

Toshiaki Ayukawa

THE DEMONSTRATIVE KA AND DEFINITENESS MARKING IN ROMANI

0. INTRODUCTION

In Romani there are two pronouns KA¹ and AVRO, both of which seemingly have the same meaning "other". Why can these two pronouns coexist despite their semantic similarity? In this article I will discuss that these pronouns are likely to show a complementary distribution depending on whether their referent is definite or indefinite. Moreover, KA, which originally is one of the demonstratives – unlike other demonstrative pronouns – is co-occurring with the definite article. In another dialect, however, it doesn't co-occur with the definite article. I would like to illustrate why the demonstrative KA and the definite article can co-occur and why the situation of co-occurrence differs between dialects, taking into account the problem of definiteness marking.

1. DISTINCTION BETWEEN KA AND AVRO

In this chapter I will investigate the usage of KA and AVRO, respectively, in Romani, especially in the Roman dialect, and then show the distinction between the two by comparing them. I will also refer to the situation in another dialect.

The data source for this study are the texts from 'Märchen & Erzählungen der Burgenland-Roma' (Halwachs/Ambrosch/Wogg 1999). I left part of the song texts out of consideration, because of their peculiarity as texts.

Here I'm going to analyze the examples of KA and AVRO, respectively. In the examination I will pay special attention to the definiteness of the referent and to the existence of a definite marker like the definite article.

1.1. Demonstrative KA

In this section I would like to investigate the demonstrative KA.

1.1.1. Demonstrative system in Romani

Before we look at the demonstrative KA in Roman in detail, I would like to give a general overview of the demonstratives in the Romani language. Matras has presented several de-

1 The word forms of demonstratives in Romani vary greatly from dialect to dialect and are therefore lacking in formal unity. For the sake of convenience, I use the form of the Roman dialect written in capitals, KA, to refer to the same kind of demonstrative in Romani in general.

tailed studies of demonstratives in Romani (cf. Matras 1994, 1998, 2000, 2002). Here I would like to discuss them briefly, especially the description of the demonstrative KA.

Though there are some common structural patterns, demonstratives in Romani have a great variety of word forms. One of its characteristic features compared to other European languages is that the demonstrative system in Romani is a four-term system (but in some dialects it might be a two- or three-term system).

As for the structure of the word form, the demonstratives are formed by connecting vowels and consonants following this procedure:

Table 1

carrier vowel	STEM	carrier vowel	2 nd STEM	2 nd carrier vowel	INFL
a-/o-	k-/d-	a-/o-(u-)	d-/k-	a-/o-	m.f/sg.pl/case

The so called 'carrier vowel' (Matras 2000), which is building demonstratives, is the resource of the knowledge about the referent: the vowel -a- means that the referent belongs to extra-linguistic situations or the real world, and the vowel -o- means that the referent belongs to the intra-linguistic context.

When the stem consonant -k-/-g- is duplicated within the word, its reference is 'specific'. Being 'specific' means that a certain referent is clearly distinguished from or contrasted with other possible referents. In addition, when the carrier vowel is -o- and the reference is intra-linguistic and 'specific', the demonstrative is largely used to mean 'other', referring to the 'other' object than the easily accessible entity in the sentence. As mentioned above, in some dialects demonstratives have two- or three-term system, and in these dialects the distinction concerning specificity is lost (cf. Matras 2002: 103–106). This specific form has some other functions like the demarcation of the referent or the substitution of an unrecollectable word. But the frequency of this demonstrative in texts is low, and in some dialects there is a tendency to deviate from the deictic system (cf. Matras 1998: 417–424). Here I present the four-term demonstrative system of Romani in a simplified table:

Table 2

	general k	specific k+k
situational a	k + a	k + a + k
contextual o	k + o	k + o + k

I would also like to mention the historical development of these demonstratives:

Table 3

	ProtoRomani 1 st stage	ProtoRomani 2 nd stage	ProtoRomani 3 rd stage	EarlyRomani	
prox. a	general specific	<i>ata > alo</i>	<i>alo-a > alova > ava</i>	<i>adaj-ava > adava</i> <i>akaj-ava > akava</i>	<i>adava</i> <i>akava</i>
dist. o	general specific	<i>ota > olo</i>	<i>olo-a > olova > ova</i>	<i>odoj-ova > odova</i> <i>okoj-ova > okova</i>	<i>odova</i> <i>okova</i>

(This table is based on the tables by Matras (2002: 104–110). Here the single masculine nominative case is shown as the representative form.)

