

THE CATEGORY OF MODALITY IN SLOVAK CARPATHIAN ROMANI

Anna RÁCOVÁ

Institute of Oriental Studies, Slovak Academy of Sciences,
Klemensova 19, 813 64 Bratislava, Slovakia
e-mail: kaorraco@savba.sk

The modality, that is the indispensability, possibility and intentionality of carrying out the content of the predicate, is expressed within the predicational component of the illocutionary act. The Slovak Carpathian Romani does not have any modal verbs of its own to express indispensability (must, to have to) and possibility (can, be able to). These modal relations are most often expressed either by borrowed modal verbs (*mušinel* must, to have to), by particles (*musaj* must, *šaj/našti* can/cannot), or with the help of other lexical means (*kampel* it is necessary, *jel* to be). The possibility to carry out some action is expressed in various ways depending on the further specification of the possibility. When expressing indispensability and possibility the subject is usually the one carrying out the process expressed by the autosemantic verb and at the same time the bearer of modal disposition for carrying it out expressed by the modal verb. When expressing intentionality (to want), we also frequently find cases where the subject carrying out the action expressed by a particular verb form is not identical with the bearer of modal disposition. Then the action to be carried out is expressed in the following illocutionary act.

Key words: Romani language, modality, indispensability, possibility, intentionality.

Modal verbs constitute one semantic unit with the autosemantic verb; grammatical categories are expressed on modal verbs while the action that is to be carried out is named by the autosemantic verb usually in the infinitive form (Boretzky 1994 uses the term “new infinitive” here): *me mušinav te džal* I must go, *na kamelas aňi te pa'al* he could not (did not want to) believe it.

If modality is expressed with the help of particles (*šaj/našti*), then the categories of person, number and time are expressed on the autosemantic verb: *našti dikhav* I cannot have a look, *šaj sikhaven* they can show.

MODAL CATEGORY OF INDISPENSABILITY

The indispensability is expressed by verbs *mušinel*, *kampel* (it is necessary – usually in the 3rd person singular) and *jel* which bound with the infinitive of the autosemantic verb:

No romñije, namištes tuke, hoj na mušines te hordinel o patave pro dumo andre zajda? Giña14 Well, my wife, is it bad that you "must not" carry those rags in the zajda on your back?

By the verb *kampel* the indispensability is usually expressed only if the performer of the action named by the autosemantic verb is not specified = it is necessary, it is to:

Kampel te jel cicho! Šeb133 It is necessary to keep silent.

Sar džanelas o Mojžiš, khatar kampel te džal? Bibl. How Moses knew which way they must (it is necessary, they are to) go?

Pre jekh relacija oleha e konferencia agorindas, hoj kampel te bararel the o romane dialekti... G,RNL,594-596,6. In the same context the conference emphasized that it was necessary to develop also the Romani dialects.

Indispensability can also be expressed by the construction *kampel* (3rd person) with logical subject in Dative + infinitive:

Šunel, hoj kampel leske le hod'oha te džal. Giña14 He feels that it is necessary to him to go up the hill.

Indispensability is often expressed by the particle *musaj* which bounds with autosemantic verbs in the form of present tense with the particle *te* standing before it (*musaj te džav* I must go, *musaj te džan* they must go). Some linguists, including Boretzky (1994) and Kostić (1994), consider the constriction *te* + present tense to be an analytical conjunctive.

Na daran la situacijatar, kana musaj te keren vareso korkore. EG, RNL,591-593,11 They are not afraid of the situation when they must do something alone.

The particle *musaj* is often bound with the infinitive form of the autosemantic verb (*musaj te džanel* they must know). In such cases grammatical categories of person, number and time are expressed neither on the verb nor on the particle. They often follow from the communicative situation:

Vaš oda, hoj musaj te džanel, kaj pal o slovaŕiko uštariben andro EU... Šand, RNL,587-590,10 Because they must realize that after entering of Slovakia to EU...

