

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Verbal modifiers in areal perspective : The case of Latvian Romani

Kozhanov, Kirill

2022-12-30

Kozhanov , K & Ross , A 2022 , ' Verbal modifiers in areal perspective : The case of Latvian Romani ' , Kalbotyra , vol. 75 , pp. 82-106 . <https://doi.org/10.15388/Kalbotyra.2022.75.4>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/355951>

<https://doi.org/10.15388/Kalbotyra.2022.75.4>

cc_by

publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Verbal modifiers in areal perspective: The case of Latvian Romani

Kirill Kozhanov

Department of Slavic studies
University of Potsdam
Am Neuen Palais 10, Haus 01
D-14469 Potsdam, Germany

Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian, and Scandinavian Studies
University of Helsinki
P.O 24 (Unioninkatu 40)
00014 Helsinki, Finland
E-mail: kozhanov@uni-potsdam.de
ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3852-6617>

Anette Ross

Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian, and Scandinavian Studies
University of Helsinki
P.O 24 (Unioninkatu 40)
00014 Helsinki, Finland
E-mail: anette.ross@helsinki.fi
ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3965-4330>

Abstract. Based on the analysis of the texts collected in the 1930s in Latvia and Estonia, this paper provides a description of the semantics of the verbal modifiers, i.e., prefixes (preverbs) and particles, in Latvian Romani. The system of verbal modifiers in Latvian Romani is an innovation evolved under Slavic and Baltic influence. Most preverbs are instances of MAT-borrowing from Slavic and Baltic, whereas verb particles are a PAT-borrowing, modelled after the Latvian system. The paper argues that even preverbs of Slavic origin often copy the semantics and derivational patterns of Latvian prefixed verbs. It is also shown that, differently from Latvian, in Romani both preverbs and verb particles can affect the verb's argument structure (e.g., by making it transitive)

Submitted: 20/06/2022. Accepted: 20/07/2022

Copyright © 2022 Kirill Kozhanov, Anette Ross. Published by Vilnius University Press

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

and change its aspectual value (e.g., by making it perfective). Finally, the distribution of verbal modifiers in Latvian Romani (the development of verb particles as opposed to other closely related Northeastern Romani dialects which only have prefixes, and higher frequency of verb particles in Estonia than in Latvia) confirms the areal cline in the spread of verb particles.

Keywords: Romani, verbal prefixes, preverbs, verb particles, Latvian, Slavic, language contact

1 Introduction

Latvian Romani (also Lotfitka) belongs to the group of Northeastern dialects, a cluster of closely related Romani varieties spread in Poland, Belarus, Russia, and the Baltic countries; see Tenser (2008). Latvian Romani is spoken in Latvia, Estonia, and northern Lithuania (e.g., Šiauliai, Žagarė). Speakers of Latvian Romani also live in Russia and, as the result of recent migrations, in Western Europe, with a particularly large community residing in the UK. The overall number of speakers can be approximately estimated at 10 000.

After leaving the Balkans, the ancestors of Northeastern Romani speakers entered the German-speaking territories in the early 15th century (Tcherenkov, Laederich 2004, 75–84). A century later, in the mid-16th century, they moved eastward inhabiting the lands of Kingdom of Poland and Grand Duchy of Lithuania (Mróz 2001; Tcherenkov, Laederich 2004, 103). These migrations resulted in dozens of German and Polish loanwords, to a great extent shared by all Northeastern Romani dialects. In the following centuries, Northeastern Romani dialects evolved as distinct vernaculars, even though the borders between certain varieties (for instance, Belarusian and Russian) are not so strict, and the level of mutual understanding is still quite high. Latvian Romani shares later lexical borrowings with Lithuanian Romani, which suggests their common split-off from the Northeastern dialects. Importantly, Latvian Romani further evolved under significant influence from Latvian (Manuš-Belugin 1973).

This paper discusses two ways of modifying verbs' semantics in Latvian Romani, namely by preverbs (or verbal prefixes), e.g., *lel* 'take' → *vīlel* 'take out' (cf. similar derivations in Latv. *izņemt*, Pol. *wyjąć*, Germ. *herausnehmen*), and verbal particles, cf. *čhinel* 'cut' → *čhinel tele* 'cut down' (cf. the English translation or Latvian *cirst nost*). Romani has some remnants of old Indo-Aryan preverbs, but none of them is in any way productive, whereas verbal modifiers are an important part of verb morphology and vocabulary in both Slavic and Baltic. All verbal modifiers in Latvian Romani are contact-induced phenomena. Preverbs are found in all Northeastern dialects of Romani and must have

been borrowed from Slavic rather early — in the 16–17th centuries, prior to the split between the dialects. In Lithuanian and Latvian Romani, some preverbs of the Baltic origin were later added to this system (Ariste 1973, Manuš-Belugin 1973; Kozhanov 2011). Verb particles, commonly found only in Latvian Romani, are probably a later innovation induced by the contact with Latvian¹.

In this paper, we will discuss the use of verbal modifiers in Latvian Romani based on the two collections of texts gathered in the 1930s and 1940s in Latvia and Estonia. The first sample of texts in Latvian Romani was collected by Jānis Leimanis², a Romani activist, in Latvia in the 1930s (in total, approximately 42 thousand words), and the second one by Paul Ariste³, a prominent Estonian linguist, in Estonia in the 1930s and the beginning of the 1940s (in total, around 35 thousand words). We used all Latvian Romani texts from Ariste's collection, and only a part of the texts from Leimanis' collection (those segments that were available in the Latvian Folklore Archive's digital collection in May 2021). Both collections are comprised of different forms of folklore, mostly folk tales.

The data come from two distinct geographical regions and two different Latvian Romani subdialects: Leimanis' texts from Latvia are in the Kurzeme subdialect of Latvian Romani, spoken in western Latvia, and Ariste's texts are in the Vidzeme subdialect spoken mostly in the Vidzeme region of Latvia, and in Estonia. For a long time, the main contact language of Latvian Romani were Latvian dialects (perhaps mainly central dialects, even though further research is needed to answer this question, but certainly not Latgalian). In addition to that, Latvian Roma in Estonia spoke Estonian even before WWII (Ariste 1959, 25). Ariste's collection includes texts from 8 different speakers who at the time lived near the Estonian town of Tartu. In his manuscripts, Ariste attempted to follow the speakers' pronunciation as precisely as possible writing it down in a Finno-Ugric phonetic transcription. Leimanis also collected his texts from different people (at

¹ One might argue that verb particles could have evolved earlier under German influence, and thus they are retained in Latvian Romani due to the support of the Latvian corresponding system and are lost in other Northeastern Romani dialects. Although such evolution is not impossible, we prefer to see verb particles as later influence from Latvian, since it provides a simpler explanation. As noted by one of the reviewers, further research on the semantic and structural overlap of verb particles in German, Latvian, Estonian, and Latvian Romani is desirable, as German influence on Latvian and Estonian particles is evident (Hasselblatt 1990).

² Jāņa Leimaņa čigāņu folkloras vākums (Folklore Collection of Janis Leimanis) nr. 1389 (available online at <http://garamantas.lv/en/collection/886320/Romani-folklore-collection-of-Janis-Leimanis?File-page=4>), Archive of Latvian Folklore, Latvia. See Perkova, Kozhanov (2022) on the creation of the corpus.

³ Paul Ariste, Fond 330, m 194:2 : Zingarica (Mustlaste jutte), 17.11.1934-4.8.1941 (available online at <https://fennougrica.kansalliskirjasto.fi/handle/10024/87064>); Fond 330, m 176:1 : Eesti läti mustlaste murdest (available online at <https://fennougrica.kansalliskirjasto.fi/handle/10024/87067>), Estonian Literary Museum.

least 12 speakers) but wrote down their stories in his own unified orthography. Before the Second World War, there were 800 Roma in Estonia (Ariste 1959), and 3839 Roma lived in Latvia (Apine 1998).