[Proto Romani 1st stage]: there was a two-term system of proximate (vowel a-) and remote (vowel o-) demonstratives, and the consonant -t- changed to -l-.

[Proto Romani 2nd stage]: the remote demonstrative started to be used as third-person personal pronoun, and then split from the demonstratives. In order to reinforce their weakened deictic function, the demonstratives took on the suffix -a; there was also epenthesis of the consonant -v- and weakening or shortening of the consonant stem -l-.

[Proto Romani 3rd stage]: the contracted form of the remote demonstrative started to be used in anaphoric function and split as a new third-person personal pronoun. In order to reinforce their again weakened deictic function, demonstratives were prefixed with the local adverbs *adaj* 'here' / *akaj* 'just here' / *odoj* 'there' / *okoj* 'just there'. By doing this, a new distinction regarding whether the referent is specified or not was introduced in addition to the proximate/remote distinction. Then word contraction took place. In this way the present four-term demonstrative system developed in Romani. (cf. Matras 2002: 106–112)

1.1.2. General explanation

In the Roman dialect there are three demonstratives: *ada/oda/ka*. As for *ada*, it is used to mean 'this certain' and has an emphatic function. And as for *oda*, it is used to mean either 'this' or 'that' and generally has an anaphoric function. Therefore, the distinction between *ada* and *oda* is not like the one between proximate and remote (Halwachs 1998: 91–92).

Besides *ada* and *oda*, in this section I'm going to deal with *ka*. This demonstrative pronoun declines as shown in the following table. Like *ada* and *oda*, *ka* is also used as a pronoun or adjective. When used as an adjective, it declines only in the nominative and oblique (accusative) cases.

Table 4

	m. sg.	f. sg.	pl.
Nom.	<i>ka</i>	<i>kija</i>	<i>kole/kola</i>
Acc.	<i>kole</i>	<i>kola</i>	<i>kole(n)</i>
Dat.	<i>koleske</i>	<i>kolake</i>	<i>kolenge</i>
Abl.	<i>kolestar</i>	<i>kolatar</i>	<i>kolendar</i>
Loc.	<i>koleste</i>	<i>kolate</i>	<i>kolende</i>
Instr.	<i>koleha</i>	<i>kolaha</i>	<i>kolenca</i>
Gen.	<i>koleskero</i>	<i>kolakero</i>	<i>kolengero</i>

Here I give an example of the pronominal use of *ka* from the text:

- (1) taj o ka le haroha lakere va tele tschintscha. 4–7²
 and the other the sword-Inst. her-Gen.hands cut off-3.sg.Perf.
 'and then the other (one of two thieves) cut off her hand with the sword.'

An example of adjectival *ka*:

- (2) kaj hi o ka balitscho?" 10–29
 where is the other pig
 '[asked when came home after giving one of two pigs to a girl] where is the other pig?'

The distinction between proximate and remote is likely to correspond to that between *ada/oda* and *ka*, and *ka* stands for the other one who is distant in terms of space and emotion from the peaker's point of view (Halwachs 1998: 93).

In Roman demonstratives form a three-term system: *ada/oda/ka*. If we compare this three-term system of Roman with the four-term demonstrative system of Romani in general, *ada* corresponds to the situational/perceptual demonstrative and *oda* to the contextual/conceptual one. According to Matras, *ka* would belong to the -o- vowel demonstratives, because its oblique plural form *kole* has a vowel -o- as its stem-vowel (Matras 2000: 116). Taking this into consideration, it can be said that *ka* is a specific contextual/conceptual demonstrative and that the demonstrative system of Roman is lacking the specific situational/perceptual demonstrative as shown in the following table:

Table 5

	general	specific
situational	<i>ada</i>	-
contextual	<i>oda</i>	<i>ka</i>

1.1.3. Usage analysis

I will analyze the usage of *ka* using examples from the Roman text.

