russian and Latvian verbal prefixes. In addition to these three models, there are cases in which the prefix is not based on any of the lexical items from these languages.

Ariste (1983: 27) has identified the aktionsart prefix *za-* in the verb derived from Estonian *laulatama* ‘to marry, to wed’, Lot. *laulisker-* in *Jow za-lauliskerdža rakl'a* ‘He wedded his

daughter’ to express the perfective aspect. In the current data, there are no aktionsart prefixes added to the Estonian verb stems, but there are many examples with the prefix *za-* with verb stems from different origins, e.g. in Latvian loan verbs to show the perfective aspect, e.g. *za-maldin-* ‘get lost’, Lat. *maldīties* ‘get lost’, which in Latvian gets the prefixes *ap-* or *no-* to express the perfective aspect. The prefix *za-* also appears with inherited lexicon such as in:

- (113) *zaghurdi* ‘dressed’,
zamordi ‘washed’,
zamaxhela ‘makes dirty’,
zaxaja ‘eaten’,
zanasval’osa ‘get sick’
zaphagirla ‘breaks’,
zabančkirla ‘bends’
zasikl’akirja ‘taught’.

The frequency of the prefix *za-* is probably increased by the Latvian prefix *sa-*, which is a marker of the perfective aspect as well. Therefore, the marker for the inherited lexicon is either motivated by Latvian, Russian or Polish. Although the prefix *za-* is common in LL, the usage of the prefix differs in vocabulary and function compared to EL.

Another case of fusion with aktionsart prefixes is present when speakers use double prefixes on Romani verbs. Here is an example that uses the prefixes *za-* and *s-* following each other. The speaker is probably mixing the Lotfitka and Xaladytka lexical items for ‘repair’, which are respectively *zaker-* and *sker-*.

- (114) *Urdena sige za-s-kerde.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
carts quickly AKT-AKT-do.PST.3PL
The carts were being repaired quickly.

- (115) *Urdena bystres s-kerde.* (Estonian Xaladytka)

- (116) *Jone za-kerde sige urdena.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
The carts were being repaired quickly.

Another example is *pazabistirde* ‘forgotten’, which contains the two Slavic prefixes *pa-* and *za-*. In this case it is probably from the Russian form *позабывать* ‘to forget’, and both

of the prefixes before *бывать* are added to the Romani stem *bistir-* ‘to forget’. The lexical item could be *zabister-* and the prefix *po-* is added for the perfective meaning.

- (117) *Doj parakirla doj pa-za-bistirde.* (Estonian Laloritka)
The story was told and forgotten.

6.2.11 Verbal particles

Matras (2002: 158) indicates that another type of aktionsart marking in some Romani dialects is a combination of the verb stem with the semi-bound verbal particle, which is common in the Romani dialects in intensive contact with Hungarian and German. All of the Romani dialects belonging to the NE group have been under German-language influence. The influence has been especially heavy on Latvian and Estonian Romani, as compared to other NE dialects additional borrowed lexical items from German are found. (Tenser 2008: 221)

Tenser (2014) shows that, in samples from the same region and same dialect, speakers’ patterns can highly vary concerning verbal prefixes and particles. This can be influenced by current contact language, i.e. Estonian and Latvian vs. Russian and Lithuanian Romani show an overwhelming preference for Slavic prefixes (ibid.).

The verbal particles in Lotfitka dialects are derived from the prepositions *tele* ‘down’ *xačkir- tele* ‘burn down’, *auri* ‘out’ *traadena auri* ‘drive away (someone)’, *opre* ‘above, on’ *d- opre* ‘wake up’, *paale* ‘back’ *jav- paale* ‘go back’ and *andre* ‘in’ *jav- andre* ‘enter’. The particles *krik*, *kriġal* ‘away, off’ and *phiiro* (*pšiiro*) ‘open’ are formed from adverbials. Another particle in the data is *capla*, which is, according to Mānušs (1997: 38), formed of the Russian interjection *уан!* ‘to catch!, to snatch!’ and Romani *la* ‘her’ *l- capla(m)* ‘embrace’, *d- capla(m)* ‘grab, hold’. According to Zuzana Bodnarova (2015: 218–219) in Kisbajom Romani, where the German and Hungarian verbal particles are common, the particles either indicate direction or change the aktionsart, aspect or the verb meaning.

6.2.12 Modals and Auxiliaries

For presenting the modals and auxiliaries, I follow the analysis Matras proposed (2002: 163) and Tenser (2008: 165) has used for analyzing the NE group. In addition to the usual

modals of necessity and ability, Matras includes the volition verb ‘want’ and proposes a borrowability scale (ibid.).

VOLITION > INABILITY > ABILITY > NECESSITY

The scale, which holds true for the NE dialects, states that the more control the agent has over the action, the more stable the verb; and the less control the subject has, the more likely the modal is to be borrowed, and the more likely it is to be expressed by an impersonal form, or a modality marker. (Matras 2002: 163)

The most stable is the volition modal ‘want’, which is expressed the same way throughout the NE dialects with *kam-*. It is always inflected and accompanied by a complementizer. Next on the scale are the modal of inability ‘cannot’, and that of ability ‘can’. (Tenser 2008: 166) In the EL and LL dialects the inherited Romani modals *našti* ‘cannot’ and *ašti* ‘can’ are typically used, but in the EL dialect there is a tendency to replace it with *dol-* ‘can’ and *na dol-* ‘cannot’. The original meaning of *dol-* is ‘to get’ and it is probably a calque from the Estonian verb *saama* ‘to get, to become, to be able to’.

(118) *Kas sa saa-d koos minu-ga tulla?* (Estonian)
Q you.SG can-2SG together me-COM come.INF
Can you come with me?

(119) *Tu dol-esa manca te jees?* (Estonian Laloritka)
you can-2SG me.INST COMP come.2SG
Can you come with me?

(120) *Tu ašti manca te jees?* (Estonian Lotfitka)
you can me.INST COMP come.2SG
Can you come with me?

Examples of ‘cannot’ with the inherited *našti* and calqued *dol-* and Estonian equivalent.

- (121) *Ma ei saa sõita mööda seda teed.* (Estonian)
 I NEG can.INF drive.INF along this.PTV road.PTV
 I cannot drive through this road.
- (122) *Me našti braucinaw po dava drom.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 I cannot drive.1SG on this road
 I cannot drive through this road.
- (123) *Me na dolaa ti braucinaw pašil pir da drom.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 I NEG can.1SG COMP drive.1SG along this road

The inherited *ašti* and *našti* are impersonal, as seen from the examples above, but the calqued modal *dol-* is always conjugated in person and tense. Both of the inherited modal verbs for ability and inability are in variation with calqued verbs. The preference seems to be speaker specific, as one Laloritka speaker prefers the inherited *našti* ‘cannot’ but uses only a few examples of the inherited (*v*)*ašti* ‘can’, while an EL speaker expressed only one example of *našti* but used (*v*)*ašti* quite often. In some informants’ speech we find only a few examples of inherited forms and only *na dol-/ dol-* is used.

The complementizer *te* (*ti*) is not always used with the inherited modal verbs *našti* and (*v*)*ašti*. One Laloritka Roma uses the complementizer exclusively, while other Laloritka and Lotfitka Roma use the complementizer only to a certain extent.

Two of the EX speakers use the calqued modal verb *dol-* due to contact with Lotfitka speakers. One who has been influenced more heavily by Lotfitka dialects also uses the inherited Romani *našti* and *ašti*. The other two use the Russian borrowings *мочь* ‘can’, *уметь* ‘can, be able to’ without integrating them to Romani and retain the Russian conjugation pattern.

- (124) *Me mag-u te džaw de foro.* (Estonian Xaladytka)
 I may-1SG COMP go.1SG in town
 I might go to town.

Typically the complementizer *te* is retained while using the Russian borrowing with Russian conjugation.

- (125) *Tu mož-yš te javes manca?* (Estonian Xaladytka)
 you can-2SG COMP come.2SG me.INST
 Can you come with me?

The modal of necessity is always a Slavic borrowing in the NE group (Tenser 2008: 167). In all three Estonian Romani groups the Polish loan *čeb-* ‘is necessary, needs, has to’ is used. It appears in impersonal form. In the present tense in EL it is usually used as *čeb* or *čeb’i* and in EX as *čejny*, *čebi* or *čeb’in*. The modal verb is used with the dative construction as in Polish.

- (126) *Mange čeb miire draugi.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 me.DAT need my.PL friends
 I need my friends.

Sometimes the past participle is used instead, especially by LL speakers.

- (127) *Mange dava na sis čebno butediir.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 me.DAT this NEG COP.PST.3SG need.PP anymore
 I didn’t need it anymore.

- (128) *Mange dova na sis čebnu.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 I didn’t need it anymore.

One Laloritka and one EX speaker also used the Slavic modal verb *treb-*, which is not present in the Latvian data. In the Latvian data Xaladytka speakers have borrowed *нужно* ‘necessary’ from Russian and *vajadzīgs* from Latvian.

The two aspectual auxiliary verbs ‘start’ and ‘stop’ are used most commonly in the NE group: *l-* ‘take’ and ‘stop’ is based on the verb *(j)ač-* ‘stay’ (Tenser 2008: 168). The *l-* ‘start’ is commonly used in the EX and Lotfitka dialects. To express ‘stop’, borrowed verbs are integrated from Russian *končinel* < *кончатся* ‘stop, end’ and Latvian *bejginel* < *beigt* ‘end’.

7 Syntax

The chapter on syntax covers an overview of prepositions in the EL dialect; adverbial and relative clauses; and embedded questions under the section subordination, complementation and utterance modifiers.

In Latvian and Estonian Romani subgroup in the NE dialects Tenser (2008: 282) points out change in interrogative *sav-* > *saj-* ‘which’ that is specific in syntax.

7.1 Prepositions

Prepositions are more often inflected by EX speakers. EL rarely uses the inflected prepositions. The inflected preposition *and-o/and-e* ‘in’ seems to be the most common but is also not used consistently, and the uninflected form *an* is a more common variant.

7.1.1 Prepositions of space and location

Compared to the data provided by Tenser (2008: 177) about Latvian and Estonian Romani, the Polish/Latvian preposition *preču* only expresses the meaning ‘opposite’ or ‘across’ and rarely ‘in front’ in EL. The preposition *preču* was not found in the meaning ‘above’ in either the Estonian or Latvian dialects. The preposition *blakus/blakam/blaku* designated as ‘near’ by Tenser (ibid.) has in EL retained the original Latvian meaning ‘next to’ (Latvian *blakus, blaku, blakām* ‘next to, beside’) and is only rarely used in the sense of ‘near’. To denote the meaning ‘in the middle’ in the Estonian Romani dialects, the preposition *maškir* ‘between’ is used while in LL the preposition *an* ‘in’ and adverb *vidus* are used in Romani (the Latvian adjective *vidus* ‘middle’ and the adverb *vidū* LOC ‘in the middle’), e.g. *an ciemusku vidus* ‘in the middle of the village’.

In EL and LL the preposition *rax* ‘at, by, near, next to’ of Kurdish origin is present in a few examples. Mānušs et al. (1997: 352) listed the preposition *rax-ke/rax-ko* ‘near, close to’, but in the current data it exists independently.

- (129) *Murš čamudžja džūl’a rax lempi.* (Estonian Laloritka)
man kissed.3SG women.ACC on lips
The man kissed the woman on the lips.

Table 10. **Spatial prepositions in Estonian Lotfitka, Latvian Lotfitka and Estonian Xaladytka**

English	Early Romani	Estonian Lotfitka	Latvian Lotfitka	Estonian Xaladytka	Latvian/ Estonian Romani (Tenser 2008)
‘behind’	<i>pal</i>	<i>pal, pal-</i>	<i>pal, (pal-)</i>	<i>pal, pal-</i>	<i>pal-</i>
‘in front’	<i>angle</i>	<i>angil, (paš)</i>	<i>angil, (preču)</i>	<i>angil, paš, paš-</i>	<i>angil, preču</i>
‘above’	<i>opre</i>	<i>opre, p-</i>	<i>p-</i>	<i>angil, paš</i>	<i>preču</i>
‘opposite’, ‘across’	<i>mamuj</i>	<i>preču</i>	<i>preču</i>	<i>naprotif</i>	<i>preču</i>
‘under’	<i>tel</i>	<i>tal</i>	<i>tal</i>	<i>tel-tal</i>	<i>tal-</i>
‘to’	<i>ke, te</i>	<i>ke (ki), k-</i>	<i>ki, k-</i>	<i>ke, ki</i>	<i>ke, ki</i>
‘from’, ‘out of’	<i>katar, tar</i>	Ablative case	Ablative case	Ablative case	Ablative case
‘in’	<i>andre</i>	<i>andre, and-, an</i>	<i>andre, an</i>	<i>andre, dre, de</i>	<i>andr-, and-, an</i>
‘on’	<i>opre</i>	<i>p-</i>	<i>p-</i>	<i>p-</i>	<i>p(r)-</i>
‘near’	<i>paš</i>	<i>paš, paš-, k-blakam, blakus</i>	<i>paš, k-blakam, blaku(s)</i>	<i>paš, paš-, paš</i>	<i>paš-, blaka</i>
‘between’	<i>maškar</i>	<i>maškir, maškiral</i>	<i>maskir, starp</i>	<i>maškir, maškiral</i>	<i>maškir</i>
‘around’	<i>trujal</i>	<i>trujal, truj, truju, vistruj</i>	<i>truju, truja(a)l, apkārt</i>	<i>vakrug</i>	<i>trujal</i>
‘across’	<i>perdal</i>	<i>pirdal</i>	<i>pirda(a)l</i>	<i>(p’idal), čir’is</i>	<i>pir</i>
‘through’	<i>perdal</i>	<i>durx, drux, pirdal, pir, (čir’is)</i>	<i>drux, pur, pir</i>	<i>(p’ir’i, p’idal), čir’is</i>	<i>drux, durx</i>
‘by’ (the hair)	N/A	<i>pal</i> Ablative case	<i>pal</i> Ablative case	<i>pal, pal-</i>	<i>pal-</i>

The preposition *mamuj* (Early Romani ‘opposite’) found in Tenser’s (2008: 172) data only once for Russian Romani and Lithuanian Romani in the adverb meaning ‘past’ is present in the EX and EL dialects as the adverb ‘directly, straight’. In the Latvian data it is present in the speech of one Xaladytka Roma.