The paper is structured as follows: first, we show what preverbs (Section 2) and verb particles (Section 3) are used in Latvian Romani and what their frequency is. We discuss the semantics of the verbal modifiers, including their influence on the aspectual characteristics of the verb and its argument structure. In Section 4, we discuss the distribution between preverbs and particles across different meanings and across two collections of texts. In the conclusions (Section 5), we overview the system of verbal modifiers in Latvian Romani and discuss its place among other languages of the area.

2 Preverbs in Latvian Romani

In total 16 preverbs (not counting allomorphs) are used in the texts under analysis. All preverbs are examples of MAT-borrowing (only the preverb *per-* possibly being an exception, cf. the discussion below). It is not always clear how to distinguish between them in terms of their origin: one could claim that allomorphs with *-o-* are of Slavic origin, whereas those with *-a-* are Baltic, cf. *ob-* vs. *ap-*, *ot-* vs. *at-*, *po-* vs. *pa-*. The pair *roz-* and *raz-*, also attested in the texts, could mean that the variation *o/a* simply reflects different Slavic source — with no vowel reduction (Polish) or with *akanje* (Belarusian or Russian).

Preverbs can be attached to both borrowed verbs and inherited ones, e.g., *pšemiškirel* ‘think over’, cf. Pol. *przemyśleć* ‘id.’, *noburinel* ‘bewitch’, cf. Latv. *noburt* ‘id.’, *dodžal* ‘reach’ ← *džal* ‘go’, cf. Pol. *dojść* ← *iść* ‘id.’, etc. Curiously, there are examples of borrowed Latvian verb stems in combination with preverbs of the Slavic origin, e.g., *obrokinel* ‘bury’, cf. Latv. *aprakt* ‘id.’, and *virokinel* ‘dig out’, cf. Latv. *izrakt* ‘id.’.

In the current analysis the focus is put on the use of preverbs with inherited verbs. In the following statistics, preverbs used with loans are excluded. Two forms that could be interpreted as prefixed verbs are fossilized verbs *dolel* ‘get, obtain’ (← *lel* ‘take’) which in Ariste’s texts also has the meaning ‘be able to’ and *domarel*, *dumarel* ‘beat up, kill’ (← *marel* ‘beat’).

The list of preverbs used in our data and their frequency is given in Table 1. The number of tokens contains all occurrences of the given preverb in the texts, and the number of types shows with how many different lemmata each preverb is combined (reflexive verbs are counted as one lemma together with their non-reflexive counterparts).

Preverb	Ariste's texts		Leimanis' texts	
	Tokens	Types	Tokens	Types
<i>do-</i>	3 (1%)	2	27 (7,9%)	13
<i>ie-</i>	0	0	9 (2,6%)	3
<i>no- (nu-)</i>	25 (8%)	17	12 (3,5%)	9
<i>ob-</i>	15 (4,8%)	7	13 (3,8%)	8
<i>ab-</i>	0	0	1 (0,3%)	1
<i>ot-</i>	11 (3,5%)	5	24 (7,1%)	12
<i>at-</i>	0	0	6 (1,8%)	6
<i>pie-</i>	1 (0,3%)	1	0	0
<i>po-</i>	25 (8%)	9	19 (5,6%)	14
<i>pa-</i>	1 (0,3%)	1	1 (0,3%)	1
<i>pše-</i>	13 (4,2%)	5	24 (7,1%)	9
<i>per-</i>	4 (1,3%)	2	0	0
<i>roz-</i>	0	0	7 (2%)	6
<i>raz-</i>	2 (0,6%)	2	0	0
<i>sa-</i>	5 (1,6%)	4	3 (0,9%)	3
<i>uz-</i>	3 (1%)	1	5 (1,5%)	4
<i>vi-</i>	40 (12,9%)	20	58 (17,1%)	35
<i>iz-</i>	3 (1%)	1	0	0
<i>za-</i>	160 (51,5%)	43	122 (35,9%)	49
<i>aiz-</i>	0	0	9 (2,6%)	7
Total	311 (100%)	120	340 (100%)	180

Table 1. Frequency of preverbs in Latvian Romani text collections by tokens and types

2.1 Semantics of preverbs in Latvian Romani

The semantics of preverbs in Slavic and Baltic is described in numerous articles and monograph-length studies; see Endzelin (1906) among many others. Here we will give a brief overview of the semantics of preverbs in Latvian Romani, with the focus on the spatial semantics, lexicalized usage and semantic correlates in Slavic and Latvian.

aiz-

Aiz-, which only appears in Leimanis' texts, is borrowed from Latvian and always follows Latvian patterns, e.g., *aizrakhel*⁴ 'protect' ← *rakhel* 'keep, guard', cf. Latv. *aizsargāt* ←

⁴ All examples are cited with the original spelling. The source of the example is indicated in brackets after the translation: Leim. = Leimanis' collection, Ar. = Ariste's collection.

sargāt ‘id.’. It describes movement behind the landmark, i.e., a certain point in space or metaphorically in time, (and in this sense is synonymous with its Slavic counterpart *za-*, see below) or away from its initial spatial domain, as illustrated in (1) where *aizdžal* copies the use of the Latvian *aiziet* ‘go away’:

- (1) *te nikai dūr khēr-estir našt-andīne aiz-dža-n.*
 and nowhere far house-ABL.SG cannot-PST.3PL PVB-go-SBJ.3PL
 ‘and they couldn’t go anywhere far from home’ (Leim.)

do-

This preverb is of Slavic origin (cf. Pol., Rus. *do-*, Bel. *da-*), although it is also commonly borrowed into Baltic rural dialects and non-standard urban varieties; see, e.g., Kozhanov (2014). In standard Latvian, its main semantic equivalent is the preverb *pie-* (and to a lesser extent *aiz-*). When added to verbs of motion, *do-* denotes that the landmark is reached, e.g. *dožal* ‘go up to, reach’ ← *džal* ‘go’, *dojavel* ‘come up to, reach’ ← *javel* ‘come’, *dolidžal* ‘carry up to something’ ← *lidžal* ‘carry’, cf. (2):

- (2) *Jake Tal-is peskūr-e čhāv-esa do-jav-dža*
 this.way Talis-NOM.SG own-OBL son-INS.SG PVB-come-PST.3SG
ko, čovahan-o hula-skūr-o khēr...
 to enchanted-DIR.SG.M owner-GEN.SG-DIR.SG.M house.DIR.SG
 ‘This way Talis and his son reached the enchanted house of the landlord...’ (Leim.)

Do- also describes addition or joining, as in *dophandel* ‘tie up to something’ ← *phandel* ‘tie’. This preverb appears in certain calques with no spatial semantics, e.g., *dosikavel* ‘prove’ ← *sikavel* ‘show’, cf. Bel. *dakazvac*, Rus. *dokazyvat*, and Latv. *pierādīt* ‘prove’.

ie-

The borrowed Latvian preverb *ie-* is attested with inherited verbs only in Leimanis’ texts. Even though in Latvian this preverb’s basic spatial meaning is ‘in’, the Romani texts have no examples with spatial semantics, instead the preverb is used in the verbs that copy the Latvian derivational pattern in which *ie-* and the reflexive marker (Latv. *-es* and Romani *-pes*) combine with verbs of sound as in *iebašelpes* ‘start to bark’ (see (3)) ← *bašel* ‘bark’, cf. Latv. *ierieties* ← Latv. *riet* ‘id.’; *iedelpes goli* ‘cry out, exclaim’ ← *del goli* ‘call, scream’, cf. Latv. *iesaukties* ← Latv. *saukt* ‘id.’.