Musaj te phenel, kaj čačes hin maškar amence o principos jekh vaš e sakoneste, sako vaš jekh. EG,RNL,591-593,11 I must say that among us there really is the principle one for all, all for one.

When indispensability is expressed with the help of the particle *musaj*, grammatical categories of person, number and time can be expressed by the finite form of the verb *jel* to be inserted between the particle *musaj* and the autosemantic verb in the infinitive form: *musaj sas te džal* they had to go, *musaj sam te šunel* we must listen:

Musaj sas te džal avri andal o peskero šukar khere andre bar Eden. Bibl. They had to leave their beautiful home in the garden Eden.

The tu, the me musaj sam te šunel le Devles. Bibl. Also you and me must obey God.

Vaš oda so kerde musaj sas len te trestinel. Bibl. He had to punish them for what they had done.

Indispensability can also be expressed with the help of construction *si* (3rd person singular of the verb *jel* to be) + *te* + the finite verb form:

Si te avas cicho! Šeb114 We must keep silent!

MODAL CATEGORY OF POSSIBILITY

There is no special modal verb to express possibility in the Slovak Carpathian Romani. The possibility to carry out some action may be expressed by several means depending on further specification of possibility: may (to be allowed to), to be able to, can, to know. Sometimes the border between various shades of meaning is rather unclear or they can be explained variously on the basis of a particular communicative situation.

If something can/may, is allowed to be done, it is usually expressed with the help of particles *šaj*, *našti* (in negation), which are bound with finite forms of autosemantic verbs:

Šaj džav? May I (am I allowed to) go?

Imar pes šaj sikhavel. Giňa12 She is allowed to show up again.

Ale jekh džanav, kaj pale andre amare khera našti visaľivas. Reiz22 But one thing I know, that we are not allowed to return home.

Strictly speaking, the positive particle *šaj* and the negative particle *našti* are not exact opposites. By the particle *šaj* it is expressed that something is allowed to be done – the performer of the action has the alternative either to perform or not to perform the action: *Kalo šaj džal.* Kalo may go (but also not go). But by the particle *našti* it is expressed that something must not be done, the performer of the action does not have alternative either to perform or not to perform the action. Thus the negative particle *našti* is semantically close to the positive particle *musaj* must. This particle also does not give a performer other alternative than to perform the action expressed by the autosemantic verb: *Kalo musaj te džal* Kalo must go.

Similarly, the positive particle *šaj* can in the sense may, be allowed to is semantically closer to the negative *na mušinel* (not have to). In both cases the performer of action has the alternative either to perform or not to perform an action.

Hübschmannová (1991) also uses the verb *na tromal* in the sense not to be allowed to (otherwise meaning do not dare to): *o čhave na tromanas te vakerel.* Children are not allowed to (must not) speak.

In similar meaning the verb *del* to give, to allow to, which is bound with the dative, and the verb *mukhel* let go, to allow to, bounding with the accusative, are used: *Na diñas lake odoj te džal.* *Na mukhľas la odoj te džal.* He has not allowed them to go there.

In such expression of possibility/impossibility (be allowed to, may/not be allowed to, must not) different nominator and different performer of the action (grammatically formed by the dative or accusative) are presupposed. At the same time the performer of the action is the bearer of the modal disposition expressed by the verb.

Nadomuklas lenge odoy te džal Bibl. He (nominator) has not allowed them (performers) to go there.

By means of the particle *šaj/našti* it is also possible to express that somebody can/cannot/**is able/is not able** to do something. In this case the semantic proximity of *šaj* and *našti* with *na mušinel* and *musaj* is not in force:

Imar našti dikhav pre tumari dukh. Reiz6 I cannot (am not able to) look at your pain any longer.

Sar tu šaj varekaske šigitines? Bibl. How can you help anybody?