(130) *Baro mamuj čir'is drom.* (Estonian Xaladytka)
 pub straight across road
 The pub is just across the street.

(131) *Jow urn'andyja mamuj po st'ana šeresā.* (Latvian Xaladytka)
 he ran.3SG directly at wall head.INST
 He ran against the wall.

Noun phrases followed by prepositions are usually left in the nominative case. Matras (2002: 88) states that the locative case serves as a default prepositional case accompanying most inherited prepositions. This is retained in the LL and EL *paš tu-te* 'next to you(SG)'; *pašil tumen-de* 'next to you(PL)' and *mašir len-de* 'between them'. With borrowed adpositions, the cases vary either following the source language pattern or following an alternative pattern. The Latvian postposition *blakus/blakam* + DAT 'next to, beside' borrowed by Romani is often followed by a noun phrase in the dative case as in Latvian or in the instrumental case, e.g. *blakam len-ge* (DAT) and *blakam len-ca* (INST). In EL and LL *blakam/blakus* is most often used as a preposition while it sometimes also takes the postposition as in Latvian.

The Russian adverb *рядом* 'next to', which is used with the Russian preposition *с* and acquires instrumental case, is used by EX and LX speakers with the instrumental case in Romani as well, e.g. *r'adom kheresa* 'next to the house'.

In LL the borrowed preposition *preču* is often accompanied with the dative case instead of leaving the noun in nominative case. The Polish preposition *przeciw* 'against' is followed by a noun phrase in the dative case, which is probably the model of the construction.

(132) *preču buota-ke* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 opposite shop-DAT
 'in front of the shop'

(133) *Preču khangerja-ke isi skuola.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 opposite church-DAT is school
 Opposite the church there is the school.

In LL sometimes a more complex structure combines the preposition *angil* ‘in’ and *preču* as *angil khangīri preču* ‘opposite the church’.

The inherited Early Romani preposition *dži* ‘up to, until’ in the variant *žinku* (also *žina* in LL) is retained in the meaning of the spatial preposition ‘up to’.

- (134) *Sir ame ašti ti džas žinku fooros...* (Estonian Laloritka)
how we can COMP go.1PL up to town
How can we get to town...

In Lotfitka-type dialects sometimes prefixes and verbal particles of phrasal verbs are positioned after each other in a sentence. This might leave an impression of double prefixing as the preposition and the verbal particle that is after the verb are next to each other. In other NE dialects, verbal prefixes are commonly used or their meaning is expressed only with prepositions: in the case of LL and EL dialects, on the basis of Latvian, which marks both the verb with an aktionsart prefix and adds a preposition that are both often in the same form. Latvian-influenced Romani dialects copy this, but instead of the verbal prefix, the verbal particle is used instead.

- (135) *Ližinaw pirdāl pir du kaudzi.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
climb.1SG over.PTCL over.PREP ART pile
I climb over the pile

- (136) *Jej phird’a palal pal muršeste.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
she walked.3SG behind.PTCL behind.PREP man.LOC
She was walking behind a man.

Xaladytka dialects follow the logic of Slavic languages and modify the verb with a prefix and the noun with a preposition. In Russian the verbal prefix and preposition are more rarely used with the same stem, but calquing it to Romani results in the prefix and preposition having the same form as *p’ir’i-džal p’ir’i mosto* ‘go across the bridge’.

Due to stronger Latvian influence, the structure is more frequent in LL than in EL. The Estonian dialects usually use only the preposition and do not modify the verb. Although the structure is supposedly influenced by Latvian, it should be kept in mind that in Latvian,

in most of these expressions, the verbal prefix would be used instead of the verbal particle. Verbal particles in these positions are probably used due to the general tendency towards using verbal particles.

7.1.2 Temporal prepositions and conjunctions

Some of the temporal prepositions in the NE group are metaphorical extensions of the local, or spatial, prepositions. The prepositions *andr-* > *an*, *d-* (*andre* ‘in’) and *opr-* > *p-* (*opre* ‘on’) are found in all NE dialects. (Tenser 2008: 178) In Estonian and Latvian Lotfitka and Xaladytka, patterns differ according to the dialect.

For marking the hours in EL, the preposition *p-* is used, e.g. *po epta* ‘at 7 o’clock’, while in LL the preposition *an* is used, e.g. *an epta*. In EX and LX the preposition is derived from *andre* ‘in’ as in LL, but another variant *de* is used, e.g. *de epta*. One EL speaker used the construction *an zigaaris epta*, calquing the Estonian expression *kell seitse* ‘at seven o’clock’ in which *kell* is ‘watch, clock’ in Estonian and *zigaaris* is ‘watch’ in the Lotfitka dialect.

(137) *kell seitse* (Estonian)
clock seven

(138) *an zigaaris epta* (Estonian Laloritka)
in clock seven
at 7 o’clock

To mark the months, EL and LL use the preposition *an* as in *an jūlija* ‘in July’, and Xaladytka in both countries mark them with *de* as *de ijul’a* ‘in July’. Both are prefixes derived from *andre*, as mentioned earlier. In EL the preposition is sometimes missing.

(139) *Ašti juulija te del brišint?* (Estonian Laloritka)
might July COMP give.3SG rain
It is possible that it will rain in July.

With holidays and celebrations, all dialects use the preposition *p-* ‘on’ as *po svenki* ‘(I will visit you) for the holidays’ (EL), *po ražd’estvo* ‘for the Christmas’ (Xaladytka) and *po*

ziemsvētki ‘for the Christmas’ (LL). The preposition *p-* is also used for events like a party, but it is in competition with the preposition *an*. Xaladytka speakers most often use the first example *po v’ečer’inka*, but in the Lotfitka dialects a range of loanwords are used from Russian, Latvian and Estonian and the preposition depends on the preposition and marking in the contact language or on the speaker’s choice. Here are some examples of events which are marked with either one by different speakers *po balla/ an balla* < Latvian colloquial *balle* ‘party’; *po pidos/ an(do) pidos* < Estonian *pidu* ‘party’.

Other inherited spatial prepositions in temporal uses in EL are *pirdal* ‘across’ in the meaning ‘after’ and ‘during’ and *pal-* ‘behind’ in the meaning ‘during’. Therefore, they are calquing the Russian model; in Russian the prefix *за* ‘behind’ is used (Tenser 2008: 179). The preposition *pal-* is used in EX in the meaning ‘after’ and ‘during’ as in Lithuanian Romani (ibid.: 178). In LL variants of *pirdal* express the meanings ‘after’ and ‘during’ as in EL and the preposition *pal-* in the meaning ‘during’, but quite rarely.

The inherited spatial preposition *angil* ‘in front of’ stands for the temporal preposition ‘before’ and ‘until’ in EL and for ‘before’ in LL and EX.

The inherited spatial preposition *k-* ‘at, to’ is used in the meaning ‘until’ by two EX speakers. LX speakers use it as well, but LL speakers exclusively use the reconstructed inherited Romani particle *dži* ‘up to, until’ that continued to be used in the NE dialects as a complex preposition *žy-k-* ‘until’ (Tenser 2008: 178).

(140) *Kaj jov dživela ke lynaj?* (Estonian Xaladytka)
 where he live.3SG.FUT to summer
 Where does he live until the summer?

(141) *Kaj jow žinko linaj dživel?* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 where he until summer live.3SG
 Where does he live until the summer?

In EL the forms *žinko* ‘until’ and *žin kana* ‘still, until now’ and in LL the forms *žinko*, *žiko* and *žina*, are used in the meaning ‘until’ and *ži kana*, *žin kana*, *žink dadiis*, *žinko kana* ‘still, until now’. Among EX and LX speakers, the common forms are *žyka*, *žyko* ‘until’.

Table 11. **Temporal prepositions**

		Estonian Lotfitka	Latvian Lotfitka	Estonian Xaladytka	Latvian Xaladytka
Hours		<i>p-</i> (< <i>opre</i>)	<i>an</i> (< <i>andre</i>)	<i>de</i> (< <i>andre</i>)	<i>de</i> (< <i>andre</i>)
Days of week	‘Mon–Thu’	- (<i>an</i>)	- (Latvian borrowings)	<i>de</i>	<i>de</i>
	‘Friday’	- (<i>an</i>)	- (Latvian borrowings)	<i>de</i>	<i>de</i> (<i>pjatnica</i>) <i>de</i> (<i>parastvin</i>)
	‘Saturday’	- (<i>an</i>)	- (Latvian borrowings)	<i>de</i>	<i>de</i> (<i>subota</i>)
	‘Sunday’	GEN (<i>kurkeskiiro</i>) -	- (Latvian borrowing)	<i>de</i> (<i>kurko</i>)	<i>de</i> - <i>kurk’e</i>
Months		<i>an</i>	<i>an</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>de</i>
Seasons		GEN	GEN	GEN	GEN
Festivals		<i>p-</i>	<i>p-</i>	<i>p-</i>	<i>p-</i>
‘before’		<i>angil togi(t)</i>	<i>angil togi(t)</i> <i>iekāms</i>	<i>k-pr’ežd’e čem paka</i>	<i>angil pr’ežd’e čem paka</i>
‘during’		<i>pirdal pal-</i>	<i>pirdal pur pal-</i>	<i>pal-</i>	<i>pal-</i>
‘after’		<i>pošli pirdal</i>	<i>pošli pirdal</i>	<i>pošli kol’i pal-</i>	<i>pošli</i>
‘until’		<i>angil žinko žin kana</i>	<i>žinko žiko žina</i>	<i>k-žyka žyko</i>	<i>k-žyka žyko</i>
‘since’		ABL	ABL	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i>
‘while’		<i>paka kamēr kamet poskil, poske</i>	<i>kamēr kamet poskil, poske</i>	<i>paka</i>	<i>paka</i>

In the Estonian and Latvian Lotfitka and Xaladytka dialects the most common temporal loans are the Slavic *pošli* ‘after’, *paka* ‘while’, ‘before’, ‘until’. EX speakers use the Russian *kol’i* as ‘until’, ‘while’, ‘before’. In LL and in EL the Latvian temporal conjunction *kamēr* ‘until’, ‘while’, ‘before’ is found in the original form and as *kamet*.

Two temporal conjunctions with unknown origin are present in EL and LL; these are *togi(t)* ‘before’, ‘while’, ‘then’ and *poskil, poske* ‘until’, ‘before’, ‘while’. In the Estonian data *togi* was found only in the speech of one Laloritka speaker in the meaning ‘then’; in LL this word is widely used.

In the meaning ‘while’ as in ‘while we were waiting’, EL speakers calque the Estonian expression. The EX dialect has picked it up as influence from Lotfitka Romani.

- (142) *sel ajal kui* (Estonian)
 this-ADE time-ADE when
- (143) *dava lajkus kidi* (Estonian Laloritka)
de lajkus ki (Estonian Lotfitka)
dava lajko kagda (Estonian Xaladytka)
 this time when
 while (we were waiting)

In the sense of ‘while’ the interrogatives *sir (si)* ‘how’ and *kidi (ki)* ‘when’ are used in the Estonian and Latvian Lotfitka and Xaladytka dialects.

- (144) *Ame gabadžam gilja **kidi** ame po phu kerdžam butti.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 We sang songs while we were working in the field.

The meaning ‘since’ is expressed using the ablative case in all above-mentioned dialects and as Tenser (2008: 179) indicates, also generally in the NE group.

- (145) *Mange bičula si jow daj dživel **ijuul’os-tir.*** (Estonian Lotfitka)
 me.DAT seem.3SG how he here live.3SG July-ABL
 I think he has lived here since June.