In the analysis, no significant difference was found between the pronominal and adjectival usage, so I don't differentiate these two usages, except when there is something special to mention about them.

Firstly as for frequency in the text, 51 *ka* were found in total: 30 adjectival, 19 pronominal and 2 adverbial usages.

Before examining the examples in detail, I classified them according to definiteness, judging mainly from whether there is any article or not.

2 When giving an example, I will show the page and the line where the example was taken from in the text by connecting the page number and line number with a hyphen. For example, in this case the example is on page 4, line 7 in the text.

Table 6

definite		48
with	definite article	47
	possessive pro.	1
indefinite		1
with	no article	1
sortless	(adverbial usage)	2
total		51

Almost all the examples of *ka* are definite and marked by definiteness marking elements like the definite article (in 47 examples) and the possessive personal pronoun *mro* 'my' (in 1 example). As a representative example of the definite article I will show here the above mentioned example (1) again. I will also give an example of the possessive personal pronoun.

- (1) *taj o ka le haroha lakere va tele tschintscha.* 4–7³
 and the other the sword-Inst. her-Gen. hands cut off-3.sg.Perf.
 'and then the other (one of two thieves) cut off her hand with the sword.'

- (3) *Meg mro ka phral, so phuraneder sin,* 132–22
 still my other brother what older was
 '[mentioning her family in turn] and there was another elder brother of mine.'

Among examples with a definite article, there are many cases where *ka* is followed by a temporal noun and used to mean 'next, following' like *o ka di* 'the next day': with *di* 'day' (12 examples), with *rat* 'night' (2 examples) and with *kurko* 'Sunday' (1 example). The following is an example with *di*:

- (4) *O ka di o kirali ar dobolinatscha,* 6–25
 the other day the king announce-3.sg.Perf.
 'the next day the king announced ...'

As mentioned above, in almost all the examples *ka* is accompanied with a definiteness marker like the definite article. There is however one example of an indefinite use without any article:

3 When giving an example, I will show the page and the line where the example was taken from in the text by connecting the page number and line number with a hyphen. For example, in this case the example is on page 4, line 7 in the text.

- (5) ..., hat *kija* romani tschaj dikel leske upro pre, 86–6
 then other romani girl look-3.sg.Pres. him-Dat. on the legs
 '[a romani girl is chatting up a devil disguised as hunter] then another romani girl saw his legs.'

Different from other definite examples above, only two particular characters, a Romani girl and a devil, are appearing before the example sentence in the story. When another yet unspecified Romani girl appears – a character from a lot of potential candidates –, *ka* is used to refer to this newly introduced girl. Here we should note: according to the description by Halwachs, undetermined nominal phrases are generally without articles (Halwachs 2002: 15). Thus it would be possible for *ka* to appear without definite article even if it is semantically definite.

There are two unclassifiable examples with regard to definiteness, where *ka* is used adverbially to mean 'another, well, over' expressing that there is a large amount of something.

- (6) Saj tschereschnajin sina, hot sin li ando bulhipe *kija* pantsch meter. 48–16
 so cherrytree was that was it-Nom. in the width other five meter
 'the cherry tree was so big, it was over 5 meter in width.'

- (7) Le grasta sin, biknelahi len tafka, dur berscha,
 him-Acc. horses-Loc. were sell-3.sg.Imp. them-Acc. anyway long years
kija pansch vaj schof berscha afka gelo, 114–13
 other five or six years so go-3.sg.Perf.
 'he owned horses and sold them for long years. In this way another five or six years had passed.'

In these two examples *ka* is used adverbially to modify numeral adjectives before nouns and there's no referent of *ka* at all, therefore we cannot judge it with respect to definiteness.

Now we have seen examples for the definiteness of reference from the formal aspect, for example whether there is an article or not. But here we must note that there were a few cases where formal definiteness and semantic definiteness – which is considered contextually – did not overlap, though in most examples they seemed to match. As the functions of the definite article vary from language to language and since it would be more or less subjective or arbitrary if I tried to semantically judge the definiteness of each example considering its context, I consider the definiteness of *ka* mainly from a formal viewpoint in this study.