- (3) *Džukal noko ie-baš-ča-pes.*
 dog.NOM.SG again PVB-bark-PST.3SG-RFL
 ‘The dog started to bark again’ (Leim.)

iz-

This preverb is borrowed from Latvian and is only attested in Ariste's data with one verb *izlel* 'win (a war)' ← *lel* 'take'. Its exact source pattern is unclear, but cf. Latvian *uzvarēt* 'win' ← *varēt* 'can, be able'.

- (4) *vot, me som do-va, k iz-l-ijo-m me vo-in-a.*
 so 1SG.NOM be.PRS.1SG that-NOM.SG.M REL PVB-take-PST.1SG 1SG.NOM war-DIR.SG
 'So, I am the one who won the war' (Ar.)

no- (nu-)

This is the only frequent preverb of Baltic origin (Latv. *no-* [nuo], Latg. and Lith. *nu-*) in Latvian Romani (Ariste 1973, 80). As the same preverb is also attested in Lithuanian and Latgalian Romani varieties, it could have been borrowed from Baltic at an earlier stage (possibly before there was contact with Latvian). In Latvian, the main spatial meaning of *no-* is 'down' and 'away'. In Russian and Belarusian Romani, a similar range of meanings is expressed by the preverb *u-*, which is, however, absent in the Latvian and Lithuanian Romani varieties. In the Romani texts under consideration, there are no obvious examples of spatial uses of this preverb, even though a related meaning of separation is attested (synonymous to that of the preverb *ot-*, see below):

- (5) *Abē joi, le-sk-i raki-, nu-mura-dža les*
 but 3F.SG.NOM his-NOM.SG.F girl-NOM.SG PVB-shave-PST.3SG 3M.SG.ACC
te no-tšhin-dža le-sk-e bro-d-a i_o bal-a.
 and PVB-cut-PST.3SG his-PL beard-DIR.SG and ART hair-DIR.PL
 'But she, his girlfriend, shaved him and cut off his beard and hair' (Ar.)

ob- (ap-)

This preverb is of Slavic origin, cf. Pol., Rus. *ob-*, Bel. *ab-*, and its semantic and etymological counterpart in Latvian is phonetically similar *ap-* (which occasionally appears as an allomorph in Latvian Romani).

In contact languages, the basic spatial meaning of this preverb is 'around', cf. (6) from Latvian Romani with a related meaning:

- (6) *Po drom tačk-a Bimbar-oske būt mol-i*
 on way.DIR.SG carriage-NOM.SG Bimbaros-GEN.SG many time-DIR.PL
ob-thurd-ija-pes te mas fard-es ob-mak-ša phuj-asa.
 PVB-throw-PST.3SG-RFL and meat.NOM.SG solid-ADV PVB-soil-PST.3SG soil-INS.SG
 'On the way Bimbaros' carriage turned over many times and the meat got covered with soil' (Leim.)

In both text collections the preverb *ob-* copies Latvian prefixed verbs, e.g., *obgaruvel* ‘bury’ ← *garuvel* ‘hide, bury’, cf. Latv. *apbedīt* ← *bedīt*, *apglabāt* ← *glabāt* ‘id.’.

ot- (*at-*)

This preverb is of Slavic origin, cf. Pol. *od-*, Rus. *ot-* and Bel. *at-*, and its Latvian etymological counterpart is *at-*. Its main spatial meaning is ‘away’ (i.e. it behaves more like in Slavic than in Latvian, where it denotes ‘approaching’, see below), cf. the verb *otdžāl* ‘go away’ ← *džāl* ‘go’ in (7), and the verbs like *otdél* ‘give away’ ← *dél* ‘give’, *otlél* ‘take away’ ← *lél* ‘take’:

- (7) *ne sig jov ot-gij-a demb-ostir*
 well as.soon.as 3M.SG.NOM PVB-go-PST.3SG oak-ABL.SG

zaras me pejom telle bāre dembostir sāre zarosa...

‘But as soon as he walked away from the oak, I fell down from the big oak with the whole branch right away...’ (Leim.)

In Leimanis’ texts there are a few examples in which the allomorph *at-* of possibly Baltic origin is used. Latvian influence can be proved by the fact that this allomorph is used to copy the semantics of the Latvian preverb, cf. (8) where *at-* describes ‘approaching’, the meaning only found in Baltic, but not in Slavic.

- (8) *Ano trit-o dīves jov at-kliš-ča rati*
 in third-DIR.SG day.DIR.SG 3M.SG.NOM PVB-ride-PST.3SG at_night
ke pšilv-i da-kīr-i čhajj...
 to widow-DIR.SG mother-GEN.SG-DIR.SG.F daughter.DIR.SG

‘On the third day at night he rode (arrived) to the widow’s daughter...’ (Leim.)

po- (*pa-*)

This preverb appears in both collections of texts and in all other Northeastern dialects and is of Slavic origin, cf. Pol. and Rus. *po-*, Bel. *pa-*. A few examples with the allomorph *pa-* possibly reflect Baltic influence. This preverb does not have any obvious spatial meaning in Slavic. The preverb *po-* in Slavic and *pa-* in Baltic express delimitative meaning, i.e., the event takes place for some time, cf. (9)

- (9) *...phen-dža leske po-tardž-u dai ko urdon*
 say-PST.3SG 3M.SG.DAT PVB-stand-IMP.2SG here by carriage.DIR.SG
me zaras javava palle...

‘[he] told him: “stand here by the carriage for a bit, I’ll come back right away...”’ (Leim.)

Ariste's texts contain numerous occurrences of the verb *poperél* 'occur, end up' ← *perél* 'fall' (cf. Rus. *popást*).

pše- (*pši-*)

This preverb is clearly of Polish origin, cf. Pol. *prze-*. It is attested in both text collections and is also shared with Lithuanian (and Polish) Romani but does not appear in the Russian and Belarusian varieties. Its main spatial meaning is of crossing, moving over the landmark (corresponding to *piri-* in Russian Romani and *pār-* in Latvian):

- (10) *Phuron-i l-ija les te pomoži-dža leske signedīr*
 old_woman-NOM.SG take-PST.3SG 3M.SG.ACC and help-PST.3SG 3M.SG.DAT faster
pše-dž-al pe var rīg...
 PVB-go-SBJ.3SG on other side.DIR.SG

'The old woman took him and helped him move faster to the other side...' (Leim.)

This preverb also has a reflexive meaning, i.e., it denotes repetition of the action (with possible change of the previous situation), cf. (11). The same meaning can coincide with the meaning of the simplex verb, cf. *pšeparuvel* 'exchange' ← *paruvel* 'change, exchange' (as in Pol. *przemieniać* 'id.')

- (11) *Jone tšor-de awri do lil tə pše-tšhin-dle.*
 3PL.NOM steal-PST.3PL out that letter.ACC.SG and PVB-write-PST.3PL

'They stole the letter and rewrote (it)' (Ar.)

There are a few instances when this preverb has the meaning corresponding to Russian Romani *pro-*, as in *pšedžal* 'pass' (cf. RusRom *prodžál*):

- (12) *Pši-g-ija kar-os.*
 PVB-go-PST.3SG war-NOM.SG

'The war ended' (Leim.)

As can be seen from example (12), the preverb has an allophone *pši-* with the same range of meanings. It does not, however, include meanings expressed by the Polish preverb *przy-* 'approaching'.

per- (*pere-*)

This preverb appears only in Ariste's texts. Mānušs (1997, 100) lists it as *pir-* in his dictionary and derives it from the Lithuanian preverb *per-* (corresponding to Latvian *pār-*).

In Ariste's texts, it has the allomorph *pere-*, which could potentially be derived from East Slavic *pere-*. However, this preverb might have been influenced by the Romani preposition *pir* ~ *per* 'across, over', cf. similar observations for Lithuanian Romani by Kozhanov (2011, 312). This preverb is synonymous with *pše-*.