7.1.3 Other prepositions

The inherited Romani prepositions under question are *bi* ‘without’, the causal preposition *astjal* ‘for’ and the benefactive *vaš* ‘for’. The causal preposition *astjal* is not found in the NE group (Tenser 2008: 180), but *bi (pi, po, pu)* ‘without’ and *vaš (vas, paš)* ‘for’ are

present in their inherited meanings.

- (146) *Mange čhebi neeve idži vaš phaleski bl'ava.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
me.DAT need new.PL clothes for brother.GEN wedding.PL
I need new clothes for my brother's wedding.

- (147) *So tu lijān vaš kirlo?* (Estonian Laloritka)
what you.SG took.2SG for throat
What did you do for your sore throat?

According to Tenser (2008: 180), the benefactive *vaš* 'for' is found marginally, and usually used mostly as the referential 'about'. It is, however, quite rare in the meaning 'about' compared to the preposition *pal-* or the ablative case marking that are both quite common in EL.

- (148) *Ame sajek laminasam men vaš leski phen'enge.* (Estonian Laloritka)
we always quarrel RFL.1PL about his.PL sisters.DAT
We always have a fight about his sisters.

In the EL and EX dialects, *vaš*, *pal-* and the ablative case are quite mixed among the speakers and dialects: in LL *vaš* is preferred in the benefactive meaning 'for', while LX speakers prefer the preposition *pal-*. In the meaning 'about' in LL, the ablative case is most common and the preposition *vaš* is very rarely used. Among LX speakers the preposition *pal-* is most often used.

According to Tenser (2008: 181), the preposition 'for' in a privative-benefactive construction, such as 'he did it for me' in the meaning 'he did it instead of me', is expressed in all Romani dialects with the spatial preposition *pal-* (original meaning 'behind') that also follows the Russian and Polish model. In EL and LL the preposition *vaš* 'for' is also used.

The logic that the prepositions match the spatial preposition 'through' proposed by Tenser (2008: 181) for causative-referential construction 'they fight over/because of his sister', is only partly present in EL. Some of the speakers use *pal-* (original meaning 'behind'), which would conform to Russian logic, but the prepositions used for 'through' in these

dialects are mostly *pirdal* or *durx*. In this construction in EL, the prepositions *pal-* and *vaš* are typically used and the preposition *durx* is not found. The preposition *durx* is used among LL speakers in the meanings ‘through’ and in the above-mentioned construction, and thus in accordance with the logic.

7.2 Subordination

In the section on subordination, adverbial clauses, relative clauses and embedded questions are discussed.

7.2.1 Adverbial clauses

The conjunctions for the conditional clauses in EL are the inherited *sir* ‘how’, *kidi* ‘when’, *kaj* (*ki*) ‘where’ and the completizer *te*. In addition to inherited conjunctions, the Russian loan *jesli* is a common conjunction. EX speakers use either the Russian loan *jesli* or *koli*. Estonian Romani speakers seem to prefer the same conjunction in the conditional realis and irrealis and in the potential construction. The same is seen in LX where only the Russian conjunction *jesli* is used.

In LL the Latvian borrowed conjunction *ja* ‘if’ introduces conditional realis clauses and the inherited *te* introduces irrealis clauses. The potential construction is more unstable and either *te*, *sir* or *ja* is chosen.

Latvian *ja* ‘if’ in the conditional realis:

- (149) *Ja tu atjāsa, me tut dikhā.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 if you.SG come.2SG I you.SG.ACC see.1SG
 If you come, I shall see you.

In the Lotfitka dialects sometimes both clauses are used in the sentences with conditional and potential constructions. The first part is introduced with *sir*, *kaj* (*ki*) or *te* and the second clause with *te*.

- (150) *Ja mange ti jowjasis kaut-cik lōve, ti me dijumas tuke.* (Latvian Lotfitka)
Ki mande te java loove, te me daas tuke. (Estonian Laloritka)
 If I had some money, I would give it to you.

- (151) *So-n'ibut' si dikhes, ti phen mange!* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 anything how see.1SG COMP say me.DAT
 If you see something, tell me.

Two LL speakers introduce the second clause with *togi(t)* 'then'.

- (152) *Ja me pjā būt thūda, togit me jovā zorali.* (Latvia Lotfitka)
 if I drink.1SG a lot milk then I become.1SG strong.F
 If I drink a lot of milk, I will be strong.

The Slavic conditional particle *by* is occasionally found in samples of EL. The particle is more often present in the irrealis construction, but also sometimes in the potential construction. As Tenser (2008: 194) points out, this occurrence is common for Romani dialects in contact with Slavic languages. Among LL the use of the particle *by* is very rare.

- (153) *Ti jeen mande loove me bi dijumas tukke.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 If I had some money, I would give it to you.

In EL the concessive conditional clauses are the Polish *choc* 'even though' and the Russian *хотя* 'although', and the Russian *даже если* 'even if', which is sometimes integrated into Romani as *daže ki* or *daže si*. In LL the Polish loan *choc* 'although' is also preserved, and instead of Russian loans, Latvian loans are borrowed into Romani, e.g. *lai gan, kaut gan, kaut arī* 'although' and *pat ja* 'even if'.

The temporal adverbial clauses are distinguished into three groups: simultaneity, anteriority and posteriority. In EL general and simple ('just as') simultaneity is expressed with the conjunctions *sir* and *kidi*. Speakers use the same conjunction for general and simple simultaneity, but the conjunction depends on the speaker. In LL the conjunction *si* is preferred in both cases. That goes against the general tendency noticed by Tenser (2008: 195) that the preference for introducing general simultaneity is given to the interrogative *kidi* 'when'.

- (154) *Kidi jow kerdža udar pšiiro, gija brišind.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 when he made.3SG door open.M went.3SG rain
 Just as he opened the door, it started to rain.

In EL and LL, anteriority proper is expressed the same way as in other NE dialects—with loan particles or combinations of particles equivalent to the English ‘before’ (Tenser 2008: 196) e.g. the Latvian *iekāms* ‘before’, the Russian *прежде чем* ‘before’. And, Tenser continues, there are analytical constructions that rely on inherited material, such as *angil dava si* (EL *angil daa si*) ‘before (before that when)’. The second variant is usually preferred in EL. Beside these variants, in LL the anterior-durative adverb *poskil* ‘until’ is used with the anterior proper clauses. The tendency is also noticed by Tenser (ibid.) in LL and in the NE group in the Polish dialect and the Ukrainian Xaladytka dialect.

In Russian and Latvian, loan anterior-durative clauses are used according to Tenser (ibid.), e.g. the Latvian *kamēr (kamet)* ‘while’, the Russian *нока* ‘while’, and the adverb *poskil (pozgit)* ‘until’ with unknown origin.

Posteriority is expressed in EL through the Slavic *posli/pošli*, in some cases combined with the demonstratives *dova* ‘that’ or *sir* ‘how’ and following the Polish/Russian model as indicated by Tenser (ibid.). In some cases only the conjunction *sir* ‘how’ or *kidi* ‘when’ is used in the LL and EL dialects.

In causal clauses two different conjunctions are used in EL. Xaladytka speakers most frequently use *pal dova (so)* ‘because’ and LL speakers use *vaš dova (si/ki)* ‘because’. EL speakers tend to use both variants and usually shorten the demonstrative *dova* to *do* as mentioned earlier, creating the forms *vaš do* and *pal do*. Both of the variants *pal dova* and *vaš dova* are loanshifts from the Russian *номоту чмо* or the Polish *dła tego co* (for cause); or the Russian *номоту* or the Polish *dła tego* ‘since’ (for reason) combining ‘for’/‘about’ and the demonstrative ‘that’ (Tenser 2008: 197).

7.2.2 Relative clauses

Speakers of the LL and EL dialects differentiate relativizers used with animates and inanimates. The relativizer for animates is *kon* ‘who’ and for inanimates *so* ‘what’, *kaj* ‘where’ and *sav-* ‘which’. The relativizer *sav-* is quite rare among speakers of Lotfitka dialects in Latvia and Estonia. It is, however, a very common relativizer beside *kaj* in Xaladytka dialects for animates and inanimates. While LL speakers use *kaj* and *so* quite equally by speaker, preferring the second one, EL speakers’ choices depend on the speaker. Two of the EL speakers almost exclusively use the relativizer *kaj*, and one Laloritka and

one EL Roma seem to prefer *so* exclusively. The relativizers *kon*, *so* and *sav-* are marked with a case marking according to Russian and Polish language models (Tenser 2008: 200).

(155) *Me dikhjom du kheer sos-tir tu rakirdžan.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 I saw.1SG that house what.OBL-ABL you talked.2SG
 I saw the house that you were talking about.

(156) *Romni kon-esa me rakirdžam...* (Estonian Lotfitka)
 woman who-OBL.INST we spoke.1PL
 The woman that we spoke to...

7.2.3 Embedded questions

Like in other NE dialects, in Lotfitka dialects embedded questions are introduced with the relevant interrogatives, which is a common Romani feature (Tenser 2008: 201), e.g. *so* ‘what’, *kidi* ‘when’, *kon* ‘who’.

One way to construct the embedded questions with the potential conditional ‘whether’ is without using any conditional particle, a phenomenon mentioned by Tenser (2008: 202) for LL. The other way, which was absent in his data but is strongly present in LL, is with the borrowed Latvian particle *vaj*.

(157) *Me bučum skuolotajustir vaj jow jāla pu kāzi?* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 I asked.1SG teacher.INST Q he come.3SG.FUT at wedding
 I asked the male teacher whether he is coming to the wedding.

(158) *Vaj tu kames pubrojskires tut da štār romane čajenca?* (Latvian Lotfitka)
 Q you.SG want.2SG play.2SG RFLX these four Roma girls.INST
 Do you want to play with those four Gypsy girls?

One Estonian Laloritka and one Lotfitka Roma used a tag question to express the same meaning.

(159) *Phučum ōpetajatir jeela pu bl’ava vaj na jeela.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 asked.1SG teacher.INST come.3SG.FUT at wedding or NEG come.3SG.FUT

7.3 Complementation

The section on complementation follows the structure of the RMS database and is in the context of the factuality continuum proposed by Matras (1999: 18–20). Matras divides the factuality continuum into modal (introduced with *te*), manipulation, purpose and epistemic clauses (introduced with *kaj*).

In linking two predications, *KAJ* and *te* can be taken to represent two extreme ends on a continuum of clause integration (in the sense of Givón 1990): *KAJ* links clauses with independent truth-value, *te* represents the higher degree of integration, marking out predications that have no independent truth-value. In between these two extremes, there is a continuum of clause-linking devices drawn upon to express more ambivalent relations, notably manipulation and various kinds of purpose clauses. The key to a typology of clause-linking devices in such constructions is the degree of semantic integration of the events, and more specifically the degree of semantic control that is attributed to the agent of the main clause. The cline of semantic control governs a choice between *te* for the highest degree of control (and so tightest integration), and a complex subordinator in which *te* participates alongside a ‘reinforcer’, for the lower degree of control (less tight integration of the clauses). (Matras 2002: 181)

In the Latvian and Estonian Lotfitka and Xaladytka dialects, modal clauses complementing verbs such as ‘want’, ‘can’, ‘must’ and ‘like’ are introduced with particle *te*.

- (160) *Me kamaw ti džaw kidi-ta pe Ameerika.* (Estonian Laloritka)
I want.1SG COMP go.1SG sometime to America
I want to visit America some day.

LL has an option of omitting the complementizer (Tenser 2008: 204) and the current data supports this idea. The phenomenon also appears rarely in EL.

- (161) *Me kamjom kheere džaw.* (Estonian Laloritka)
I want.PST.1SG home go.1SG
I wanted to go home.

The epistemic complementation that has been introduced with the complementizer *kaj*

follows three models in Estonian Laloritka. Some older speakers use the inherited complementizer *kaj* in the form *ki*. In addition, some EL speakers follow the Russian model with the complementizer *so* ‘what’, where the epistemic complementizer *umo* matches in the form with the interrogative *umo* ‘what’ (Tenser 2008: 205). The third way is a shared innovation with LL, where the complementizer is *si* ‘how’. LL speakers either use the inherited *kaj* or the more common *si*. In the Estonian data the complementizer is mostly stable in the speech of the informant, and there is rare variation between *ki* and *si*, and between *si* and *so*.

(162) *Me šundžum ki daj dživen i veer roma.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 I heard.1SG COMP here live.3PL also other Roma
 I heard that other Roma live here as well.