1.2. Pronoun AVRO

In this section I will investigate the pronoun AVRO.

1.2.1. General explanation

Like *ka*, *avro* has the meaning 'other', and it declines as in the following table. *Avro* is also used as a pronoun or an adjective. When used as an adjective, it declines only in the nominative and oblique (accusative) cases.

Table 7

	m. sg.	f. sg.	pl.
Nom.	<i>avro/aver</i>	<i>avri/averi</i>	<i>avre/avere</i>
Acc.	<i>avre/avere</i>	<i>avra/avera</i>	<i>avren/averen</i>
Dat.	<i>avreske/avereske</i>	<i>avrake/averake</i>	<i>avrenge/averenge</i>
Abl.	<i>avrestar/averestar</i>	<i>avratar/averatar</i>	<i>avrendar/averendar</i>
Loc.	<i>avreste/avereste</i>	<i>avrate/averate</i>	<i>avrende/averende</i>
Instr.	<i>avreha/avereha</i>	<i>avraha/avraha</i>	<i>avrenca/averenca</i>
Gen.	<i>avreskero/avereskero</i>	<i>avrakero/averakero</i>	<i>avrengero/averengero</i>

Etymologically *avro* is said to have developed as follows:

avro/aver < Prakrit: *avara-* < Old Indic: *apara-* 'other; next' (Boretzky/Igla 1994: 14)

As we can see from the fact that it originally comes from Old Indic, it belongs to the oldest vocabulary in Romani, and thus it is one of the core words in the Romani lexicon.

There are many compounds in which *avro-*(*avre-*) is combined with another element. Such compounds are treated as one word. The following words are some examples from the Roman dictionary:

averval (*avreval*) 'another time, once more, once again'; *avrethan(e/nde)* 'in another place, else where, somewhere else'; *avrijal* 'differently, otherwise'; *avredi* (*averdi*) 'the following day, the day after, tomorrow'; *jekavre* 'one another, mutually'; *avrikor* 'in former times'; *avripe* 'something different'

Considering these compound elements, we find a variety of forms like free forms or bound forms. Free forms there are *than* 'place', *di* 'day', *jek* 'one', (*a*)*kor* 'then' and so on. Bound forms are *-val(-jal)* 'time', *-ipe* (noun deriving suffix) and so on. By combining these elements with *avro*, new words or adverbs can be derived. From all the compounds above I only give an usage example of *avrijal* in the text:

- (8) Akan gaunc *avrijal* lo ulo. 100–12
 now completely otherwise he become-3.sg.Perf.
 'Now he completely changed his attitude.'

In cases like the example (8), it is difficult to distinguish this *avro-* clearly from an independent free adjective. Therefore it is difficult to decide whether I should also include these compounds into my study or not. As there is only one example like (8) in the text, and since this is not enough for plausible examination, I will not consider these compound forms in this paper.

In (9) I give an example of a pronominal use of *avro* from the text:

- (9) "Soske niko na kamla taj tschumidel man sar le *avren*?" 30–7
 why nobody not like-3.sg.Fut. and kiss-3.sg.Pres. me-Acc. like the other-Acc.
 'why does nobody love me and kiss me like other ladies?'

(10) Is an example of an adjectival use of *avro*:

- (10) kesdintscha pe ar te dikel, te na la le *avre* romendar dikle, 124–12
 start-3.sg.Perf. herself to look out if not her-Acc. the other rom-Abl. see-3.pl.Perf.
 'she began to look around to make sure other Roma would not see her.'

1.2.2. Usage analysis

I will analyze the usage of *avro* using examples from the Roman text. As in the case of *ka*, I don't differentiate between the two usages, except when there is something special to mention about them.

Firstly as for frequency in the text, 17 examples of *avro* were found in total; 12 adjectival, 4 pronominal and 1 adverbial usage. The number of examples is somewhat small, so there might be some doubt left about the result of this investigation.

Before examining the examples in detail, I classified them according to definiteness, judging mainly from whether there is any article or not.