In Ariste's texts, it appears 3 times as *per-* and 1 time as *pere-*: 3 times with the verb *hurél* 'dress' in the meaning 'change (the dress)' and 1 time with the verb *džál* 'go' meaning 'pass'.

- (13) *per-gij-a* *briši-nd*
 PVB-go-PST.3SG rain.NOM.SG
 'the rain stopped' (Ar.)

roz- (*raz-*)

This preverb is of Slavic origin, cf. Pol. *roz-*, Rus. and Bel. *pa3-*, and is attested in both text collections. Its main spatial meaning is movement into different directions:

- (14) *Gren našmijandijam pe čhār avri mukhas,*
sobi na-rodz-dž-an Dēvel džin kai
 in.order.to NEG-PVB-go-SBJ.3PL God.NOM.SG know where
 'We didn't dare to let the horses out, so they would not go God knows where' (Leim.)

vi-

This preverb is of Slavic origin, cf. Pol. *wy-*, Rus., Bel. *vy-*, and it is one of the most frequent preverbs in the texts. Its main spatial meaning is 'out', as can be seen from (15) and such verbs as *vijanel*, *vilidžal* 'bring out' ← *janel* 'bring', *lidžal* 'carry', *vilel* 'take out' ← *lel* 'take'. Its semantic counterpart in Latvian is the preverb *iz-*.

- (15) *Ne džukal ot-lij-a-pes te vi-gij-a štub-atir pallo*
 well dog.NOM.SG PVB-take-PST.3SG-RFL and PVB-go-PST.3SG room-ABL.SG behind
udār.
 door.DIR.SG
 'And the dog got up and left the room, [going] behind the door' (Leim.)

This preverb often emphasizes the completeness of the action as in *vimorel* 'wash (clean)' ← *morel* 'wash', *vikerel* 'complete, finish something' ← *kerel* 'do'. In some cases *vi-* copies Latvian verbs with the preverb *iz-*, e.g., *vihurel* 'undress' ← *hurel* 'dress', cf. Latv. *izģerbt* ← *ģerbt* 'id.'

za- (sa-)

This preverb is of Slavic origin, cf. Pol., Rus., Bel. *za-*, and is attested in other North-eastern dialects of Romani as well. *Za-* describes movement up or behind the landmark. In Latvian these meanings are expressed by the preverbs *uz-* and *aiz-*. In the Latvian Romani texts, this preverb often has an inceptive meaning, describing entry into a state, cf. (16) and the verbs like *zanasvalandija* ‘fell ill’, *zalahandija* ‘got ashamed’, *zaxolisadija* ‘got angry’ etc.

- (16) *jow* *za-straxand-ija*, *dij-a* *go-li*: *jē-zos*.
 3M.SG.NOM PVB-get_afraid-PST.3SG give-PST.3SG scream Jesus
 ‘he got afraid and screamed: Jesus!’ (Ar.)

In Latvian Romani, this preverb has several functions which are absent in its Slavic source, for instance, the meaning ‘together’, i.e., it copies Latvian *sa-*, cf. ex. (17) where the verb *zadžasa amen* ‘get together’ is a curious mixture of Latv. *saiet* and Rus. *sojtis*, cf. the same meaning in the verbs *zajavel* ‘come together’ ← *javel* ‘come’, *zakharel* ‘call together’ ← *kharel* ‘call’ etc.

- (17) *Me_som tšorori*, *tu san barvalo*,
ame *našti* *tə* *za-dž-a-sa* *ame-n*.
 1PL.NOM cannot CMPL PVB-go-PRS.1PL RFL
 ‘I am poor, you are rich, we cannot get together’ (Ar.)

The allomorph *sa-* which appears in a few examples in both text collections is a Latvian borrowing, e.g., *sahurelpeš* ‘dress up’ ← *hurel* ‘dress’, cf. Latv. *saģērbties* ← *ģērbt* ‘id.’.

uz-

This preverb is a Latvian borrowing and is attested in both collections of texts. In the texts under consideration, it only has abstract meanings, cf. *uzrikirel* ‘support’ ← *rikirel* ‘hold’, copying Latvian *uzturēt* ← *turēt* ‘id.’.

Latvian Romani texts have no examples of prefix stacking, apart from the verb *zadolel* ‘get, obtain’ ← *lel* ‘take’ in both text collections, cf. (18).

- (18) *Joi* *za-do-l-ja* *xâbe-n-a*, *tse-l-o* *ve-dr-its-a*
 3F.SG.NOM PVB-PVB-take-PST.3SG food-DIR.PL full-DIR.SG bucket-DIM-DIR.SG
smenta-n-a.
 sour-cream-DIR.SG
 ‘She got food, a full bucket of sour cream.’ (Ar.)

2.2 Argument structure

Both Slavic and Baltic preverbs can affect the verb's argument structure (Kozhanov 2016). The most obvious example of such change is transitivization, i.e., introduction of an obligatory direct object.

Being borrowed from Slavic and Baltic, preverbs in Latvian Romani can also transitivize verbs. In the data under analysis this function is attested with the verbs that take the preverbs *do-*, cf. (19), *vi-*, *pa-*, *aiz-*, *pše-*, *za-* and *aiz-*, cf. (20).

- (19) *Do-dživi-dža čhāv-en te čhāv-eng-e čhāv-en.*
 PVB-live-PST.3SG SON-ACC.PL and SON-GEN.PL-OBL SON-ACC.PL
 '[He] lived to have sons and sons' sons' (Leim.)

- (20) *jov ker-dža-pes aiz-tardž-ol pes te peskīr-i šaim-a.*
 3M.SG.NOM do-PST.3SG-RFLPVB-stand-SBJ.3SG 3RFL.ACC and own-SG.F family-DIR.SG
 'he tried to protect himself and his family' (Leim.)

By transitivizing verbs, some preverbs follow Latvian patterns, e.g., in (20) *aiztardžol* 'defend, protect' ← *tardžol* 'stand', cf. Latv. *aizstāvēt* ← *stāvēt* 'id.'. This is also obvious in case of *pa-* which in Lithuanian or the Slavic languages of the area usually does not have the transitivizing function, cf. (21) where *pojavel* 'obtain, meet' ← *javel* 'come', cf. Latv. *panākt* ← *nākt* 'id.':

- (21) *Kana nanāš da štetostir,*
moži daj po-jav-esa tīr-i bah
 maybe here PVB-come-FUT.2SG your-SG.F luck.DIR.SG
 'Now don't run away from this place, maybe you will find your luck here' (Leim.)

2.3 Preverbs and aspectuality

Preverbs play an important role in the aspectual system both in Slavic and Baltic, by being able to perfectivize verbs; see Arkadiev (2014, 2017) and Benacchio et al. (2017) for a broader context. Despite general similarities between Slavic and Baltic aspectual systems, one can safely say that the aspect in Slavic is more grammaticalized than in Baltic (Holvoet 2001; Wiemer 2001; Arkadiev 2011). The traditional theory of aspectuality operates with two values – imperfective and perfective, thus classifying all verbs into imperfective, perfective, and bi-aspectual; see Staltmane (1958) and Hauzenberga-Šturme (1979) for Latvian. In recent years, a more fine-grained approach to aspectuality in Baltic introduced a theory consisting of two components — aspectual viewpoint and

actionality (Arkadiev 2011). The traditional notion of perfective vs. imperfective will suffice for the discussion of the topic in this paper.

Normally Romani does not mark aspect in present/future tense, but express perfective and imperfective aspect as different past tense forms (Matras 2002, 151–155). See ex. (22–23) from Kalderash Romani where completed event (= perfective) is expressed by the aorist (24), whereas process (= imperfective) is expressed by the imperfect (25).