Exceptionally the particle *te* is inserted between *šaj/našti* and the autosemantic verb:

Našti te keras važno the profesionalno buči bi oda, le manuš na ela peskeri zorali identita. G,RNL,591-593,11 It is not possible (you cannot) to do serious and professional work if one does not have his own strong identity.

Can/be able to is also expressed by means of the construction *jel hodno* or the verb *kamel* + infinitive of the autosemantic verb:

Na som hodno te avel. I cannot come.

O Kalo ča dikhelas, na kamelas aňi te paťal peskere jakhenge. Dem11 Kalo was just looking, he could not believe his eyes.

In such cases the negation may also be expressed with the help of the autosemantic verb with the prefix *do-* in the negative form:

Kalo na dochal. Kalo cannot eat (because he is ill).

Can in the sense **to know** is expressed with the help of the verb *dokazinel* borrowed from the Slovak language or by the aid of the verb *džanel*. These verbs connect with the infinitive of the autosemantic verb:

Kalo dokazinel/džanel te bašavel. Kalo can/knows to play.

Negation is expressed by the negative verb with the prefix *do-*:

Kalo na dobašavel. Kalo cannot/does not know to play it.

Similarly can in the sense **to have/have not possibility** is also expressed with the help of the particle *šaj/našti* with the finite verb form or by the means of the construction *jel hodno*:

...a ov imar našti le bakrorengere kerel vareso rosno. Bibl. ... and he cannot hurt sheep any more.

Le Devleskere the le manušengere kamlinastar šaj akana genen le Devleskero Lav the tumen... Bibl. Out of God's as well as human love also you can now read the God Word...

Te visa!ol imar na sas hodno. Dem24 They could not return any more.

The action, that is to be performed as a result of the possibility (can, have possibility) is often expressed in a clause. In this clause the autosemantic verb forms one unit with the modal verb and is in the finite form:

Kaj hodno sas, odoj len marelas i trapinelas. Dem4 Where she could, there she beat them and tortured.

...kaj kampelas, odoj pomožinelas. Reiz10 ...how she could, so she helped.

In these composite sentences the infinitive of the autosemantic verb is dropped out as superfluous; the autosemantic verb appears in the second part of the composite sentence:

...kaj kampelas (te pomožinel), odoj pomožinelas.

MODAL CATEGORY OF INTENTIONALITY

The intentionality is, similarly as the possibility, expressed by various means depending on its specification.

To want (to intend) and to want (to wish) is expressed by the aid of the verb *kamel*, which links with the infinitive or with the present tense of the autosemantic verb (here the particle *te* is inserted in front of it). The differentiation of the specification of intentionality (intention or wish) depends on the content of the utterance.

If the performance of the action expressed by the finite verb form is fully in the competence of its performer, we speak of intention:

O Fijalis kamelas te del le gres pro šlubrikos... Giňa8 Fiala wanted (intended) to give the horse to the slaughterhouse.

Andro projektos kamelas te thovel the e romane džuv'len. EG,RNL,591-593,11 She wanted (intended) to include also Romani women to the project.

Ča že man tuha amare na kamena te mukel. Reiz11 But my family will not want to let me go with you.

If the performance of an action is not fully in competence of a performer, it does not depend on his will, we speak about wish:

Kaml'as te arakhel le Davidos u te murdarel les. Bibl. He wanted (tried) to find David and to kill him.

Muršale, kamen te jen barvale? Reiz16 Men, do you want to be rich?

Kamen te džanen, so pes ačhil'a le rikoneskera mort'aha? Dem18 Do you want to know what has happened with the dog's skin?

To want (ask, request) is expressed with the aid of the verb *mangel*:

"So mangel te chal?" phuč'la o Luciferis. Dem25 "What do you want to eat?" asked Lucifer.

If a performer is supposed to execute somebody else's will, it can be expressed with the help of the infinitive: *So te kerel?* What (am I) to do? (= what you want me to do?)

