

## THE DIRECTIVE ILLOCUTIONARY ACT IN THE SLOVAK CARPATHIAN ROMANI

Anna RÁCOVÁ

Institute of Oriental Studies, Slovak Academy of Sciences,  
Klemensova 19, 813 64 Bratislava, Slovakia

Ján HORECKÝ

Linguistic Institute of Ľudovít Štúr, Slovak Academy of Sciences, now retired

The directive illocutionary act is a characteristic type of the operational illocutory act. It demands an addressee to whom its content, that is, the order, command or request is directed. This content may be formulated by various means: grammatical (imperative) and lexical (specific performants, particles, conjunctions). Secondly, depending on an actual communicative situation, the content of the directive illocutionary act may be formulated also by modal verb, modal particles and interrogative, indicative and conditional sentences.

The illocutionary act is the act by which something is uttered about reality, the act carrying the content (proposition) of the utterance as a basic communicative sign (Horecký 1996: 33). In contrast to the communicative act, it is conveyed by purely linguistic means.

The major symptom of the illocutionary act should be seen in the speaker's intention. It may be an intention to influence the state of consciousness of the addressee by transferred information (in order to change or tighten the existing state), to evoke a certain physical or verbal response by the addressee, or not to transfer information at all (contact, phatic illocutionary acts) (Horecký 1996: 34).

The illocutionary act in which an obligatory physical reaction by the addressee is expected (the performance or non-performance of the required activity) is called the directive illocutionary act.

In the first place, the directive illocutionary act orders (forbids) something but it also has a more general meaning of directing an action or activity. Therefore an addressee (receiver), but not the nominator (the originator of the command), is usually expressed in it. An addressee may be expressed explicitly – by an address (vocate) or by pronoun.

*No, lavutare, len o love a džan khere.* Dem 26 Well, musicians, take money and go home!

*Nič ajso, ča tut mukh andre chañig...* Dem 10 Nothing like that, just you go down to the well!

*Ušti the tu!* EG, RNL, 591 – 6, 11 Get up also you!

*Mamo, ča ker rezanka tu!* Fer 17 Mum, just make the noodles you!

However, very often the addressee is not expressed at all and is understood from the context.

The content of the directive illocutionary act may be command, order, request, demand, wish, prayer, recommendation, but also an instruction or advice. These types of directive illocutionary act express various degrees of interestedness on the side of the speaker and the addressee to realize (perform) the content of the directive illocutionary act and also a different degree of categoricalness, obligation or urgency. When commanding or ordering, the speaker is in a superior relation to the addressee. On the other hand, when requesting or begging, the speaker is, at least at that moment, in a subordinate relation to the addressee. Although the realization of a request is of consequence to the speaker, he cannot force the addressee to it. The realization (performance) of a request depends on the willingness and good will of the addressee (Daneš – Hlavsa – Grepl 1987: 340).

Different shades of categoricalness of the directive illocutionary act differ also by their form.

In the case of command or order, the directive illocutionary act is often formulated implicitly – grammatically – by the imperative. Less frequently it is expressed explicitly, by means of performatants (I command, order, request, beg). In the Slovak Carpathian Romani, there is only a small range of performatants for expressing the command, order and also those occurring there have been usually borrowed from the Slovak language (*rozkazinel*, *rozkázat* to command/alongside *parančolinel* to command, *prikazinel* *prikázat* to order) or at least they are modified by a Slovak prefix (*zaphenel*, *zakázat* to forbid). Moreover, the degree of urgency expressed by performatants can often be specified only on the basis of the communicative situation. For instance, the verb *mangel* can express a higher degree of categoricalness – to ask as well as the much lower degree of categoricalness – to beg.

As the second person is the direct addressee of the directive illocutionary act, the imperative in the form of the second person singular or plural is used (*dža* sg./*džan* pl. go, *phen* sg./*phenen* pl. tell):

*Zadurkin u dža andre!* Dem 4 Knock (at the door) and go in!

*Sikhav pro obrazkos le elefantos.* Bibl Show an elephant on the picture!

*Denašen andro veš, me tumen ledžava.* Reiz 17 Run to the forest, I will lead you!

*Vičinen mange tumares vajda!* Reiz 17 Call me your vajda!