(22) *Aratí dikh-l'-ám laš-ó film-o.*
 yesterday see-PST-1PL good-SG.M film-DIR.SG
 ‘Yesterday we saw a good movie.’ (Osłon 2018, 578)

(23) *Ka l pánž čas-ur'a dikh-áv-as tilivízar-o*
 at ART.PL five hour-DIR.PL see-1SG-IMPF TV-DIR.SG
 ‘At five o’clock I was watching TV’ (Osłon 2018, 577)

Most Romani verbs can be labeled “perfective” as they have only perfective interpretation in the aorist. There is however a small group of “imperfective” verbs, e.g., *rodel* ‘look for’, which can express processes by the aorist forms. In Latvian Romani there is a prefixed verb *zarodel* ‘find’ ← *rodel* ‘look for’ (cf. Latv. *uzmeklēt* ← *meklēt* ‘id.’) which behaves as a perfective verb, cf. (24):

(24) *...joi zaras za-rod-ija pharun-o⁵ thav-a...*
 3F.SG.NOM right.away PVB-look.for-PST.3SG silk-SG.M thread-DIR.PL
 ‘...she found silk threads right away...’ (Leim.)

In this example, the change in the aspectual value of the verb accompanies the change of the verb’s lexical meaning. Such examples, however, allow us to say that in Latvian Romani preverbs can also change verb’s aspectual value, as they do in Latvian.

A pure aspectual derivation by means of prefixation can hardly be found in Latvian Romani (again, as most simplex verbs are already “perfective”). However, the phenomenon of “empty prefixes” (or “préverbes vides”) is still of some relevance. In Baltic and Slavic “empty prefixes” are preverbs which do not add any obvious lexical meaning to the verb but only change its aspectual characteristics, cf. Latv. *rakstīt* ‘write (IPFV)’ vs. *uzrakstīt* ‘write (PFV)’. The most common “empty prefix” in contemporary Latvian is *no-* (Horiguchi 2015, 242), which also appears in Latvian Romani, cf. (25) where *nučamudel* ‘kiss’ ← *čamudel* ‘id.’ copies Latv. *noskūpstīt* ‘kiss (PFV)’ ← *skūpstīt* ‘kiss (IPFV)’:

⁵ Probably a mistake, instead of the correct *pharune* (PL).

- (25) *L-ija· len te nu-tsamud-ija.*
 take-PST.3SG 3PL.ACC and PVB-kiss-PST.3SG
 ‘[she] took them and kissed [them]’ (Ar.)

In Romani, however, these preverbs are “empty” not only in terms of their lexical meaning, but also their aspectual value, cf. (26) where the simplex verb has the same perfective value:

- (26) *Kra-l’its-a d-ija· tsa-pla kral’-is trui men i*
 queen-DIR.SG give-PST.3SG grab king-ACC.SG around neck.DIR.SG and
tšamud-ija.
 kiss-PST.3SG
 ‘The queen took the king by his neck and kissed [him]’ (Ar.)

3 Verbal particles in Latvian Romani

Latvian Romani is unique among Northeastern Romani dialects in deploying verb particles as a productive way to modify the semantics of verbs, cf. (27) with a spatial meaning and (28) with more abstract semantics which cannot be interpreted as an adverbial use:

- (27) *Mukha-a buž’n’-a tele te jana-a šax ko rū.*
 let-FUT.1SG goat-ACC.SG down and bring-FUT.1SG cabbage.DIR.SG to wolf.NOM.SG
 ‘I will let down the goat and will bring the cabbage to the wolf’ (Ar.)
- (28) *Kam-ja sawnakun-e gr-es’ tele te tšor-el.*
 want-PST.3SG golden-OBL horse-ACC.SG down CMPL steal-SBJ.3SG
 ‘[He] wanted to steal a golden horse’ (Ar.)

The particle usually follows the verb immediately, but a verb’s arguments (e.g., direct objects) can be placed between them, cf. (27). The particle rarely precedes the verb, cf. (28).

The distinction of verbal particles from adverbs is not always straightforward. In our analysis we included only those particles that can have some non-spatial meaning. If the element in question governs a noun phrase it is not considered a verb particle, but a prepositional phrase.

The list of verb particles attested in the two text collections and their frequency is presented in Table 2. As in Table 1, tokens stand for the total number of instances, and types describe distinct lexemes. Most verbal particles originate from inherent Romani spatial adverbs or adjectives, and from a few borrowings.

Particle	Origin	Ariste's texts		Leimanis' texts	
		Tokens	Types	Tokens	Types
<i>andre</i>	adverb <i>andré</i> 'inside'	131 (17,2%)	14	15 (10,5%)	10
<i>avri</i>	adverb <i>avri</i> 'outside'	178 (23,4%)	38	28 (19,6%)	17
<i>durx, drux</i>	adverb <i>durx</i> 'through' (borrowed from Germ. <i>durch</i>)	9 (1,2%)	6	1 (0,7%)	1
<i>krigal, krig</i>	adverb <i>krigál, krig</i> 'away'	31 (4,1%)	9	12 (8,4%)	8
<i>khetane</i>	adverb <i>khetané</i> 'together'	25 (3,3%)	9	2 (1,4%)	2
<i>opre, opral, oprel</i>	adverb <i>opré</i> 'on top'	137 (18%)	23	21 (14,7%)	11
<i>paše pašil</i>	adverb <i>pašé</i> 'near', <i>pašil</i> 'nearby'	52 (6,8%)	9	11 (7,7%)	5
<i>pirdal, pirdel</i>	adverb <i>pirdal, pirdel</i> 'through'	8 (1%)	3	0	0
<i>preču</i>	adverb <i>préču</i> 'opposite, against, in front of' (borrowed from Slavic, cf. Pol. <i>przeciw</i>)	19 (2,5%)	8	0	0
<i>pšīro, phīro</i>	adjective <i>pšīro, phīro</i> 'open'	26 (3,4%)	5	3 (2,1%)	2
<i>tele, telal, talal</i>	adverb <i>telé</i> 'down', <i>telál, talál</i> 'from the bottom'	142 (18,7%)	28	41 (28,7%)	13
<i>truju, truja</i>	adverb <i>truju, truja</i> 'around, over'	3 (0,4%)	2	9 (6,3%)	8
Total		761 (100%)	154	143 (100%)	77

Table 2. Verbal particles in Latvian Romani

3.1 Semantics

andre

Its spatial meaning is 'in, inside' (cf. Latv. *iekšā*), corresponding to that of the preverb *ie-*. Unsurprisingly, it occurs primarily with verbs of motion like *džal* 'go' (52 occurrences in Ariste's texts), *javel* 'come' (25 occurrences in Ariste's texts), cf. (29), however, it combines with other verbs as well, e.g., *xal* 'eat' in (30).

- (29) *Ļipin-en avri urdon-estir te jav-en andre tume*
 climb-IMP.2PL out carriage-ABL.SG and come-IMP.PL inside 2PL.NOM
ob-tač-on
 PVB-get.warm-SBJ.2PL

'Get out of the carriage and come inside to get warm' (Leim.)

- (30) *Tad žinj o zigā-ris dui te dija go-li o mūlo,*
ke kana akevraz xa-a tumen andre.
 that now at_once eat-FUT.1SG 2PL.ACC inside
 ‘Then at two o’clock the dead man shouted that “I will eat you up at once”’ (Ar.)

avri

This particle’s basic spatial meaning is ‘out’ (cf. Latv. *ārā*), parallel to that of the preverbs *vi-* and *iz-*. *Avri* is often combined with verbs of motion, e.g., *džal* ‘go’ (34 occurrences in Ariste’s texts), *javel* ‘come’ (32 occurrences in Ariste’s texts), cf. (31):

- (31) *Tird-e auri paņing-estir man*
 pull-IMP.2SG out water-ABL.SG 1SG.ACC
 ‘Pull me out of the water’ (Leim.)