(163) *Me šundžum si daj dživen veera roma buut ošt'i.* (Estonian Laloritka)

(164) *Me šundžom so daj vār roma džuvena.* (Estonian Laloritka)

The manipulation clauses show a great variety in Lotfitka dialects similar to other NE dialects (Tenser 2008: 207). With manipulation there is a general tendency to have the same complementizer as with the modal clauses (ibid.), and we can best see it with Xaladytka in Latvia and Estonia where the manipulation clauses are *te* and *sob te*. In LL *te* is used beside the complementizer *me* and *sob te*. In EL the situation is most complex—beside *te*, *ki* and *si*, there are also the complementizer *me* and complex complementizers *sob te* and *si te*. According to Matras (1999: 19), in the speech of the Polska Roma, purpose clauses and manipulative clauses are expressed either with *te* or with a combination of the conjunctions *kaj* and *te* as *kaj te*, which could be the incentive for *si te*.

(165) *Me kamaw ki jow krik te džal.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 I want.1SG COMP he away COMP go
 I want him to go away.

(166) *Me kamaw si jow krik te džal.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 I want him to go away.

- (167) *Jej mukhela tralki me peren tele.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 she lets plates COMP fall.3PL down
 She lets the plate fall.

The purpose clauses are introduced in the Lotfitka dialects and Xaladytka with *te* or *sob(i) te*.

- (168) *Lake na sis zoor sob te džal kheere paale.* (Estonian Laloritka)
 she.DAT NEG was strength COMP go.3SG home back
 She did not have the strength to walk back home.

7.4 Utterance modifiers

Utterance modifier is a term proposed by Matras (1998: 293–294) to denote the contact-vulnerable items in Romani such as

- adversative coordinating conjunctions;
- sentence particles, such as ‘well’, ‘so’ and ‘anyway’;
- fillers, tags and interjections;
- focus particles, including phasal adverbs, such as ‘still’, ‘yet’ and ‘already’.

Utterance modifiers ‘display the function of modifying utterance in a way that would take into account contextual and presuppositional factors’ and they ‘contribute to a component of grammar that the speaker uses to direct the hearer’s reactions’ (ibid.: 294-295).

Utterance modifiers are highly influenced in the situation of language contact. In the NE group, the vulnerability to borrowing is visible by the quantity of borrowed items, as opposed to inherited lexemes, and the tendency is to borrow the utterance modifiers from the current contact languages, replacing the earlier loans from the previous contact languages. (Tenser 2008: 211)

In the case of utterance modifiers, the new lexical items in the speech of the Roma might be seen as code-switching instead of borrowing from the contact languages. Matras (1998: 295) explains an exclusion ‘on the basis of frequency and integration of the items in question, and second, drawing on the stratification of borrowings in Romani’. In EL the vocabulary of utterance modifiers is varied from pre-European inherited items to Polish,

Russian, Latvian and Estonian borrowings.

In EL the coordinating and correlative conjunctions are either inherited as the additive *ti* ‘and’, borrowings from Russian as the additive *i* ‘and’, the contrastive *a* and *no* ‘but’, the alternative *ili* ‘or’, *ili - ili* ‘either or’ and *ni - ni* ‘neither nor’. Beside the Russian borrowings, Latvian borrowings are used in variation as the contrastives *bet* ‘but’, *vaj - vaj* ‘either or’ or *ne - ne* ‘neither nor’. In LL very rare Russian borrowings occur and Latvian conjunctions are most often used. The inherited additive conjunction *ti* ‘and’ is typically retained. There is also an example of the correlative construction *ti - ti* ‘either or’ formed with the inherited *ti* ‘and’.

The three-way distinction in the additive-contrastive coordination ‘and’ < ‘and, however’ < ‘but’ mentioned by Tenser (2008: 212) and Matras (1999: 16) is present in Latvian and EX, but not in the Lotfitka dialects. Matras proposes in his article on utterance modifiers (1998: 302–303) a hierarchy of coordinating conjunctions: ‘and’ < ‘or’ < ‘but’. This hierarchy is applicable in Lotfitka dialects. In LL only ‘but’ is replaced with borrowing—either the Latvian *bet* or the Russian *a*. In EL ‘but’ is usually replaced with the Russian *a*, and ‘or’ with the Russian *il’i* or the inherited/Latvian *vaj*. In both dialects the inherited form *ti* ‘and’ and the Russian *i* are common. Xaladytka dialects borrow all three elements.

Phasal adverbs are loans from Russian languages in all dialects under question, e.g. *уже* ‘already’ and *еще* ‘still’. As in Tenser’s data (2008: 212) the current data assures that no phasal adverbs are borrowed from Latvian and the inherited *butir* ‘(no) more’ is used in all NE dialects, including the Latvian and Estonian ones.

In Lotfitka the inherited loans *nin* ‘also, too’ and the Polish loans *xoč* ‘even’ (Polish *choć*), and *fenju* ‘only’ with unknown origin also appear. There is a core of borrowings that are different for EL and LL. For EL they are borrowed from Russian, e.g. *даже* ‘even’, *тоčнес* ‘exactly’ (Russian *точно*), and for Latvian Lotfitka from Latvian, e.g. Latvian *pat* ‘even’, *tieš, tiešes* ‘exactly’ (Latvian *tieši*), *pilnīgi* ‘entirely’. LX and EX have Russian as a source language and some of the more stable particles are substituted with Russian particles, e.g. *fen’ti* ‘only’ with the Russian *только*.

EL maintains a stock of Polish and Latvian borrowings in the class of utterance modifiers. In the speech of the Laloritka Roma, Estonian borrowings are present as *järsku* ‘suddenly’ and *siiski* ‘however’, but they appear rarely. In EL Russian borrowings are *вдрыз, неожиданно* ‘suddenly’.

Mõre ‘yes, certainly!’ and *xaj/ghaj* ‘even, also’, which are mentioned by Mānušs (1997: 352), are present in the current sample in LL, but not in EL.

7.5 Absence of the copula

More commonly in Xaladytka, but also in EL, the copula is left out in predicative constructions and in perfective participle constructions. This construction is calqued from Russian. The copula is also non-obligatory in other NE dialects under Russian influence (Tenser 2008: 231).

(169) *Daa tiknu čhaavoro.* (Estonian Laloritka)
this small.M boy
This is a small boy.

(179) *Jow boldo.* (Estonian Laloritka)
he baptise.PP.M
He is baptised.

(180) *Vangara bikinle tele.* (Estonian Laloritka)
coal sell.3PL down
The coal was sold.

(181) *Jow sazvattime.* (Estonian Lotfitka)
he AKT.engage.IMEN
He is engaged.

8 Influence of Russian language and Xaladytka Romani on Estonian Lotfitka Romani

This chapter summarizes some features common to Xaladytka dialects that are exhibited in the EL speakers' samples, but not at all or rarely in the LL data. The features have been discussed in the grammatical description sections in this work. Many of the features have been mentioned by Tenser (2008) in the context of Russian Romani (Xaladytka), Latvian Romani (LL) and Estonian Romani.

The local dialects have been heavily influenced by Slavic languages and there is a strong interference with these languages, but the focus here is on recent changes usually triggered by the close contact with Xaladytka speakers. The features are frequent but not the only variants present and not in the speech of all informants.

The influence of Russian is visible from many loanwords in the speech of EL speakers. Russian is currently one of the main sources for borrowings because the active use of Latvian has decreased. Estonian is becoming a more relevant contact language for the younger generation, but Russian is still widely spoken by the younger generation and plays an important role in everyday communication.

Following is a list of features in EL that are motivated by Russian language or the Xaladytka Romani dialect:

- Case agreement between the adjectives and their head nouns, e.g. *tern-e murš-en* > *tern-en murš-en* 'I saw) young men'.
- Absence of the copula, e.g. *Jow si doj* > *Jow doj* 'He is there'.
- The epistemic complementizer *so* 'what'.
- The inherited spatial preposition in the temporal use, e.g. *pal-* 'behind' in the meaning 'during'.
- Temporal adverbials with Slavic case markers, e.g. the instrumental *tašarlen-ca* 'in the mornings'.
- The remoteness marker *-as* added to the present tense personal markers (instead of the perfective verb form), e.g. *kamj-om-as* 'I would like to (want.PRF-1SG-RM)' > *kam-av-as* (want.PRS-1SG-RM).
- The benefactive preposition *vaš* 'for' in the meaning 'about'.
- Indefinite pronouns: the free-choice marker *-нибудь*, e.g. *kon-nibut* 'anyone'

- The Russian borrowing *чем* in comparative constructions.
- Prepositions in inflected forms, e.g. *pal-e*, *pal-o* ‘behind’ instead of *pal*.
- The loanverb participle suffix *-ime(n)* in inherited vocabulary, e.g. *bikin-* ‘to sell’ > *bikn-ime* ‘sold’.
- Non-adaptation of Russian loanwords, e.g. instead of *pol’zini pe* ‘to use’ the form *ispoljzujet* is attested (from the Russian word *использует* ‘to use’).
- The Russian irrealis/conditional particle *by*.
- Additional layer of reflexive particles motivated by calques from Russian, e.g. *sal pes* ‘to laugh’ < Russia *смеяться* ‘to laugh’
- Additional layer of aktionsart prefixes motivated by calques from Russian, e.g. *ras-phen-* < Russian *рас-сказать* ‘tell (a story)’

Triggered by the influence of the Xaladytka Romani dialect is the case agreement with adjectives that we can sometimes find in the EL dialect. None of the speakers use it consistently and it is a quite rare feature. There are no examples of numerals or demonstratives agreeing with head nouns, which is sometimes seen in EX.

The other feature concerning the use of cases are calques from Russian to derive temporal adverbials using Slavic case markers with the instrumental case marker *-sa*, the locative *-te* and the ablative *-tir* (Tenser 2008: 78). The latter is also common in LL with *tašarlendir* ‘mornings’, but the first two are found only in Estonian dialects (e.g. *tašarlate*, *tašarlenca* ‘in the mornings’, *belvelenca* ‘in the evenings’).

The epistemic complementizer *so* ‘what’ common in Xaladytka is also used by two EL speakers. The parallel form *si* ‘how’ common in LL is also used by both of the speakers. In LL there are no examples of *so* used as a complementizer.

Another example following the Russian model is the inherited spatial preposition in temporal use. In EL *pal-* ‘behind’ is common in the meaning ‘during’. Therefore, they are calquing the Russian model as in Russian the prefix *за* ‘behind’ is used for the meaning ‘during’ (Tenser 2008: 178–179).

In the category of prepositions, another example of contact-induced influence from the Xaladytka dialect is the use of the benefactive preposition *vaš* ‘for’. It is found marginally in the NE group and is typically used as the referential ‘about’ (Tenser 2008: 180). In Russian Romani (Xaladytka) the meaning ‘about’ is both expressed with the prepositions *vaš* and *pal-*. In LL the preposition *vaš* is often used in the benefactive meaning, and the

ablative case marking is used to express the meaning ‘about’, e.g. *rakirla les-tir* ‘speaks about him’. In the Estonian dialects *vaš*, *pal-* and the ablative case are mixed among the speakers and dialects to express ‘about’, and we see the use of both (Xaladytka and LL) systems.

As an influence from Xaladytka, there are few cases in EL with the remoteness marker *-as* added to the present tense personal marker, which is an innovation in Russian Xaladytka, instead of it being added to the perfective verb as in other NE dialects.

According to Tenser (2008: 146), Russian Romani and LL do not always use Romani morphology with loan verbs in the imperative form, but instead keep the original one. In Estonia we see the same with local dialects—Xaladytka and Lotfitka—but in both cases the source language is only Russian. This strategy is probably directly taken from the Xaladytka dialect as Estonian and Latvian verbs do not behave the same way. Another case showing the avoidance of Romani verbal morphology is the general tendency in Russian Romani and in its satellites to not integrate loan verbs at all, as described by Tenser (2008: 121). The same occurs in EX and due to the influence of Xaladytka, in EL as well.

There are also a few examples where the participle suffix *-imen* commonly used with loanwords is used with inherited Romani verbs. Tenser points out that the same has been found in Russian Romani (2008: 150).

Also, concerning the verbal morphology, the use of the reflexive particle is sometimes motivated by the Russian model and used as in Xaladytka, while typically in EL the verb would not be used as a reflexive as with ‘to laugh’ *sa-* and *sa- pes*. LL speakers often do not use the reflexive form in the cases in which the verb in Latvian language is reflexive as with the above-mentioned verb *sa-* ‘laugh’. This might be based on the feature that many of the Latvian verbs in reflexive form do not clearly express reflexive uses.

The Russian conditional/irrealis particle *by* is found in the EL and EX dialects.

Russian verbal prefixes are commonly used with inherited and borrowed verbs. The system of aktionsart prefixes is very productive and used to modify verbs following the Russian models. Russian verbal prefixes are common in the LL and EL dialects. Still, in LL we see more Latvian verbal prefixes than in the EL dialect in which the Russian verbal prefixes are dominant.

Concerning syntax in EL, the copula is sometimes omitted in predicative constructions and

with perfective participle constructions, based on the Russian syntactic structure. There are some LL speakers who do the same, but in both cases it is most probably an influence from Russian language or Xaladytka Romani.