However, the directing of the directive illocutionary act may include also its author and in such a case it is formed by the imperative of the first person in the plural:

*Kiden tumenge, so kames the avas, džas!* Dem 26 Take whatever you want and let us go!

... *mukas pro Del so kale nalačhe manušenca kerela.* Reiz 22 ...let us leave on God what he will do with such bad people.

*Avas džas ke Bangi.* Fer 26 Let us go (you and me) to Bangi.

The degree of categoricalness can be modified also when the directive illocutionary act is formed by the imperative.

The command can be emphasized by the particles *ča*, *no*, *no ta*, *av* (originally the imperative of the verb *avel*, come, go here), *se*, *šaj* which stand before the imperative, or it can be made more polite with the aid of particles *ča*, *arde* placed after the imperative.

Emphasized command:

*Ča dikh, so kerel le Devleskero nipos!* Bibl Just have a look, what is God's nation doing.

*Mukena tut, ma dara, ča av sikhav, kaj tumen bešen!* Reiz 11 They will leave you, do not fear, just show, where you live.

*No chan, pijen, palis amenge bašavena.* Dem 25 Just eat, drink, then you will play.

*No, ta šun, čhaje!* Fer 23 Just listen, girl!

*Se dikh, the e Mañas imar lačhi.* Just have a look, also Maña is already good.

*“Šaj asan,” phend’a Škiparis.* Giña 10 “Just laugh,” said Škiparis.

More polite command expressed by particle:

*Av ča arde!* Šeb 59 Come here, please.

*No, šun arde, nič te kerel.* Slep 14 Well, listen (please), one can do nothing.

More polite command can be expressed also by introducing it lexically, by words *te kames/kamen* if you want (sg./pl.) after which the imperative follows:

*Te kames av manca.* Fer 23 If you want, come with me.

*Ta te kamen, ta len tumenge o livinde.* Reiz 16 Well, if you (pl.) want, take arms.

The command or order can be made more polite also by other means. For instance, it can be formulated as a prayer. Then the directive illocutionary act is introduced by performant *mangel* to beg, to ask after which the imperative of the autosemantic verb follows:

*Mangav tumen, ma bisteren mire lava.* Reiz 24 (I) beg you, do not forget my words.

*Mangav tumen, bečalinen tumen, likerem jekhe avres, pativ den.* Reiz 9 (I) beg you, respect, respect one another, pay respect.

A higher degree of uncertainty in a request (begging) can be expressed by the help of particle *šaj* can, could followed by the autosemantic verb in a particular grammatical form and the directive illocutionary act is formulated as a question:

*Šaj džahas opre pro dachos, hin tut lačhe topanki, ciracha!* Giña 34 Could you go up the roof, you have good shoes, boots. (= please go up the roof)  
*Šaj sikhaves odi chmara?* Bibl. Could you show that cloud? (= please show it!)

Even more polite request is expressed grammatically (by conditional) and lexically (be so good):

*Mro sumnakuno Devloro, te bi avehas ajso lačho u kerd'al kala phurd'atar nevi...* Dem 8 My golden God, if you were so good and made a new bridge from this one...

Prohibition is expressed by the imperative proceeded by the negative particle *ma*:

*Ma daran, o doktoris tumenge phenla sar so.* Fer 10 Do not fear, the doctor will tell you what is necessary.

*Ča ma asa u šun, so tuke phenava.* Dem 10 Just do not laugh and listen to what I will tell you.

If there is a phase or modal verb in the command, it takes the form of the imperative and the content (command, order, request) is expressed by the autosemantic verb in the infinitive form:

*Mukh les čino te khiňol avri...* Giña14 Let him rest a little.

*... dža tuke romňa te dikhel!* Dem 17 ...go to look for a wife!

*Betko, av te chal!* Fer 25 Betka, come to eat.

The directive illocutionary act may be directed also to the third person. In such case it follows from the communicative situation or context whether the second person, as a mediator/communicator of the content of the directive illocutionary act to the third person, is necessary or not. If the third person is present, he/she hears the indirect command (order, request) and is expected to execute it. (We two are not able to come to an agreement so let (present) Kalo gives us advice.)

If the third person is not present or does not take part in conversation, the addressee (the second person) serves as a mediator between the one, who utters the command, and the one, who is expected to perform it.