Similarly to the preverb *vi-*, this particle underlines the completeness of the action, cf. (32):

- (32) *Tə phen-e-la: dik ma-ita, saškir-džō-m tut awri.*
 and say-PRS.3SG look.IMP.2SG girl heal-PST.1SG 2SG.ACC out
 ‘And [the doctor] says: “Look, girl, I cured you.”’ (Ar.)

durx

This particle describes movement through the landmark (cf. Latv. *cauri*) and corresponds to the preverbs *pše-* and *per-*. It combines primarily with verbs of motion, cf. (33), but other verbs as well, such as *ginel* ‘read’, cf. (34):

- (33) *kam-dža rom dž-al druh*
 want-PST.3SG Rom.NOM.SG go-SBJ.3SG through
ne tikno mānušoro popšildža peskīro šēro auri romeskīri kisikati
 ‘The Rom wanted to pass through, but the small man stuck his head out from the Rom’s pocket’ (Leim.)

- (34) *O kra-l-is gin-dža durx o lil.*
 ART king-NOM.SG read-PST.3SG through ART letter.DIR.SG
 ‘The king read the letter’ (Ar.)

krig

This particle describes movement away from the landmark (cf. Latv. *nost* and *projām*), being equivalent to that of the preverbs *ot-* and *no-*. This meaning is also related to the idea of ‘separation’, cf. (35).

- (35) *beš-ča pe jek zar-os te čhingir-la les krig kašt-estir.*
 sit-PST.3SG on one branch-DIR.SG and cut-PRS.3SG 3M.SG.ACC away tree-ABL.SG
 ‘he sat on a branch and is cutting it off the tree.’ (Leim.)

khetane

The core of this particle’s semantics is ‘together; with’ (cf. Latv. *kopā* and *līdzī*), i.e., it semantically corresponds to the preverb *za-* (Latv. *sa-*). It is especially difficult to separate this particle from the corresponding adverbs, as in both text collections it usually combines with the verbs *džal* ‘go’ and *lel* ‘take’, cf. (36). However, some examples are more straightforward, cf. (37), where the particle is “doubled” with the preverb.

- (36) *Jone l-ine lōv-e khetane ta l-ine xāben-a.*
 3PL.NOM take-PST.3PL money-DIR.PL together and take-PST.3PL food-ACC.PL
 ‘They took money with them and took food’ (Ar.)

- (37) *Ja palc-eng-e konc-i, (vaš gr-eng-o paruben)*
 if finger-GEN.PL-PL end-NOM.PL for horse-GEN.PL-SG.M exchange.NOM.SG
za-p-ēne khetane,
 PVB-fall-PST.3PL together
togi uže niso nakeresa
 ‘If the finger’s ends (in horse dealing) grew together, then one cannot do anything’
 (Leim.)

opre

This particle denotes movement upwards (cf. Latv. *augšā*) and semantically corresponds to the preverbs *za-* and *uz-*. It often appears in combination with the verb *uštēl* ‘get up’ (42 occurrences in Ariste’s texts), cf. (38), and more rarely with other verbs, cf. *rodel* ‘look for’, *hurel* ‘dress’, *xal* ‘eat’ (18 occurrences in Ariste’s texts), cf. (39).

- (38) *ušt-i opre te jav-en khēre.*
 rise-IMP.2SG up and come-IMP.2PL home
 ‘get up and let’s go home’ (Leim.)
- (39) *Džuke-l kam-e-l man opre te xa-l.*
 dog.NOM.SG want-PRS.3SG 1SG.ACC up Cmpl eat-SBJ.3SG
 ‘The dog wants to eat me up’ (Ar.)

paše

The most occurrences of this particle have spatial semantics ‘near’ (cf. Latv. *klāt*), i.e., it corresponds to some meanings of the preverb *za-* (= Latv. *sa-*), cf. (40).

- (40) *te mīr-o rom kher-la paše vār-e murš-en paše*
 and my-NOM.SG.M husband.NOM.SG call-PRS.3SG near other-OBL man-ACC.PL near
mehan do haben savo isis kerado an dasāji pīri
 ‘and my husband invites other men to eat that food that was cooked in such a pot’
 (Leim.)

preču

This particle has a spatial meaning of ‘against, towards’ (cf. Latv. *pretī*). As an adverb and preposition, it is also attested in Lithuanian Romani as *préc’u* and belongs to the common borrowings of Lithuanian and Latvian Romani. *Preču* appears in the texts mainly with verbs of motion, cf. *džal* ‘go’, *javel* ‘come’, and verbs of speech, cf. *del goli* ‘scream’, *phenel* ‘say’, *rakirel* ‘speak’. The verb *lel preču* ‘accept, take’ seems to have origin in Latv. *ņemt pretī* or Est. *vastu võtma* ‘id.’ (a translation of Germ. *entgegennehmen* ‘id.’).

- (41) *Mor-o:sk-e vi:l’n’-i man pre-tšu na-l-e-na*
 sea-GEN.SG-PL wave-NOM.PL 1SG.ACC against NEG-take-PRS.3PL
 ‘The waves of the sea will not accept me’ (Ar.)

pirdal

This particle describes movement through the landmark and is synonymous with *durx* and the preverbs *pše-* and *per-*. In Ariste’s texts it appears primarily with verbs of motion (self-motion, and verbs of conveyance), namely *džal* ‘go’, *janel* ‘bring’, *lidžal* ‘carry’.

- (42) *Gija po-ro dui mō-r-i pirde-l.*
 go-PST.3SG through two sea-DIR.PL through
 ‘He crossed two seas.’ (Ar.)

pšīro

This particle has the general meaning of ‘open, free’ (cf. Latv. *vaļā*). It combines with five verbs in Ariste’s texts: *del* ‘give’, *kerel* ‘do’, *lél* ‘take’, *mukhel* ‘let’, *perel* ‘fall’ and two verbs in Leimanis’ texts: *kerel* ‘do’ and *perel* ‘fall’. Interestingly, in Leimanis’ texts it agrees in number with the subject, cf. (43), which reflects its adjectival origin.

- (43) *Joi ker-dža pšīr-e peskīr-e jakh-a...*
 3F.SG.NOM do-PST.3SG open-PL own-PL eye-DIR.PL
 ‘She opened her eyes...’ (Leim.)

tele

This particle describes movement down (cf. Latv. *zemē* and *nost*) and semantically corresponds to the preverb *nu-*. It is one of the most frequent verb particles in both text collections and, apart from verbs of motion, often combines with verbs of destruction or deletion, such as *marel* ‘beat’, *čhinel* ‘cut’, *riskirel* ‘tear’, *phagirel* ‘break’ etc.

- (44) *L-ija· jow teve·r; tšhin-dža· kaš tele.*
 take-PST.3SG 3M.SG.NOM axe.DIR.SG cut-PST.3SG tree.DIR.SG down
 ‘He took an axe and cut down a tree’ (Ar.)

truju

This particle describes movement around the landmark (cf. Latv. *apkārt* ‘around’) and corresponds to the preverb *ob-*.

- (45) *te lijapes balval dasaj bāri so dufindle*
so urdon truju thurd-ela.
 that carriage.NOM.SG around throw-PRS.3SG
 ‘and such a strong wind started [to blow] that they thought that it would overthrow the carriage.’ (Leim.)

In addition to the listed particles, another verbal particle *fārdo* ‘closed’ (cf. Latv. *ciet*) was reported by Manušs (1973, 128; 1996, 56) but does not appear in the texts. It comes from the adjective *fārdo* ‘solid, firm’, borrowed from Polish *twárdy*, thus copying Latv. *ciet* ← *ciets* ‘firm’.