"*Ta mišto,*" phenel o Kalo, "*so te kerel, kaj te arakhav o džido paňi?*" Dem10
"So well," said Kalo, "what to do in order to find the live water?"

In fixed constructions the intentionality can be expressed also by the aid of the impersonal construction: *cirdel man tele soviben* I am sleepy (I want to sleep, liter. It pulls me to sleep).

When expressing indispensability and possibility the nominator (subject) is usually the performer of the action expressed by the autosemantic verb and also a bearer of the modal disposition for carrying it out expressed by the modal verb: *Kalo mušinel te džal*. Kalo (subject and performer) must go. *Kalo šaj džal*. Kalo can go.

When expressing intentionality, the nominator may be a performer of the action expressed by the autosemantic verb and also the bearer of modal disposition for carrying it out expressed by the modal verb: *Šivis kamel pašlate te jel*. Reiz12 Šiva wants to be with her.

However, there are also cases, when the subject carrying out the action expressed by the finite verb form is not identical to the bearer of modal disposition. It is usually in cases of the shade of wish. In such cases the action to be carried out is expressed in the following illocutionary act which is attached by the conjunction *kaj*. Then the particle *te* stands before the verb which expresses what the performer of the action should carry out:

O Del (bearer of modal disposition) *kamel* (wishes), *kaj the amen* (performers of the action) *te šigitinas avre manušenge*. Bibl. God wants also us to help others.

Kamel kaj o manuša te dživen avka kaj ala lava te dolikeren. Bibl. He wants people to live in such way to keep these rules.

Also in such cases the modal verb forms one semantic unit with the autosemantic verb – the modal and autosemantic verb are not complete one without another.

REFERENCES

- BORETZKY, N. 1994. Zu den Ausdrücken für Notwendigkeit in den Romani-Dialekten. In: *Romano džaniben*, 1, 3/1994, p. 23 – 31.
- HÜBSCHMANNOVÁ, M. – ŠEBKOVÁ, H. – ŽIGOVÁ, A. 1991. *Romsko-český a česko-romský kapesní slovník*. Praha, Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- KOSTIĆ, S. 1994. Participium necessitatis (participium futuri passivi) neboli gerundivum v hindštině a výrazy nutnosti v romštině. In: *Romano džaniben*, 1, 3/1994, pp. 35 – 40.
- ŠEBKOVÁ, H. 1991. *Romaňi čhib. Učebnice slovenské romštiny*. Praha, Fortuna.

EXCERPTED TEXTS

DEMETEROVÁ, H.: Rom ke Romeste drom arakhel. Rom k Romovi cestu najde. Paramisa the sune. Povědky a sny. Vydalo Sdružení romských autorů – ROMAŇI ČHIB, Praha 1994. 55 s. (Dem)

- FABIANOVÁ, T.: *Sar me phiravas andre škola*. Nakladatelství a vydavatelství UDO České Budějovice in cooperation with Společenství Romů na Moravě 1992. (Fab)
- FERKOVÁ, I.: Čorde čhave. Ukradené děti. Společenství Romů na Moravě, no date. 95 pp. (Fer)
- GIŇA, A. *Bijav*. Praha, Apeiron 1991. (Giňa)
- GODLOVÁ, E.: Ufiřom sar Romaňi o kada hin mire dživipnaskro drom. RNL, XIII, No. 591 – 593/2003, p. 11, 16.
- ŠÁNDOROVÁ: Romano nevo řil, 2003, XIII, No. 587 – 590, p. 10. (Šan)
- HORVÁTOVÁ, A.: Pal e bari Roma. Romano džaniben, 1-2, 2002, pp. 88 – 98. (Hor)
- TAYLOR, K. T.: *Miri jekhto Biblija andro obrazki. Moja prvá Biblia v obrázkoch vo východoslovenskej rómčine*. Translated from Slovak to Romani by F. Godla. Bratislava, Medzinárodná biblická spoločnosť – Slovensko 1994. (Bibl.)