The direction of the content of the directive illocutionary act to the third person is expressed with the aid of particles *mi* or *te*, "let" and the verb in the third person in present tense. In such case it is often explicitly expressed, named, who is expected to respond to the content of the illocutionary act:

*O koro Rom mi morel peske andre o jakha, the o bipindreskero mi čhivel o paňi pre peste.* Dem 10 Let the blind Rom washes his eyes and let legless one pours water on himself!

*Mi dikhen o Roma, so sam!* Giña 12 Let Roma see what we are!

The naming of the performer of the content of the directive illocutionary act is not obligatory. Often it follows from the communicative situation:

*Te na domukel, kaj la te cind'aren le apsenca...* Reiz 17 Let /0/ does not allow you to wet it by tears.

*Mi šinel, sar les savore Roma mangel.* Reiz 17 Let /0/ hears how all Roma beg him.

If command, order, demand or request is reported on, the one who reports (nominator) as well as the one to whom the directive illocutionary act is directed (performer) is named and the content of the directive illocutionary act is expressed in the clause attached by the conjunction *kaj te*. If the nominator is known from the context, it is not necessary to express him explicitly:

*O Del* (nominator) *phend'a* (performant) *le Noemoske* (performer), *kaj te ačhavel bari šifa*. Bibl The God said Noe to build a large ship.

*Mangelas* (performant) *le Devles* (performer), *kaj len te na odmukel, kaj len te dodikel*. Bibl (They) begged God not to leave them, to watch them.

*Mangel le Devles te šigitinel lenge*. Bibl (They) asked/begged the God to help them.

*Mangelas the jon vaš ma le Devles, mi del mange čhavoress, mi del the len butheder čhave*. Reiz 4 (They) also interceded for me with God may he give me a child, may he gives also them more children.

The conjunction *kaj* with particle *mi* can occur in the same function:

*E Kali mangelas le čhavoress, kaj o jakhora mi phuterel, kaj mek jekhvar pre late mi dikhel*. Reiz 20 Kali begged (asked) the child may he opens his eyes, may he at least once looks at her.

*Somas ke leste, mangavas les, kaj o košiben pal tu mi lel tele*. Reiz 8 (0) was with him, (I) begged him, may he takes the curse off you.

Two successive directive illocutionary acts may also be connected by means of the conjunction *kaj te* and particle *mi*:

*Kali... mangelas les kaj te avel mi pomožinel...* Reiz 19 Kali... asked him to come, may he help...

Naturally, the conjunction *kaj te* can be repeated in such cases:

*E Kali palis pomangla le romņipen, kaj lake o bala te rozmuken, kaj la te uchanen*. Reiz 25 Kali then asked women may they free her hair, may they comb her.

As illustrated here, the conjunction *kaj te* can be divided: *te* stands closely before the verb in present tense, while the object in the Dative or Accusative can stand between *kaj* and *te*.

The imperative, performants and particles *kaj*, *te* and *me* (in 3rd person) are univocal markers of the directive illocutionary act. Besides them, there are some other means for formulating the directive illocutionary act. They are not so univocal and sometimes some context or communicative situation is necessary to be sure that they are to be considered as command, request, demand and so on. They are, for instance, the modal verb *mušinel* (must) and modal particles *šaj/našfi* in

the indicative. Though the primary function of this verb and these particles is to express obligation and probability, they may be used also for expressing other communicative intentions, conditioned by the communicative context of the particular illocutionary act. In such cases also the actual interpretation of the modal verb and particles depends on a particular communicative situation. The sentence *Kalo mušinel te kerel buti*. Kalo must work can be interpreted either as an announcement of obligation (Kalo is obliged to work) or as the directive illocutionary act (let Kalo work – I want, request, ask him to work). Similarly sentence *Šaj sikhaves odi chmara?* Can you show the cloud? can be interpreted either as a question whether you are able to show the cloud (yes or no) or as a polite form of command or request to show the cloud.

There are specific cases in which neither the imperative forms, particles, performatives, modal verb, modal particles nor the specific communicative situation are necessary for expressing the directive illocutionary act. They are instructions and advice, for instance in recipe, which are often formulated by the present tense in 1st person plural:

*O kompira randas tele, čhingeras pro hranolky a pekas len avri. Churchula žužaras, čepo opražinas, čhivas čepo lon, papros o palis len dušinas. Kudl 71* We peel the potatoes, cut to chips and fry. We wash mushrooms, fry a little, add a little salt, pepper and stew.