Importantly, all verb particles in Latvian Romani are PAT-borrowings from Latvian (Estonian or German), and few instances of adverbs MAT-borrowed from Latvian and Estonian in Ariste’s texts, namely (*u*)*spriekšu* 4 times (Latv. *uz priekšu* ‘forward’), *apakal* (Latv. *atpakaļ*) and *edasi* ‘further’ (Est. *edasi*) are used as adverbs. No examples of such borrowings in Leimanis’ texts possibly reflect the collector’s editing of the texts.

- (46) *Na-pe-r-l-as spri-ekšu na a-pakal’.*
 NEG-fall-3SG-IMPF forward NEG backward
 ‘It (lion) was getting neither forward, nor backward’ (Ar.)

3.2 Argument structure

Verbal particles usually do not affect the verb’s argument structure. In both text collections, there were only few examples of particle verbs involving transitivization. In

Leimanis' texts there are two examples of the same verb *sal avri* 'ridicule, mock' formed from the intransitive verb *sal* 'laugh' as in (47):

- (47) *Kedi dasaj lav-a avri-sa-jindoi les, ataman-os šun-dža...*
 when such word-DIR.PL out-laugh-CONV 3M.SG.ACC chief-NOM.SG hear-PST.3SG
 'When the (robber) chief heard such words ridiculing him...' (Leim.)

In Ariste's collection, there is one example with the verb *našel tele* 'pass something by running' from otherwise intransitive verb *našel* 'run':

- (48) *Joi nâš-tša, paš sve-t-os tele nâš-tša.*
 3F.SG.NOM run-PST.3SG half world-DIR.SG down run-PST.3SG
 'She ran, she passed half a world' (Ar.)

In both cases, however, Romani particle verbs seem to copy prefixed verbs in Latvian *izsmiet* 'ridicule' (← *smieties* 'laugh') and *noskriet* 'run a distance of' (← *skriet* 'run').

3.3 Aspectuality

In Latvian, verb particles combine with verbs of different aspectual values (imperfective, perfective, or bi-aspectual) without affecting these characteristics, i.e., when combined with the particle *iekšā* 'inside' the perfective verb *tikt* 'get' stays perfective as in *tikt iekšā* 'get in', and the imperfective *iet* 'go' stays imperfective as in *iet iekšā* 'go in' (Holvoet 2001, 145–146). In Latvian Romani, however, verb particles seem to be able to change the verb's aspectual value: there is at least one clear example in both text collections of a processual (i.e. imperfective) simplex verb turning into telic (i.e. perfective) when combined with particles, cf. (49) where *krenčinel truju* corresponds to the Latvian *apgriezt (galvu)* 'twist (head)' (← *griezt* 'turn') and (50) where *rodel opre* corresponds to the Latvian *uzmeklēt* 'find' (← *meklēt* 'look for'). Thus, in both cases Romani particle verbs have prefixed counterparts in Latvian.

- (49) *Me čhaj, ja (joi) dolela džinel so tu dasav rakirdžan lake,*
joi tūr-o šēr-o greh-engūr-o krenčin-i truju
 3F.SG.NOM your(SG)-SG.M head-DIR.SG sin-GEN.PL-SG.M twist-PRS.3SG around
sir zliņitko kaņake...
 how lame chicken-DAT.SG
 'If my daughter gets to know that you talked about her this way, she will twist your sinful neck as of some lame chicken' (Leim.)

- (50) *Me len ja-ke rod-a opre.*
 1SG.NOM 3PL.ACC this.way look.for-FUT.1SG up
 'I will find them this way.' (Ar.)

4 Preverbs vs. verb particles

The distribution of preverbs vs. verbal particles differs remarkably in the two text collections, cf. Table 3. In the data from Latvia preverbs are used almost three times more often than in the data collected by Paul Ariste in Estonia, and in the data from Estonia the number of verbal particles is three times higher than that of preverbs.

	Leimanis' texts		Ariste's texts	
	Tokens	Types	Tokens	Types
Preverbs	340	180	311	120
Particles	143	77	761	154

Table 3. Preverbs and particles in Latvian Romani

One could imagine that Leimanis' data might be more influenced by the collector's own idiolect. One could further suspect Leimanis in "cleaning up" the data by getting rid of loanwords and choosing "a more Romani way" to express certain meanings. This would, however, contradict the preference for preverbs as clear instances of MAT-borrowing. We think that a better way to explain such a drastic difference between the two subvarieties is to account for the areal differences within Latvian Romani. The usage of verbal modifiers in the speech of Latvian Romani from Estonia might have been influenced by Estonian where verbal particles are the only means to modify verbs' meanings. This observed distribution in Latvian Romani confirms the geographical cline found in the area, i.e., verbal particles are more frequent from southwest to northeast (Wälchli 2001, 419; Wiemer et al. 2014, 24). It can be noticed that a similar inner-language spread of verbal particles is also observed in Latvian dialects, which exhibit larger number of verb particles close to the Fenno-Ugric territories, e.g., the Livonian subdialect of Latvian; see Kalnača (2017). Latvian Romani is also an important parallel to Livonian, a Finnic language, which borrowed Latvian preverbs (Sivers 1971).

In Latvian the difference between preverbs and particles is often aspectual (i.e., particles do not change the aspectual value of the verb) but in Latvian Romani this distinction is not valid as Latvian Romani does not make a clear semantic and functional difference between preverbs and particles.

It seems that certain meanings tend to be expressed by particles rather than by preverbs: for instance, Latvian Romani does not have a productive preverb with the meaning 'in' (e.g., Russian Romani *v-*): *ie-* appears only sporadically, some contexts can be expressed with *za-*, but more commonly the particle *andre* is used. For instance, the meaning 'enter' is expressed equally four times by the prefixed verb *zadžal* and particle verb *džal andre* in Leimanis' texts, but in Ariste's collection it is only expressed by the particle

verb (52 occurrences). The semantic difference between preverbs and particles requires a separate study.

Here we only say that the coappearance of a preverb and a verb particle in Latvian Romani is rather rare, 3 examples in Ariste's texts and 13 examples in Leimanis' texts.

- (51) *Vi-rakir-dža* *āwri* *pes* *i* *vraz* *me-ja*.
 PVB-speak-PST.3SG out RFL and right.away die-PST.3SG
 '[she] outspoke and died right away' (Ar.)

5 Conclusions

Latvian Romani employs preverbs and verbal particles to modify verbs' semantics. The system of verbal modifiers in Latvian Romani is undoubtedly a contact-induced innovation. In its essence, the wholesale system of preverbs was borrowed from Slavic at an earlier stage in the history of Latvian Romani (when it was not distinguished from other Northeastern dialects) and only later "enriched" by addition of some Baltic preverbs. The preverb *no-* is the most frequent one and could have been borrowed at an earlier stage when the Latvian, Lithuanian and Latgalian Romani varieties were relatively homogeneous. Nevertheless, preverbs originally borrowed from Slavic are now regularly used to copy Latvian derivational patterns, thus functioning as "native" Romani semantic counterparts to the Latvian preverbs. When copying Latvian preverbs, Romani counterparts are established on the basis of phonetic (cf., *ot-* and *at-*, *po-* and *pa-*, and more obviously *za-* and *sa-*) or semantic (cf. *vi-* and *iz-*) similarity.

Most verb particles are examples of pattern-borrowing, i.e., they origin in Romani adverbs (including few borrowed adverbs *durx* 'through' < German *durch* and *fardo* 'hard, firm' < Polish *twardy*). They usually copy Latvian (and possibly Estonian in Ariste's data from Estonia) verb particles. Although the system of verbal modifiers has evolved under the influence of new contact languages, neither preverbs nor verbal particles copy the system of the immediate contact language exactly. For instance, differently from Latvian, Romani data show that verb particles can affect verb's aspectual value as well as its argument structure (by transitivizing it), thus being synonymous with preverbs. This can also be seen from those instances when Latvian prefixed verbs are copied by Romani particle verbs. The semantic and functional difference between the two types of verbal modifiers requires further research.