Concerning indefinite pronouns, the free-choice marker *-нибудь* is borrowed from Russian and combined with interrogatives to form all pronouns such as *kon-nibut* 'anyone', *so-nibut* 'anything', *kidi-nibut* 'anytime' and *kaj-nibut* 'anywhere'. In LL only the specific marker *-to* is borrowed from Latvian, but the free-choice indefinite pronouns are expressed in the conservative model 'X na X' as *kon-na-kon* 'anybody' or the same way as a specific category.

In EL comparatives are either expressed similarly to LL with *si(r)* 'how' or with the Russian borrowing *чем*, which is common in LX but not used by LL speakers.

Concerning the vocabulary, the weekdays are more commonly Russian loans than Estonian ones in EL. In LL the weekdays are borrowed from Latvian, and even the Greek origin *kurko* 'Sunday' is replaced with the Latvian *svētdiena*, but *kurko* is retained in the meaning 'week'. In the category of utterance modifiers, borrowings from Russian are present in Lotfitka in both countries, but in EL there is a higher number of these. Latvian borrowings are quite strongly present in the class of utterance modifiers, but Estonian has not yet replaced many.

9 The Estonian Lotfitka dialect compared to Latvian Lotfitka

This chapter gives a brief comparison between the EL and LL dialects. The features that are discussed have been mentioned in the earlier chapters and many of them have been mentioned by Mānušs et al. (1997) in the Latvian Romani (Latvian Lotfitka) context and by Tenser (2008) in the Latvian or Estonian Romani context. The focus of this section is on features that are retained in EL but show innovation in LL; differences in option selection in the two dialects; and differences in the changes resulting from the inter-dialectal influence from EX on EL and from language contact with Latvian, Estonian and Russian.

Table 12. Consonant and vowel changes in Estonian and Latvian Lotfitka

	Conservative form	Estonian Lotfitka	Latvian Lotfitka
Metathesis of <i>pš</i>	<i>pšal</i> (<i>phal</i> < <i>phral</i>) 'brother'	<i>pšal</i> (< <i>phal</i>)	<i>špal</i>
Metathesis of <i>kš</i>	<i>kšil</i> (< <i>khil</i>) 'butter'	<i>škil</i> , <i>kšil</i>	<i>škil</i>
Metathesis of <i>tf</i> > <i>ft</i>	<i>Lotfos</i> , <i>Lotfitka</i> 'Latvian'	<i>Lotfitka</i>	<i>Loftos</i>
Metathesis of <i>tk</i> > <i>kt</i>	<i>Lotfitka</i> , <i>bogitku</i> 'poor'	<i>Lotfitka</i>	<i>Lotfikta</i> , <i>bogiktu</i>
<i>t</i> ' > <i>č</i>	<i>rat'a</i> 'nights'	<i>rat'a</i> , <i>rača</i>	<i>rača</i>
<i>kh</i> ' > <i>kš</i> '	<i>dikh'a</i> 'to see'	<i>dikh'a</i>	<i>dikš'a</i>
<i>th</i> > <i>č(h)</i>	<i>lathel</i> 'to find'	<i>lathel</i>	<i>lač(h)el</i>
Voicing of <i>ph-</i> in <i>phuč-</i>	<i>phuč-</i> 'to ask'	<i>phuč-</i>	<i>buč-</i>
Latvian voiceless palatal stop <i>ķ</i>	<i>ķeeķa</i> 'kitchen'	<i>č'eeč'a</i>	<i>ķeeķa</i>
<i>r</i> > <i>l</i> in <i>ripirel</i>	<i>ripirel</i> 'to remember'	<i>ripirel</i>	<i>lipirel</i>
Metathesis of <i>baga-</i> > <i>gaba-</i>	<i>baga-</i> 'to sing'	<i>gaba-</i> , <i>baga-</i>	<i>gaba-</i>
Initial <i>v-</i> in <i>ašti</i> 'can'	<i>ašti</i> 'can'	<i>ašti/vašti</i>	<i>vašti</i>
Raising of final vowel <i>o</i> > <i>u</i>	<i>kirlo</i> 'throat'	<i>kirlo</i>	<i>kirlu</i>

9.1 Innovations

An innovation that has taken place in EL is the adaptation of the Latvian palatalized consonant *ķ* to EL as the palatalized devoiced affricate *č'*. This consonant is preserved in LL in Latvian loanwords such as Latvian *ķēķis* > Romani *ķēķa* 'kitchen', Latvian *puķe* > Romani *puķa* 'flower', but has adjusted to EL as the palatalized devoiced affricate *č'* as in *č'eeč'a* and *puč'a*.

9.2 Retentions

In LL many innovations have emerged concerning vowel and consonant changes. Out of these innovations, some have spread to EL to some extent and some not at all. Some individual changes have taken place in separate lexical items such as *r* > *l* in *ripirel* and *ph* > *b* in *phuč-*, and these have not yet spread to EL. Other changes have taken place more systematically, e.g. metathesis of *pš* > *šp*, *kš* > *šk*, *tj* > *ft* etc. Some of these changes have also spread to EL and with many we see a continuum of different stages from LL to EL, e.g. *phal* > *pšal* > *špal* 'brother' or *khil* > *kšil* > *škil* 'butter'.

The innovations in LL include the raising of the final vowel *o* > *u*, e.g. *kirlo* > *kirlu* 'throat', *baaro* > *baaru* 'big' and *lajkos* > *lajkus* 'time'. The raising of the final vowel from *o* > *u* in LL, also mentioned by Tenser (2008: 23), has not taken place that widely in EL. It is noticeable in one-syllable lexemes more often, i.e. *ko* > *ku* 'at, to, near'; *mo* > *mu* 'my', but has not spread that widely to longer items. In LL it is common to see changes from *kirlo* > *kirlu* 'throat', *tumaaro* > *tumaaru* 'your.PL', *maaro* > *maaru* 'bread'. This change has happened under the influence of Latvian dialects, and in the etymological dictionary of LL it is noted that the 'old *o*' is pronounced only /u/ in Kurzeme and /o/ or /u/ in Vidzeme. In other Romani dialects it is pronounced /o/. (Mānušs et al. 1997: 14)

Out of the NE dialects, the innovations that have taken place only in LL are probably recent ones that have taken place after the speech communities of LL and EL have grown more distant. The changes are also not present in all samples of LL and often the LL speakers that do not share some innovations also do not share others, so there is a continuum among speakers of LL, not only between LL and EL. In the etymological dictionary of Latvian Romani, Mānušs (1997: 8) lists even more changes, e.g. metathesis of some consonants that are not widespread in the current samples of LL but were well

known to him.

Another retention in EL is the presence of the older form of the modal verb *ašti* ‘can’ without the initial *v-* compared to the innovative *vašti*, which is the only form present in LL and has also spread to EL to some extent.

Another layer of phonetic features that are in the process of changing are innovations having taken place in other NE dialects. These innovations have gone farthest in Polish Romani and spread to the Baltic Romani dialects. The change concerns the palatalized consonants *d’*, *t’* and *kh’* and is easily noticed in the perfective markers that become sibilants in Lotfitka dialects, *d’* > *dž’*, *t’* > *č’* and *kh’* > *ks’* in *ripird’a* > *ripirdž’a* ‘he/she remembered’, *lat’a* > *lač’a* ‘he/she found’, *dikh’a* > *dikša* ‘he/she saw’. It is present also in separate lexical items, e.g. in the plural forms *id’a* > *idž’a* ‘clothes’, *rat’a* > *rač’a* ‘nights’. These changes are quite widespread in EL as well, but with some exceptions, i.e. in EL the form *dikh’a* has been retained compared to the Latvian *dikša* ‘he/she saw’ and the Polish Romani *dikča*, and in separate lexical items, such as *xot’* instead of LL *xoč* ‘although’, conservative forms are present beside the innovative ones.

The changes that are common for Polish and Baltic dialects have spread from Poland to speakers in Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian. Because Estonia is furthest from Poland some of the changes are present in the Lithuanian and Latvian Romani dialects, but not in EL. Also, the small population of Estonian Roma is impacting the spread of innovations.

In EL the modal complementizer *te* is always present. In LL the complementizer is sometimes omitted. The complementizer *kaj* in the form *ki* has decreased in the Lotfitka dialects and been replaced by *sir* (*si*) ‘how’ or *so* ‘what’. Still, the complementizer *ki* is better preserved in EL in which it is used as complementizer in the epistemic and manipulation categories by some speakers. In LL it is used by one speaker and only in the epistemic category. *Kaj* as a relativizer is also more commonly used for inanimates in relative clauses in EL.

The marker *-ime(n)* used to form participles from recently borrowed verbs is productive in the EL dialect, but it has diminished in LL and there are only rare examples of it.

.

9.3 Option selection

These selections in EL and LL are basing on individual speakers’ choices.

In EL two lexical items that have had the initial *a-* and from which one has been jotted and one exhibits the prothesis of the consonant *v-* have retained the original forms beside the innovative form, e.g. *ačh-* and *jačh-* ‘to stay’, *ašti* and *vašti* ‘can’. In LL only the innovative forms are found.

In both Lotfitka dialects is an option to use the demonstrative *da* to show definiteness. It is more grammaticalized in EL but also present in LL. This tendency is present in other NE dialects.

In EL the numerals from ‘11’ to ‘19’ are marked either with the marker *-u-* or without it, e.g. *deš-u-jekh* ‘11’ or *deš-jekh*. The common strategy in the NE dialects is to mark ‘11’ to ‘14’ with the marker *-u-* and ‘15’ to ‘19’ without it. The common strategy has not fully remained in LL either, but there is still stronger tendency towards the conservative system.

In EL and LL beside the regular third-person singular marker *-el*, the Greek-origin marker *-i* is present. The marker is often used with loanwords and is more common in LL than in the EL dialect. LL has a tendency to use the marker more on loanwords without the loan adaptation marker *-in-*.

9.4 Inter-dialectal influence

The main differences concerning inter-dialectal influence are present due to EX influence on the EL dialect and is discussed in section 8.

An innovation in LL is that the reflexive enclitics on verbs have personalized forms (*man*, *tut*, *men*, *tumen*), while in Estonian the reflexive enclitics can also be impersonal in the form of *pe(s)* beside the Latvian system.

9.5 Influence of contact languages

In the EL dialect there are some examples of Latvian aktionsart verbal prefixes, but in LL the prefixes are more common and often calqued based on the Latvian equivalent or a borrowed verb with a prefix. The reflexive verbs are more common, and in addition to Slavic equivalents, triggered by Latvian reflexive verbs.

In LL the Latvian question particle *vaj* is present in some speakers’ samples following the

Latvian model. In EL no question particles are used, but sometimes tag questions are found for the same function.

In LL in many spheres, Latvian borrowings are replacing older borrowings or inherited Romani vocabulary more intensively than in EL. The Polish concessive conditional clause *choc* ‘even though, although’ and *choćby* ‘even if’ are retained to some extent, but Latvian loans are borrowed into Romani, e.g. *lai gan*, *kaut gan*, *kaut arī* ‘although’ and *pat ja* ‘even if’. Furthermore, the Latvian borrowed conjunction *ja* ‘if’ is present as a new borrowing that is not found in Estonian Romani dialects. There is also the Latvian semi-calque *ne-si* from the Latvian *ne-kā* ‘than’. The indefinite pronoun ‘always’ *sajg/sajk/sajek* is replaced with the Latvian borrowing *vienmēr*. Weekdays are all in Latvian and even the Greek-origin *kurko* ‘Sunday’ is replaced with the Latvian counterpart, but it is still used in EL.

Conclusion

This thesis gives an overview of the Estonian Lotfitka Romani dialect. The main focus is on describing grammatical features important in the context of Estonian and Latvian Lotfitka and other North-eastern Romani dialects. The thesis documents the current state of the Lotfitka dialect in Estonia, lists the tendencies that are visible in newly acquired elicitation data, and more generally draws attention to Roma and Romani language in Estonia.

Important grammatical features of Estonian Lotfitka Romani are described in chapter 5 on phonology, chapter 6 on morphology and chapter 7 on syntax. In chapter 8 the features that have been influenced by the Xaladytka Romani dialect or Russian language are listed. Chapter 9 compares Estonian and Latvian Lotfitka dialects based on their most distinctive features.

This thesis draws attention to the fact that Estonian and Latvian Lotfitka dialects have many distinctive features. Both dialects are moving in different directions due to different current contact languages, distant speech communities and innovations that are taking place independently.

In addition, the thesis presents the differences between the Estonian Lotfitka dialect and the Estonian Xaladytka dialect to emphasize that there are two distinct dialects spoken in Estonia and not a uniform Estonian Romani language. Many Estonian Roma interact with speakers of both dialects, which leads to a transfer of features from one to another in both directions. The scope of the language interference and speech of individuals being in active interaction with speakers of both dialects, including speakers whose parents or other close relatives are speakers of different dialects, should be researched in more detail.