The command or request may also be expressed by future tense:

*U palis, sar aveha andal e chañig avri, mukeha e brad'i a phereha o pañi, a'e jekšeber čhoraveha (pokropineha) man, bo oda ela džido pañi.* And then, when you get out of the well, you will drop the bucket /into it/ and fetch water, but first you will sprinkle me, because it is the live water.

*No chan, pijen, palis amenge bašaven.* Dem 25 Well, eat, drink, then you will play for us.

In a certain communicative context also the illocutionary act formulated as a condition can be understood as a command or request:

*Sar na preacheha te gravčinel, ta tut figinava pro tragaris!* Giňa 8 If you do not stop crying (= stop crying, otherwise), I will hang you on the ceiling!

*Te na aveha čit, džaha pro pindre!* Giňa 12 If you are not silent (be silent, otherwise), you will go on foot.

In oral communication this function of the directive illocutionary act is indicated by intonation, in the written text it is indicated by the exclamation mark.

The directive illocutionary act need not even comprise any verb. The command may be expressed for instance by an interjection or adverb:

*Čit!* Fer 25 Pst! (= keep silent!)

*Avri andal miro kher!* Fer 18 Out of my house!

A specific way of formulation of the directive illocutionary act is represented by the interrogative sentence. When the speaker turns to the addressee by a question, he expects a response – an answer from him. It depends on a particular communicative situation whether the addressee will interpret the question as a request for a verbal response or for an action. A question is then a request for the addressee either to give the speaker some information on a specific point, or, in some other communicative situation, to act on the basis of the question. It may be the yes-no question or the completive question.

### YES-NO QUESTION

When uttering the yes-no question, the speaker expects the addressee either to confirm or to controvert the content of the utterance:

*Džanes, s'oda ela?* Giňa 8 Do you know what will be here?

*Avaha adaj dži ra'i?* Giňa12 Shall we be here till night?

The answer to the question may be simply a confirmation – yes or a controversion – no. In order to confirm (controvert) the question, the addressee sometimes repeats the sentence or the part of the sentence the validity of which is to be confirmed or controverted in his answer:

*Šun arde, sal mange romňi?* Listen, are you my wife?

*Som tuke romňi.* I am your wife.

*Solachard'al tu mange?* Have you taken an oath to me?

*Solachard'om.* Slep 15 I have taken an oath.

However, the speaker often does not expect the addressee only to confirm or controvert the content of his question. His question may function as a request, proposal or demand directed to the addressee who is expected to respond by particular action. A decisive role is played by the communicative situation here. A response to the sentence *Avaha adaj dži ra'i?* Shall we be here till night? can be the answer yes or no, but this question may be understood also as the request of the speaker to the addressee to do something what will change present state – not to be there all night, to go away.

The content of the yes-no question can be formulated positively or negatively. The semantic difference between affirmation and negation is in the main neutralized in such cases and their mutual substitution manifests the fact that in the moment of speech the speaker presupposes that the positive as well as the negative content can hold good (Daneš – Hlavsa – Grepl 1987: 324).

*Džanes, s'oda ela?*

*Na džanes s'oda ela?*

The speaker can formulate both possibilities already in his question:  
*Betko, sal oda tu, či na?* Fer 22 Betka, are you this or not?



On the other hand, in some cases positively and negatively oriented yes-no questions are not semantically equivalent. In the sentence *Kamen te džanen so tumenca jela?* Reiz 22 Do you want to know what will be with you? the speaker asks the addressee to answer yes or no. But the question *Na kames te dikhel, mri čhaj?* Hor 95 Do not you want to have a look, girl? is rather a polite invitation to activity – for the girl to have a look.

### COMPLETIVE QUESTION

By a completive question the speaker turns to the addressee, he appeals to him, asks him to complete information, which he does not have. By a particular interrogative pronoun he expresses what type of information is to be completed.

*Joj, kirvo, sar tumen adaj dochudňam?* Dem 25 Oh, godfather, **how** you have got there?

*Ko čalavel la chmaraha?* Bibl Who moves the cloud?

*A kaj hiñi e zebra?* Bibl And where is the zebra?

*Soske o Adam the o Eva musaj sas te omukel peskero šukar kher?* Bibl Why Adam and Eve had to leave their beautiful home?