Latvian Romani is not unique among Romani dialects in developing a system of verbal modifiers consisting of both preverbs and particles: such a system is also found, for instance, in Sinti (Schrammel 2005). However, this is the only Northeastern Romani

dialect in which the system of verb particles has evolved. Thus, it is an important part of the East Circum-Baltic area in which the spread of verb particles grows from south-west (Slavic and most Lithuanian dialects where verb particles are essentially absent) via north-eastern Lithuanian dialects, Latvian and Livonian to north-east (Finnic where verb particles are the only means of verbal modifiers).

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank two anonymous reviewers, Anna Verschik and Mikhail Osłon for valuable comments on the previous versions of the paper. We are also grateful to Jack Rueter for improving our English. All shortcomings or mistakes remain our responsibility.

This research was done as part of the project “Interaction in Romani in everyday speech situations: case studies in Estonia” (2019–2023) at University of Helsinki.

References

- Ariste, Paul. 1959. Mustlastest [Gypsies]. *Eesti Loodus* 1, 22–28.
- Ariste, Paul. 1973. Lettische Verbalpräfixe in einer Zigeunermundart. *Baltistica* 9 (1), 79–81.
- Arkadijev, Peter. 2011. Aspect and actionality in Lithuanian on a typological background. *Langues baltiques, langues slaves*. Daniel Petit, Claire Le Feuvre & Henri Meurantaud, dir. Paris: Editions CNRS. 57–86.
- Arkadijev, Peter. 2014. Towards an areal typology of prefixal perfectivization. *Scandoslavica* 60 (2), 384–405. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00806765.2014.984473>
- Arkadijev, Peter. 2017. Borrowed prefixes and the limits of contact-induced change in aspectual systems. *The Role of Prefixes in the Formation of Aspectuality*. Rosanna Benacchio, Alessio Muro & Svetlana Slavkova, eds. Firenze: Firenze University Press. 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.36253/978-88-6453-698-9.03>
- Apine, Ilga. 1998. Čigāni. [Gypsies]. *Mazākumtautību vēsture Latvijā*. [History of national minorities in Latvia]. Leo Dribins, red. Rīga: Zvaigzne ABC. 199–207.
- Benacchio, Rosanna, Alessio Muro & Svetlana Slavkova, eds. 2017. *The Role of Prefixes in the Formation of Aspectuality*. Firenze: Firenze University Press.
- Endzelin, Janis. 1906. *Latyšskie predlogi*. [Latvian prepositions]. Jurjev.
- Hasselblatt, Cornelius. 1990. *Das estnische Partikelverb als Lehnübersetzung aus dem Deutschen*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harassowitz.
- Hauzenberga-Šturma, Edīte. 1979. Zur Frage des Verbalaspekts im Lettischen. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 93, 279–316.
- Holvoet, Axel. 2001. *Studies in the Latvian verb*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

- Horiguchi, Daiki. 2015. Latvian attenuative *pa-* verbs in comparison with diminutives. *Contemporary Approach to Baltic Linguistics*. Peter Arkadiev, Axel Holvoet & Björn Wiemer, eds. De Gruyter Mouton. 235–261.
- Kalnača, Andra. 2017. The construction *non-prefixed verb + spatial adverb* in Latvian. *ESUKA – JEFUL*, 8–1. <https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2017.8.1.05>
- Kozhanov, Kirill. 2011. Balto-slavjanskije glagol'nye pristavki v baltijskix dialektax cyganskogo jazyka. [Balto-slavic verbal prefixes in the Baltic dialects of Romani]. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 7 (3), 311–315.
- Kozhanov, Kirill. 2014. Priešdėlio *da-* semantika lietuvių kalboje. [The semantics of the preverb *da-* in Lithuanian]. *Baltai ir slavai: dvasinių kultūrų sankirtos*. [Balts and Slavs: Intersections of spiritual cultures]. Tatjana Civjan, Maria Zavjalova & Artūras Judžentis, red. Vilnius: Versmė. 254–274.
- Kozhanov, Kirill. 2016. Verbal prefixation and argument structure in Lithuanian. *Argument realization in Baltic*. Axel Holvoet, Nicole Nau, eds. John Benjamins. 363–402.
- Manuš-Belugin, Leksa. 1973. O vlijanii baltijskix jazykov na dialekt latyšskix cygan. [On the influence of Baltic languages on the dialect of Latvian Roma]. *Latvijas PSR zinātņu akadēmijas vēstis* 4 (309), 124–139.
- Mānušs, Leksa, Jānis Neilands & Kārlis Rudevičs. 1997. *Čigānu–latviešu–angļu etimoloģiskā vārdnīca un latviešu–čigānu vārdnīca*. [Romani-Latvian-English etymological dictionary and Latvian-Romani dictionary]. Rīga: Zvaigzne ABC.
- Matras, Yaron. 2002. *Romani: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mróz, Lech. 2001. *Dzieje Cyganów-Romów w Rzeczypospolitej XV–XVIII w.* [History of Roma-Gypsy in the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth 15th–18th centuries]. Warszawa.
- Oslon, Mikhail. 2018. *Jazyk kotljarov-moldovaja: Grammatika kelderarskogo dialekta cyganskogo jazyka v russkojazyčnom okruženii*. [Language of Kotlyarya-Moldovaya. Grammar of Kalderash Romani in the Russian-speaking surroundings]. Moskva: JaSK.
- Perkova, Natalia, Kirill Kozhanov. 2022. Towards the Corpus of Latvian Romani Texts: Deciphering the Manuscripts in Jānis Leimanis' Archive. *Proceedings of the 6th Digital Humanities in the Nordic and Baltic Countries Conference (DHNB 2022)*. Karl Berglund, Matti La Mela, Inge Zwart, eds. Uppsala. 382–390.
- Sivers, Fanny de. 1971. *Die lettischen Präfixe des livischen Verbs*. Nancy.
- Schrammel, Barbara. 2005. Borrowed verbal particles and prefixes in Romani: A comparative approach. *General and applied Romani linguistics*. Dieter Halwachs, Barbara Schrammel & Gerd Ambrosch, eds. Munich: Lincom Europa. 99–113.
- Staltmane, Velta. 1958. Verbu veidi mūsdienu latviešu literarajā valodā. [Verbal aspect in contemporary standard Latvian]. *Valodas un literatūras institūta raksti* 7, 5–47.

- Tcherenkov, Lev, Stéphane Laederich. 2004. *The Rroma. Volume 1: History, Language, and Groups*. Basel: Schwabe.
- Tenser, Anton. 2008. *Northeastern Group of Romani Dialects*. Ph.D. thesis. Manchester: The University of Manchester.
- Wälchli, Bernhard. 2001. Lexical evidence for the parallel development of the Latvian and Livonian verb particles. *The Circum-Baltic languages. Typology and contact. Vol. 2: Grammar and typology*. Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm, eds. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company. 413–442.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2001. Aspektual'nye paradigmy i leksičeskoe značenie litovskix i russkix glagolov. [Aspectual paradigms and lexical meaning of Lithuanian and Russian verbs]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2, 26–58.
- Wiemer, Björn, Il'ja Seržant & Aksana Erker. 2014. Convergence in the Baltic-Slavic contact zone (Triangulation approach). *Congruence in Contact-induced Language Change (Language Families, Typological Resemblance, and Perceived Similarity)*. Juliane Besters-Dilger, Cynthia Dermarkar, Stefan Pfänder & Achim Rabus, eds. Berlin: De Gruyter. 15–42.