The Estonian Lotfitka and Estonian Xaladytka dialects should be researched in more detail, as there are differences between the language variants in Estonia, Latvia and Russia and language support for the community cannot be given on the basis of research done in other countries. In the current work, only the impact of Xaladytka on Estonian Lotfitka, with some features identified, was discussed. The language features that are transferred from Estonian Lotfitka to Estonian Xaladytka speakers and the idiolects of the speakers who tend to mix the dialects more intensively remains undescribed.

References

- Ariste, Paul 1938. Romenge paramiši : mustlaste muinasjutte. Tartu: P. Arumaa
- Ariste, Paul 1940a. Laiuse mustlased. Tartu Ülikooli Toimetised B50, 1–26.
- Ariste, Paul 1940b. Soome mustlaste kohanimed. Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis (Dorpatensis) B45. Tartu: K. Mattiesen, 1–18.
- Ariste, Paul 1958. Des Tziganes (Bohémiens) des pays Baltes. Omagiu lui Iorgu Iordan cu prilejul împlinirii a 70 de ani, 35–40. București: Editura Academiei.
- Ariste, Paul 1961. The Latvian Gypsy Legend of May Rose. Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society Third Series, 40, 100–105.
- Ariste, Paul 1962. O. W. Masing ja mustlaskeel. Keel ja Kirjandus nr 10, 609–611.
- Ariste, Paul 1964. Supplementary review concerning the Baltic Gypsies and their dialect. Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society, third series, p. 58–61.
- Ariste, Paul 1967. Tükike lõunamaad Laiusel. Punalipp, nr 45.
- Ariste, Paul 1969. Ein lettisches Ableitungssuffix im Zigeunerischen. Baltistica 5, 2, 179–181. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Ariste, Paul 1973. Lettische Verbalpräfixe in einer Zigeunermundart. Baltistica 9, 1, 79–81. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Ariste, Paul 1978. On two intonations in a Romany dialect. Studies on accent, quantity, stress, tone. Papers of the symposium. Estonian papers in phonetics, 7, 5–7.
- Ariste, Paul 1983 (1985). Eesti laensõnu mustlaskeeles. Emakeele Seltsi aastaraamat, Volume 29, 25–28.
- Ariste, Paul 1984. Laiuse mustlasi meenutades. Keel ja Kirjandus, 27, 4, 223–225.
- Ariste, Paul 2012. Mustlaste raamat. Compiled and edited by Urmas Sutrop. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- Backus, Ad 2013. A usage-based approach to borrowability. In Eline Zenner & Gitte Christiansen (eds.), New perspectives on lexical borrowing. Zenner, E. & Kristiansen, G. (eds.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 19–39.

- Basic Schools and Upper Secondary Schools Act 2010. Riigi Teataja. <https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/530102013023/consolide> (15.11.2016)
- Blomster, Risto 1999. Eesti mustlased enne Teist maailmasõda. Lohetapja. *Pro folkloristica*, volume 6. Tartu: Eesti Kirjandusmuuseum, 36-41.
- Bodnarova, Zuzana 2015. Vend Romani: a Grammatical Description and Sociolinguistic Situation of the so-called Vend dialects of Romani. Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Arts.
- Elšík, Viktor 1997. Towards a morphology-based typology of Romani. In *Typology and Dialectology of Romani*, edited by Y. Matras, P. Bakker, H. Kyuchukov. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 23–60.
- Elšík, Viktor, Yaron Matras 2001a. Romani Morpho-Syntactic (RMS) Database. University of Manchester, Department of Linguistics
- Elšík, Viktor, Yaron Matras 2001b. Romani Dialectological Questionnaire. University of Manchester, Department of Linguistics.
- Elšík, Viktor, Yaron Matras. 2006. *Markedness and Language Change: The Romani Sample*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Estonian Population and Housing Census 2000. Statistics Estonia. <http://www.stat.ee/population-census-2000> (15.11.2016)
- Estonian Population and Housing Census 2011. Statistics Estonia. <http://www.stat.ee/phc2011> (15.11.2016)
- Kukk, Tiit 1983. Paul Ariste mustlaskeelee uurijana. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 26, 8, 433-440.
- Lutt, Roman, Lembit Vaba, Jüri Viikberg 1999. Mustlased. Eesti rahvaste raamat: rahvusvähemused, -rühmad ja -killud. Koost. Jüri Viikberg. Tallinn: Eesti Entsüklopeediakirjastus, 334-339.
- Lutt, Roman, Jüri Ginter, Viktoria Neborjakina, Tatjana Neborjakina, Kadri Põldaru 2011. Romad Eesti haridussüsteemis. Uurimise aruanne. Tartu. https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/romad_eesti_haridussusteemis.pdf (15.11.2016)
- Mānušs, Leksa, Jānis Neilands, Kārlis Rudevičs 1997. Čigānu-latviešu-angļu etimoloģiskā vārdnīca un latviešu-čigānu vārdnīca. Rigi: Zvaigzne ABC.

- Matras, Yaron 1998. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics* 36-2: 281–331.
- Matras, Yaron 1999. The speech of the Polska Roma: some highlighted features and their implications for Romani dialectology. *JGLS, fifth series*, 9(1): 1–28.
- Matras, Yaron 2002. *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron, Christopher White, Viktor Elšík 2009. Everaert, Martin and Musgrave, Simon (eds.) 2009. The use of databases in cross-linguistic studies. *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology*, 41. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 329-362.
- Miklosich, Franz 1972–1881. *Über die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europas*. Wien.
- Pajusalu, Renate 2000. Indefinite determiners *mingi* and *üks* in Estonian. In: Erelt, M. (Ed.). *Estonian: typological studies. IV*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 87–117.
- Population Census 2000. Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia. <http://data.csb.gov.lv> (15.11.2016)
- Pott, August Friedrich 1844. *Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien: ethnographisch-linguistische Untersuchung, vornehmlich ihrer Herkunft und Sprache, nach gedruckten und ungedruckten Quellen*. Halle: E. Heynemann.
- ROMLEX = Romani Lexical Database. <http://romani.uni-graz.at/romlex/>
- Ross, Anette 2013. *Eesti romade mitmekeelsus: keeleoskus, keelekasutus ja keelekasutuse mõjutajad*. Tartu: Tartu University.
- Ross, Anette 2016. Estonian Lotfitka Romani and its contact languages. *Linguistic, Social and Cognitive Aspects of Language Contacts and Multilingualism. Philologia Estonica Tallinensis*, Vol 1, 154–172.
- Rusakov, Aleksandrs Yu. 2001. The North Russian Romani Dialect: Interference and Code Switching. *The circum-Baltic languages : typology and contact. Vol. 1, Past and present*. Edited by Östen Dahl and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 313–337.
- Tenser, Anton 2005. *Grammatical Description of the Lithuanian Romani Dialect*. Munich: Lincom Europa.

- Tenser, Anton 2008. Northeastern Group of Romani Dialects. Manchester: The University of Manchester.
- Tenser, Anton 2014. Slavic and Germanic verb derivations in Lotfitka Romani dialect: asymmetries. Oral presentation on the 11th International Conference on Romani Linguistics, Oslo.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey 2001. Language Contact : [an introduction]. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey, Terrence Kaufman 1988. Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Thesleff, Arthur 1901. Wörterbuch des Dialekts der finnländischen Zigeuner . Helsingfors: Druckerei der Finnischenliteratur-gesellschaft.
- Ventzel, Tatjana V. 1983. The Gypsy Language. Moscow: Nauka Publishing House.
- Weinreich, Uriel 1953. Languages in contact : findings and problems; with a preface by Andre Martinet. New York.
- Wolf, Siegmund A. 1960. Großes Wörterbuch der Zigeunersprache (romani tsiw). Wortschatz deutscher und anderer europäischer Zigeunerndialekte. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut.

Eestis kõneldav roma keele Lotfitka murrak

Uurimistö „Eestis kõneldav roma keele Lotfitka murrak” annab ülevaate roma keelest Eestis ning keskendub eelkõige Eestis kõneldavale roma keele Lotfitka murrakule. Eestis on levinud kaks roma keele murret – Lotfitka (Läti) ja Xaladytka (Vene) murded. Lotfitka murret kõneletakse nii Eestis kui Lätis ja seetõttu on uurimistöös vastavad murdekujud nimetatud Eesti Lotfitka murrakuks ja Läti Lotfitka murrakuks. Xaladytka roma murre on levinud üle Venemaa ning ka Eestis ja Lätis. Lotfitka ja Xaladytka murded kuuluvad roma keele kirderühma murrete hulka. Eesti Lotfitka murraku kirjeldamisel on keskmes selle erinevused Lätis kõneldava Lotfitka murdega ning mõjud, mis tulenevad intensiivsest kokkupuutest Eestis elavate Xaladytka romadega. Muutused, mis on Eesti Lotfitka murrakus toimunud Xaladytka murde mõjul on aset leidnud ilmselt alates II maailmasõjast, kui Xaladytka romad asusid enam elama Eesti aladele. Lotfitka murrakute erinevused on ilmselt kujunenud mõningal määral pikema perioodi jooksul, sest juba enne II maailmasõda oli Eesti aladel Läti päritolu romasid.

Uurimistö esimesed peatükid tutvustavad Eestis kõneldud ja kõneldavaid roma keele murdeid ning roma keele uurimise ajalugu Eestis ja mujal. Kuni 1939. aastani elasid Eestis peamiselt Laiuse (Lajenge) romad. Laiuse roma murre kuulus looderühma murrete hulka, olles sarnande Rootsis ja Soomes kõneldava roma murdega. Lisaks Laiuse romadele liikus Eesti aladel ka Lätist pärit Lotfitka romasid ja Venemaalt pärit Xaladytka romasid. 19. ja 20. sajandil enne Teist maailmasõda oli enim rändava elustiiliga romasid pärit just Lätist. Vene romasid oli enne Teist maailmasõda kümne perekonna ringis ning nad liikusid peamiselt Ida-Eestis. (Lutt jt 1999: 334–335) Pärast Teist maailmasõda suurenes Xaladytka romade ränne Eestisse. Lotfitka romade liikumine Eesti aladele, eelkõige Lätti, on jätkunud tänaseni. Roma keele uurimise ja roma murrete kohta saab eesti keeles rohkem lugeda magistristö autori (Ross 2013) bakalaureusetööst, mis käsitles Eesti romade keeleoskust ja keelekasutust.

Siinse töö kontekstis on oluline eristada Eestis kõneldavat Lotfitka ja Xaladytka murret. Lotfitka murde kõnelejad peavad ennast kas Lotfitka (Läti) või Laloritka (Eesti) romadeks. Lotfitka murde uurimises on teinud suure töö Läti päritolu roma Lekša Mānušs, kelle koostatud Lotfitka murde etümoloogiline sõnaraamat ja lühike grammatikakirjeldus on ilmunud 1997. aastal. Paul Ariste on alates 1930ndatest 80ndateni avaldanud mitmeid artikleid romade keele, kommete ja ajaloo kohta. Ta on kogunud keelematerjali Laiuse ja

Eesti Lotfitka murrete kohta ning säilinud materjalid on kättesaadavad Eesti Rahvaluule Arhiivis nime all Mustlase I ja II. Osa Ariste roma keele teemalisi artikleid on avaldatud 2012. aastal teoses „Mustlaste raamat”.

Uurimistöös viies, kuues ja seitsmes peatükk kirjeldavad Eestis kõneldava Lotfitka murraku olulisi grammatilisi jooni fonoloogias, morfoloogias ja süntaksis. Olulisel kohal on näited Läti Lotfitka murrakust ning Eesti ja Läti Xaladytka murrakutest. Kaheksas peatükk võtab kokku olulised grammatilised tunnused, mis ilmnevad Eesti Lotfitka murdes kas Xaladytka murde või vene keele mõjul. Üheksandas peatükis tuuakse välja põhilised erinevused Eestis ja Lätis kõneldava Lotfitka murde keelekujudes.

Töö lähtub Anton Tenseri (2008) doktoritööst, milles käsitletakse roma keele kirderühma murdeid laiemalt. Tenseri töös on Eestist kogutud kuus näidet analüüsitud ühiselt Eesti roma murde (*Estonian Romani*) nime all. Käesoleva magistritöö eesmärk on täiendada Tenseri esitatud põhjalikku murdekirjeldust ning pöörata seejuures tähelepanu Eesti Lotfitka ja Xaladytka murrakute erinevustele, sest osa ühele murdele iseloomulikke jooni on Tenseri töös üle kantud ühise analüüsi käigus ka teisele. Samuti on eesmärgiks pöörata tähelepanu Eestis ja Lätis kõneldava Lotfitka murde erikujudele, sest Tenseri mitmed ühiseks nimetatud tunnused on levinud ainult ühes murdekujus.