*Ale so tu adej keres korkori, Betko, kadebor svetos?* Fer 23 But what are you doing here alone, Betka, so far in the world?

However, the speaker does not put the completive question only if he expects a completion of information. He may also put it if he wants to express surprise over clear, though unexpected state of things. At the same time the speaker can attract the attention of the addressee to create transition at arranging illocutionary acts:

*Avla leske pre god'i o Del, hazdña o jakha opre ko řebos u phenel: "Mro som-nakuno Devloro, te bi avehas ajso lačho u kerd'al laha phurd'atar nevi, ta tajsa džava andre khangeri pes te modlinel." U so na dikhel? Nevi phurd angle leste.* Dem 8 He remembered God, lifted the eyes to heaven and said: "My golden God, if you were so good and would make a new bridge from this one, I will go to pray to the temple tomorrow." *And what he does not see?* There is a new bridge in front of him.

### "ORATORICAL" QUESTION

Also with the so-called oratorical question the speaker expects a verbal reaction from the addressee, the affirmation or negation of the content of his question. Positively and negatively oriented questions are usually not equivalent here. If the speaker expects a negative answer, he usually formulates his question positively:

*"So sam? Vandraka? Čavargoša?"* Giña 12 What we are? Vagrants? Vagabonds? (= we are neither vagrants nor vagabonds).

*Ko džanel, ko hin tri dad?* GH 118 Who knows who is your father? (= nobody knows).



When expecting a positive answer, the speaker formulates the question negatively:

*Na dikhes, hoj oda gurunňa?* Rus 24 Do not you see that it is a cow? (= I see it).

## REFERENCES

- DANEŠ, F. – HLAVSA, Z. – GREPL, M. a kol. 1987. *Mluvnice češtiny 3. Skladba*. Praha, ACADEMIA. 746 p.
- HORECKÝ, Ján, 1996. *The content and form of illocutionary acts*. In: *Discourse and Meaning. Papers in Honor of Eva Hajičová*. Ed. by Barbara H. Partee, Peter Sgall. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 31–38.
- ŠEBKOVÁ, H. – ŽLNAYOVÁ, E. 1999. *Romaňi čhib. Učebnice slovenské romštiny*. Praha, Fortuna. 269 pp.

## EXCERPTED ROMANI TEXTS

- DEMETEROVÁ, H.: *Rom ke Romeste drom arakhel. Rom k Romovi cestu najde. Paramisa the sune. Povídky a sny. Sdružení romských autorů – ROMAŇI ČHIB*, Praha 1994. 55 pp. (Dem)
- FERKOVÁ, I.: *Čorde čhave. Ukradené děti. Společenství Romů na Moravě*. Undated. 95 pp. (Fer.)
- GIŇA, A.: *Bijav*. Praha, Apeiron 1991 (Giňa)
- GODLOVÁ, E.: *Uřom sar Romaňi o kada hin mire dživipnaskro drom*. In: *Romano nevo řil*, XIII, No. 591 – 593/2003, p. 11 (EG)
- HORVÁTHOVÁ, A.: *Pal e bari Roma*. In: *Romano džaniben*, No. 1 – 2, 2002, pp. 88 – 98. (Hor)
- KUDLIČKOVÁ, J. (ed.): *Romaňi tavřard'i. Rómska kuchárka. Rómska jazyková úprava a preklad Matej Adam. Minority Rights Group – Slovakia, Bratislava 1997*. 124 pp. (Kud)
- REIZNEROVÁ, M.: *Kal'i. Paramisa. Sdružení romských autorů – ROMAŇI ČHIB*, Praha. Undated. 49 pp. (Reiz)
- RUSENKO, A.: *Trin pheňa. Tri sestry. Paramisa. Sdružení romských autorů – ROMAŇI ČHIB*. Praha 1944. 44 pp. (Rus)
- SLEPČÍK, J.: *Lavutaris anel maškar o nipi pařiv*. In: *Romano džaniben*, No. 3 – 4, 1997, pp. 48 – 51. (Slep)
- TAYLOR, K. T.: *Miri jekhto Biblija andro obrazki. Moja prvá Biblia v obrázkoch vo východoslovenskej rómčine. Preklad F. Godla. Bratislava, Medzinárodná biblická spoločnosť – Slovensko, 1998*.