Magistritöös kasutatud keelematerjal on kogutud Helsingi Ülikooli läbi viidud projekti „Soome roma murre ja teised roma keele põhjarühma murded Läänemere piirkonnas” (*Finnish Romani and other northern dialects of Romani in the Baltic Sea area*) raames. 2013. ja 2015. aastal koguti välitöödel 11 lingvistilisel tõlkeküsitlusel põhinevat intervjuud Eestis. 2013. aastal koguti 14 intervjuud Läti Lotfitka murraku kõnelejatega ja 3 intervjuud Läti Xaladytka murraku kõnelejatega. Välitööd viisid Eestis läbi Anton Tenser, Roman Lutt, Zalina Dabla ja Anette Ross ning Lätis Dainis Krauklis ja Anton Tenser. Keelenäidete kogumise aluseks oli Yaron Matrasi ja Viktor Elšíku koostatud roma keele morfo-süntaktiline tõlkeküsimustik, mille põhjal on koostatud roma keele morfo-süntaktiline andmebaas (Romani Morpho-Syntax Database = RMS) (Matras, Elšík 2001a).

Tenser toetub oma doktoritöös samuti Matrasi ja Elšíku (2001a) koostatud roma keele morfo-süntaktilisele tõlkeküsimustikule ning selle põhjal loodud andmebaasile. Kuna roma keelt kõneletakse üle maailma, aitab selline ühiste keelenäidetele üles ehitatud küsimustik luua võrreldavad andmed roma keele analüüsimiseks eri keelenäidete taustal. Ka siinses uurimistöös on kasutatud RMS-i andmebaasis sisalduvaid keelenäiteid

naabermurrete kohta – sealt pärinevad näited kirderühma kuuluvate Leedu ja Poola roma murrete kohta.

Eesti keelejuhtide seas oli seitse Lotfitka murde ja neli Xaladytka murde kõnelejat. Lotfitka murde kõnelejad elasid Paides, Pärnus ja Tapal ning on varem elanud Raplas, Kohilas, Kohtla-Järvel, Elvas, Tartus, Viljandis, Rakveres ning väiksemates külades. Keelejuhid olid sündinud Eestis, välja arvatud üks keelejuht, kes oli sündinud Lätis ja kolinud Eestisse varases lapsepõlves. Lotfitka murde kõnelejad olid 25 kuni 65 aastat vanad. Nendest olid kuus naised ja üks mees. Xaladytka murde kõnelejad elasid Tapal, Kohilas, Narvas ja Tallinnas. Kaks keelejuhti olid sündinud Eestis ja kaks Venemaal, kes 7- ja 18-aastaselt olid kolinud Eestisse. Keelejuhtidest kolm olid naised ja üks mees. Üks keelejuht oli umbes 25-aastane ja teised 60 kuni 75 aastat vanad.

Uurimuses on Eesti Lotfitka ja Laloritka romade keelenäited analüüsitud ühiselt Lotfitka murraku nime all. Laloritka romad on Lotfitka romade järeltulijad, Laloritka tähistab Lotfitka murdes Eestit ja Eestiga seonduvat. Sõna algupärane tähendus roma keeles on 'tumm' (Mānušs 1997), kuid keelejuhid ei osanud algupärast tähendust ise välja tuua. Laloritka romad seovad ennast tugevamalt Eestiga kui Eesti Lotfitka romad. Näiteks toodi keelematerjali kogumisel välja, et Laloritka romad elavad Eestis ja on saanud siin oma hariduse, seega on nad ka Eesti romad mitte Läti. Senise analüüsi põhjal on raske välja tuua kindlaid jooni, mis eristaksid Laloritka ja Eesti Lotfitka romade keelekasutust, kuid võib eeldada, et Laloritka romad on vastuvõtlikumad eesti keele mõjudele, sh laenudele. Lotfitka romad hoiavad tugevamat sidet Lätiga, säilitavad oma keeles rohkem Läti mõjusid ning võivad ka suurema tõenäosusega osaleda uuendustes, mis toimuvad Lätis kõneldavas Lotfitka murdes.

Roma keele kirjeldamisel on olulised nii keelesuguluse kaudu edasi kanduvad muutused (*genetic model*) kui muutuse geograafilisest tekkekohast teistele kõnelejatele ja murretesse levivad muutused (*geographic diffusion model*). Matras (2002: 215) kirjeldab, et roma keele murrete sugulus põhineb roma rühmadele, kes ühiselt liikusid Bütsantsi riigist edasi Balkanile, ning nende rühmade keel arenes eri piirkondades ühtse murdena edasi. Perioodi, mil romad asusid Bütsantsi riigi territooriumil, nimetatakse roma keele varaseks perioodiks (*Early Romani*). Roma keel oli sel ajal tugeva kreeka keele mõju all ning saavutas küllaltki ühtse keelekuju. Edasi liiguti Euroopasse, kus eri aegadel Euroopasse tulnud roma kogukondades hakkasid keelemuutused üha enam levima ühest murdest teise olenevalt kõnelejate uutest rändeladest. Nii levisid keelemuutused lähtuvalt roma rühmade

geograafilisest asukohast ning sõltusid vähem lähemalt suguluses olevatest rühmadest, kes võisid liikuda teistel aladel ja kellega võis kontakt nõrgeneda või üldse kaduda.

Eesti kontekstis on keelesuguluse kaudu levivad muutused näha Lotfitka murde Lätis ja Eestis asuva kõnelejaskonna kaudu. Lotfitka murde Eestis asuv kõnelejaskond on varasemalt olnud osa Läti Lotfitka kõnelejaskonnast ning Lotfikta murdes toimunud muutused on olemas mõlemas Lotfitka praeguses murrakus. Nüüd, kui Eestis asuvad Lotfitka murde kõnelejad on pigem distantseerunud Läti kogukonnast, jääb osa uuendusi ainult Läti Lotfitka kõnesse. Eestis on suuremaks muutuste põhjustajaks lävimine kohaliku Xaladytka murrakuga. Xaladytka murre on küll keelesuguluselt küllaltki lähedane murre, kuuludes samuti roma keele kirderühma murrete hulka, kuid on siiski arenenud teises suunas. Murrete piisava erinevuse tõttu on Xaladytka murdest levivad muutused märgatavad ainult Eesti Lotfitka murrakus, kuid mitte Läti Lotfitkas, mille kõnelejal ei ole olnud nii intensiivset kontakti Xaladytka murde kõnelejatega.

Nagu eelnevalt mainitud, on Eestis kõneldava Lotfitka murraku kirjeldamise seisukohalt oluline geograafiline ja sotsiaalne eraldumine Lätis kõneldavast Lotfitka murrakust ja sellega kaasnevalt sealsetest muutustest kõrvalejäämine ning Xaladytka murde mõjud.

Vene keele ja Xaladytka murde mõju Eesti Lotfitka murrakule

Xaladytka murde ja vene keele mõju Eesti Lotfitka murrakule on esmalt märgatav rohkete laenude tõttu. Vene keel ja teised slaavi keeled on kirderühma murdeid mõjutanud ka varasematel perioodidel, kuid viimane kiht mõjutusi Eesti Lotfitka murrakus väljendub just erinevustes Lätis kõneldava Lotfitka murdega. Järgnevalt esitatakse põhilised vene keelest ja roma keele Xaladytka murdest mõjutatud keeletunnused Eesti Lotfitka murrakus. Kõik välja toodud tunnused esinevad korduvalt mitmel kõnelejal ning on seega põhjust arvata, et need on Eesti Lotfitka murde kõnelejate seas laiemalt levinud ja esinevad küllaltki stabiilselt.

- Xaladytka murdes on levinud omadussõnade, arvsõnade ja näitavate asesõnade ühildumine peasõna käändega. Üldiselt käänatakse roma keeles ainult peasõna ja eelnevad täiendid saavad obliikvakäändelise lõpu. Xaladytka murde mõjul on ka Eesti Lotfitka murrakus näiteid täiendite ühildumisest peasõnaga, nt *tern-e murš-a* ‘noored mehed’ > *tern-e murš-en* ‘(ma nägin) noori mehi’ > *tern-en murš-en* (noor-AKK.PL mees-AKK.PL).

- Xaladytka murdes esineb vene keele eeskujul levinud koopula väljajätt, nt *jow si doj* > *jow doj* ‘ta on seal’. Eesti Lotfitka murdes on koopula väljajätu enamikel kõnelejal, kuid mitte ühelgi kõnelejal läbivalt.
- Tõenäosuslause sidendi *so* ‘mis’ esinemine algupärase *kaj (ki)* ja lätipärase *si* asemel.
- Kohaeessõnade kasutamine aega märkivas tähenduses, nt *pal-* ‘taga’ tähenduses ‘(millegi) jooksul’.
- Ajamäärustes on levinud samad käänded, mis slaavi keeltes, nt instrumentaali *tašarlen-ca* ‘hommikuti’. Läti Lotfitka murrakus on sama nähtus küll levinud, kuid vähemate variantidega.
- Suffiks *-as* (*remoteness marker*), millega tähistatakse verbi lihtminevikus, enneminevikus, korduvate tegevuste puhul, tingivas kõneviisis ja viisakuse väljendamiseks, liidetakse verbi oleviku vormile nagu Xaladytka murdes, mitte algupärasel viisil perfektitüvele, nt *kamj-om-as* ‘tahaksin (tahtma.PRF-1SG-RM)’ > *kam-av-as* (tahtma.PRS-1SG-RM).
- Eessõna *vaš* ‘(mille) jaoks’ kasutamine tähenduses ‘(millegi) kohta’.
- Umbmääraseid asesõnu (keegi, miski, millalgi, kuskil) moodustatakse tunnusega *-нибыдь*, nt *kon-nibut* ‘keegi’, *so-nibut* ‘miski’, *kidi-nibut* ‘millalgi’, *kaj-nibut* ‘kuskil’.
- Keskvõrdes kasutatakse vene päritolu sidendit *чем* ‘kui’. Lotfitka murdes kasutatakse üldiselt läti keele eeskujul arenenud sidendit *si* (>*sir*).
- Eessõnad esinevad lisaks Lotfitka murdes tavapärasele markeerimata vormile ka sootunnuste ja obliikvääändega, nt *pal-e/pal-o* ‘taga’ *pal* asemel.
- Laensõnade kesksõna tunnust *-ime(n)* kasutatakse ka algupärase sõnavaraga, nt roma omatüvelise *bikin-* ‘müüma’ > *bikn-ime* ‘müüdüd’.
- Vene keelest laenatud verbe ei integreerita roma keelde ehk jäetakse vene keele käändelõppudega, nt *pol’zini pe* ‘kasutab’ asemel *ispoljuzjet* (vene keelest *использует* ‘kasutab’).
- Mitmetel kõnelejal esineb vene keelest pärit tingiva kõneviisi partiklit *бы*.

- Refleksiivpartikli kasutamine järgib vene keele eeskuju, nt *sal pes* ‘naerma’ < vene keelest *смеяться* ‘naerma’.
- Verbi tegevuslaadi väljendavad eesliited lähtuvad vene keele vastetest, nt *ras-phen-* < Russian *рас-сказать* ‘jutustama’.

Erinevused Läti ja Eesti Lotfitka murrakutes

Erinevused Lätis ja Eestis kõneldavate Lotfitka murrakute vahel on eelkõige märgatav sõnavara põhjal, kuid need kajastuvad ka teistel tasanditel. Süstemaatiliseks erinevuseks on foneetilised muutused Läti Lotfitka murrakus, mis on Eesti Lotfitka murrakus väiksemal määral levinud või millest Eesti Lotfitka murrak on kõrvale jäänud.

Tabel 1. Häälikumuutused Eesti ja Läti Lotfitka murrakutes

	Algupärane vorm	Eesti Lotfitka	Läti Lotfitka
<i>pš</i> metatees	<i>pšal</i> (<i>phal</i> < <i>phral</i>) ‘vend’	<i>pšal</i> (< <i>phal</i>)	<i>špal</i>
<i>kš</i> metatees	<i>kšil</i> (< <i>khil</i>) ‘või’	<i>škil, kšil</i>	<i>škil</i>
<i>tf</i> > <i>ft</i> metatees	<i>Lotfos</i> ‘lätlane’, <i>Lotfitka</i> ‘läti’	<i>Lotfitka</i>	<i>Loftos</i>
<i>tk</i> > <i>kt</i> metatees	<i>Lotfitka</i> ‘läti’, <i>bogiktu</i> ‘vaene’	<i>Lotfitka</i>	<i>Lotfikta, bogiktu</i>
<i>t</i> ’ > <i>č</i>	<i>rat’a</i> ‘ööd’	<i>rat’a, rača</i>	<i>rača</i>
<i>kh</i> ’ > <i>kš</i> ’	<i>dikh’a</i> ‘nägi’	<i>dikh’a</i>	<i>dikš’a</i>
<i>th</i> > <i>č(h)</i>	<i>lathel</i> ‘leidma’	<i>lathel</i>	<i>lač(h)el</i>
<i>ph-</i> helilistumine sõnas <i>phuč-</i>	<i>phuč-</i> ‘küsimä’	<i>phuč-</i>	<i>buč-</i>
Läti keelest pärit helitu palataalne sulghäälik <i>ķ</i>	<i>ķeeķa</i> ‘köök’	<i>č’eeč’a</i>	<i>ķeeķa</i>
<i>r</i> > <i>l</i> sõnas <i>ripirel</i>	<i>ripirel</i> ‘mäletama’	<i>ripirel</i>	<i>lipirel</i>
<i>baga-</i> > <i>gaba-</i> metatees	<i>baga-</i> ‘laulma’	<i>gaba-, baga-</i>	<i>gaba-</i>
Sõnaalguline <i>v-</i> sõnas <i>ašti</i>	<i>ašti</i> ‘saama, oskama’	<i>ašti/vašti</i>	<i>vašti</i>
Lõppsilbis <i>o</i> -hääliku kõrgenemine <i>o</i> > <i>u</i>	<i>kirlo</i> ‘kurk (kurgu)’	<i>kirlo</i>	<i>kirlu</i>

Uuendusena hääldatakse Eesti Lotfitka murrakus Läti palataliseeritud sulghääliku *k* palataliseeritud helitu afrikaadi *č*'-na.

Eesti Lotfitka murrakusse ei ole mitmed foneetilised muudatused üldse levinud, nagu häälikumuutused, mis on toimunud üksikutes sõnades ning ei mõjuta teisi analoogse struktuuriga sõnu, nagu *r*-i asendamine Läti Lotfitka murrakus *l*-iga sõnas *ripirel* > *lipirel* 'mäletama' või *ph* helilistumine *b*-ks sõnas *phuč-* > *buč-* 'küsima'.

Teine osa foneetilisi muutusi hõlmab häälikumuutusi teatud häälikujärjendites või sõnas paiknemises ning need muutused esinevad Läti ja Eesti Lotfitka murrakutes kontiinumina. Läti Lotfitkast alguse saanud muutused on edasi kandunud Eesti Lotfitkasse, kus võib näha nii uuemate kui vanemate variantide paralleelset kasutamist. Nii on näiteks sõnaalguline *ph* muutunud *pš*-ks ning seejärel läbinud metateesi *pš* > *šp*: *phal* > *pšal* > *špal* 'vend'. Kui Eesti Lotfitkas on levinud vormid *phal* ja *pšal*, siis Läti Lotfitkas on enamiku keelejuhtide kõnes vaid vorm *špal*. Sõnaalgulise *kh* puhul on lisaks häälikumuutusele *kh* > *kš* toimunud metatees *kš* > *šk* levinud ka Eesti Lotfitka kõnelejatele. Seega on Eesti Lotfitka keelejuhtide kõnes kõik kolm vormi – *khil* > *kšil* > *škil* 'või' –, kuid Läti Lotfitka kõnelejatel vaid vorm *škil*.

Mānušs ja teised (1997: 8) toovad välja ka teisi metateese, mille levikut selle töö aluseks oleva materjali põhjal ei saa kontrollida, nt *ļēņivo* > *nēļivo* 'laisk', *vadviļo* > *vadļivo* poolakeelsest sõnast *wadliwy* 'vigane'. Võib eeldada, et need muutused ei ole Eesti Lotfitkas levinud.

Mõlemas murrakus on küllaltki levinud *o* kõrgenemine lõppsilbis *u*-ks, nt *ko* > *ku* 'juurde, juures', *mo* > *mu* 'minu (m)'. Samas on mitmesilbilistes sõnades Eesti Lotfitkas see muutus vähem levinud, seega eelistatakse Eesti Lotfitkas pigem esimesi variante ja Läti Lotfitkas teisi: *kirlo* > *kirlu* 'kurk (kurgu)', *baaro* > *baaru* 'suur' ja *lajkos* > *lajkus* 'aeg'. Mānušsi ja teiste (1997: 14) hinnangul on see muutus toimunud Läti murrete mõjul – Kurzeme piirkonnas asunud või asuvad romad hääldavad algupärast *o*-häälikut ainult *u*-na ja Vidzeme piirkonna romad *u* või *o*-na.

Veel üks konservatiivse vormi säilimise näide Eesti Lotfitkas on modaaltegusõna 'saama, võima' vorm *ašti*, mis esineb Eesti Lotfitkas algupärase *ašti*-na ning innovatiivse *v*-algulise *vašti*-na. Läti Lotfitkas esineb ainult sõnaalgulise *v*-ga variant.

Süsteemaatiline häälikumuutus kirderühma roma murretes on ka palataliseeritud sulghäälikute *d'*, *t'* ja *kh'* muutumine *d' > dž'*, *t' > č'* ja *kh' > kš'*, nagu sõnades *ripird'a > ripirdž'a* 'mäletas', *lat'a > lač'a* 'leidis', *dikh'a > dikša* 'nägi'. Muutus on süstemaatiliselt märgatav ka muus sõnavaras, nt *id'a > idž'a* 'riided', *rat'a > rač'a* 'ööd'. Selline häälikumuutus on kaugeimale arenenud Poola roma murdes. Xaladytka (Vene) murre jääb nendest muutustest peamiselt kõrvale. Samas Läti Lotfitka murrakus on häälikumuutus kaugemale arenenud kui Eesti Lotfitkas, nt *dikh'a > dikša* 'nägi' või *xot' > xoč'* 'kuigi'. Vorm *dikša* ei esine ühegi Eesti informandi kõnes, kuid on levinud Läti Lotfitkas, samas *xot'* ja *xoč'* esinevad mõlemad Eesti Lotfitka murrakus. Läti Lotfitka suurem mõjutatus on ühelt poolt põhjendatav geograafilise paiknemisega: Poolast on muutused levinud Balti regiooni roma murretesse ning alles seejärel Eesti Lotfitkasse. Eestis aeglustab muutuste levikut ka kümme korda väiksem roma kogukond kui Lätis.

Peale häälikumuutuste on keeleerisusi ja -arenguid ka morfoloogias, süntaksis ja leksikas. Sidendeid (*complementizer*) puudutavalt on Eesti Lotfitka murrakus samuti mõningaid konservatiivseid jooni. Modaallausete sidend *te* on Eesti Lotfitka murrakus kohustuslik, samas kui Läti Lotfitkas võib selle ära jätta. Sidend *kaj* (kujul *ki*) on kahel Eesti Lotfitka kõnelejal säilinud episteemiliste lausete sidendina ja ühel neist manipulatsioonilise lause sidendina. Läti Lotfitkas on ühel kõnelejal *ki* säilinud episteemiliste lausete sidendina, teistel on sidend *kaj* asendunud läti keelest jäljendatud romakeelse sõnaga *sir* 'kuidas' või vene keele eeskujul romakeelse sõnaga *so* 'mis'.

Eesti ja Läti Lotfitka murrakutes on võimalik sõna definiitsust esile tõsta demonstratiivpronoomeniga *da* 'see'. Eesti Lotfitkas on *da* laiemalt grammatikaliseerunud, kuid sama tendentsi näeb ka Läti Lotfitka murrakus. Lisaks Lotfitka murdele on see tendents levinud ka teistes kirderühma roma murretes.

Lotfitka murdes on arvsõnade kategoorias segunenud teistkümnete moodustamise süsteem. Üldiselt moodustatakse kirderühma roma murretes arvud 11–14 ja 15–19 eri alustel: 11–14 moodustatakse markeriga *-u-*, nt *deš-u-jekh* '10-u-1' ehk '11' ning 15–19 ilma markerita ehk *deš-pandž* '10–5' ehk '15'. Läti Lotfitka murraku kõnelejad järgivad rohkem väljakujunenud süsteemi, kuid Eesti Lotfitka murrakus on väga suur varieeruvus.

Verbide puhul varieerub Lotfitka murdes ainsuse 3. pöörde lõpp, milleks on kas algupärane lõpp *-el* või kreeka keelest laenatud lõpp *-i*. Kreeka keelest laenatud lõppu *-i* kasutatakse laensõnadega ja see on enam levinud Läti Lotfitka murrakus kui Eesti Lotfitkas. Üldiselt

liidetakse pöördelõpp *-i* laenatud verbe integreeriva suffiksi *-in-* järele, kuid Läti Lotfitkas on üsna levinud ka suffiksi *-in-* ärajätmine ja laenatud pöördelõpu lisamine võõrtüvele.

Laenatud verbide partitsiibi tunnus *-ime(n)* on Eesti Lotfitka murrakus säilinud, kuid mitte Läti Lotfitka murrakus.

Läti Lotfitka murrakus on enesekohased enkliitikud isikustatud vormidega, Eesti Lotfitka murrakus kasutatakse Xaladytka murdes levinud umbisikulist kliitikut *pes* kõrvuti isikustatud vormidega.

Läti keele mõjul on Lotfitka murdes levinud läti verbiprefiks, nt *aiz-* 'all, suunas, ära', *ap-* 'ümber', *at-* 'ära, lahti', *ie-* 'sees, sisse', *no-* 'eemale', *pār-* 'üle' and *uz-* 'peal, peale'. Verbiprefiksitate kasutus on sageli motiveeritud läti keelest laenatud verbidega või tõlkelaenudega, mille puhul kasutatakse läti keelest laenatud sõnavara puhul läti verbiprefiks, kuid sõna tüvi tõlgitakse roma keelde, nt Läti *aiz-do-t* (välja-andma-INF) 'laenama' eeskujul moodustatakse romakeelne *ajz-d-el* (välja-andma-3SG, romakeelne *d-* 'andma'). Lisaks läti keelest laenatud verbiprefiksitatele on levinud ka juba varasemalt slaavi keeltest, eelkõige poola ja vene keelest, laenatud verbiprefiks. Eesti Lotfitka murrakus on läti verbiprefikseid vähem ning kasutatakse rohkem vene keele eeskujul moodustatud verbe.

Lisaks mõjutavad läti ja vene keel refleksiivsete enkliitikute kasutamist. Kontaktkeelte eeskujul moodustatakse refleksiivseid tegusõnu, mida roma keeles on väljendatud ilma enkliitikuta, nt vene keele *смеяться* 'naerma' eeskujul *sa-pes* 'naerma' algupärase *sa-* asemel.

Mõned Läti Lotfitka murraku kõnelejad kasutavad läti küsipartiklit *vaj*. Eesti Lotfitka murraku kõnelejad küsipartikleid ei kasuta, kuid kasutavad vahel küsijätkuga küsimust, nt *jeela pu bl'ava vaj na jeela?* 'kas ta tuleb pulma **või ei tule?**'.

Läti Lotfitka murrakus on läti laenudega asendatud mitmeid varasemaid laene ja roma omasõnu, mis Eesti Lotfitka murrakus on säilinud. Näiteks on poola laenud *choć* 'kuigi' ning *choćby* 'isegi kui' asendatud läti laenudega *lai gan*, *kaut gan*, *kaut arī* 'kuigi' ning *pat ja* 'isegi kui'. Samuti on uuemaks laenuks läti sõnad *ja* 'kui', mida Eesti Lotfitka murrakus ei esine ning Läti Lotfitka murrakus esineb läti keelel põhinev vorm *ne-si* 'kui' läti *ne-kā* eeskujul. Umbmäärastest asesõnadest on algupärane *sajg/sajk/sajek* 'alati' asendatud läti sõnaga *vienmēr*.

Uurimistöõ täiendab seniseid andmeid kohalike roma murrete kohta ning juhib tähelepanu kahe eri murde esinemisele Eestis. Magistritöö on keskendunud eelkõige Eesti Lotfitka murraku kirjeldamisele ning võrdlusele Eestis ja lähinaabruses kõneldavate murretega. Eesti Lotfitka murrak on muutumas aina enam iseseisvaks Läti Lotfitka murrakust ning seetõttu on oluline kogukonna ja kõnelejate toetamisel arvestada just kohaliku murraku eripäradega.

Uurimistöõ raames ei ole kogutud keelenäiteid suurima roma kogukonnaga Valgast, kuhu praeguseni suunduvad elama Lätist pärit romad. Sealsed Lotfitka kõnelejad võivad seetõttu enam kokku puutuda Läti romadega ja olla rohkem mõjutatud Läti Lotfikta murrakus toimuvatest muutustest. Valga roma kogukonna keele uurimine eeldab omaette käsitlust, mitte üksnes tõlkeküsimustikust lähtumist. Lisaks Lotfitka murdele on oluline uurida Xaladytka murde olukorda, mis ei ole Eestis mõjutamata jäänud Lotfikta murdest, ning võib olla distantsi tõttu jäänud kõrvale ka mõnedest Xaladytka murdega toimunud muutustest.

Kindlasti väärrib tulevikus enam uurimist ja talletamist sinne sõnavara, milles esineb märgatavalt rohkem laensõnu saksa keelest kui roma keele kirderühma Leedu ja Poola murretes ning mis ei ole välja toodud ka Mānušsi ja teiste poolt koostatud Läti Lotfitka etümoloogilises sõnaraamatus (1997). Samuti tuleks lisaks tõlkeküsimustikust saadud andmestikule koguda narratiive ja loomulikku kõnet.