Table 8

definite		6
with	definite article	6
indefinite		10
with	no article	9
	indefinite article	1
sortless	(adverbial usage)	1
total		17

For *avro* there were relatively many instances of indefinite usage, there were 9 examples without any article:

- (11) Upre jek rik si lake o tschon,
 on one side is her-Dat. the moon
 t'upre *aver* rik si lake o schukar kham!" 12–16
 and on other side is her-Dat. the beautiful sun
 'there is the moon on one side of her chest, and on the other side there is the beautiful sun!'

There is also one instance where *avro* was used with the indefinite article *jek*:

- (12) Kada urtschim samahi, gejam ando foro
 when jump-1.pl.Perf. were-1.pl.Pret. go-1.pl.Perf. in the town
 taj la srastunaha ladijam dschi jek *avro*. 118–4
 and the train-Instr. drive-1.pl.Perf. until a other
 'when we were traveling, we walked to one town and took a train to another town.'

On the other hand there are 6 definite examples with the definite article. Here I cite the example (9) again:

- (9) "Soske niko na kamla taj tschumidel man sar le *avren*?" 30–7
 why nobody not like-3.sg.Fut. and kiss-3.sg.Pres. me-Acc. like the other-Acc.
 'why does nobody love me and kiss me like other ladies?'

And there is one peculiar example, where *avro* is used adverbially to mean 'otherwise':

- (13) afka la schaj te hal dav,
 so her-Acc. can to eat give-1.sg.Pres.
 mint *aver* nan man nischta lake." 18–20
 because otherwise isn't me-Acc. nothing her-Dat.
 '[I'm gathering hay] so that I can give food to her (the goat), otherwise I have nothing for her.'

Unlike for *ka*, no temporal expression like *o ka di* 'the next day' could be found for *avro*. In the dictionary, however, there is a compound word *avredi (averdi)* 'the following day, the day after, tomorrow'. Therefore it was only by chance that such an expression did not appear in the text examined.

Now we have seen examples for the definiteness of reference from the formal aspect, for example whether there is an article or not. But again, also for *avro* we must note that

there are some cases where formal definiteness and semantic definiteness did not overlap, though in most examples they seemed to match. This inconsistency, however, may be explained by the description of Halwachs: undetermined nominal phrases as a rule are without articles (Halwachs 2002: 15).

1.3. Comparison

Above we have seen the usage of *ka* and *avro*, respectively. In this section I will discuss the question why *ka* and *avro* can coexist.

Firstly as for frequency in use, 51 *ka* and 17 *avro* were found in the text. That means that *ka* occurred three times as frequently as *avro*. For *ka* we found idiomatic expressions like *o ka di* 'the next day', which occupied about one third of all the instances of *ka*. This kind of idiomatic use might affect the frequency of *ka*. Even after excluding these idiomatic uses, however, *ka* occurs about two times as often as *avro*, and therefore there still remains nonaccidental bias. This disbalance in frequency means that *ka* in some respect has a wider range of application than *avro*. Or in other words: there is some reason why *ka* selectively is used more often than *avro*, despite the fact that both pronouns have the same meaning 'other'.

Here I would like to reconsider whether *ka* and *avro* really overlap semantically. In fact, *ka* and *avro* have some different meanings besides the meaning 'other'. For *ka*, there were the meanings 'next, following', which indicates a temporal consecutive relation, and 'another, well, over', which adverbially emphasizes a numeral adjective. In contrast, *avro* has an adverbial meaning 'otherwise' besides 'other'. Therefore, *ka* and *avro* do not totally overlap semantically. However, these differing meanings are just marginal and the number of examples in the text is small. Most of the instances of *ka* and *avro* in the text exemplify the shared meaning 'other'. Then, what is the decisive difference between *ka* and *avro*?

In this study I paid special attention to definiteness. My results show that for *avro* there is no clear preference for either an indefinite or a definite use: we find quite a number of indefinite uses without any article, but also there are a number of definite uses. For *avro* therefore there is no particular bias concerning definiteness. At the same time, almost all the instances of *ka* in the text are definite uses with elements like the definite article. Therefore there is an obvious bias for definiteness with *ka*.

Judging from the results so far obtained, I will conclude as follows: As *avro* is etymologically thought to have derived from Old Indic *apara-* 'other; next' (cf. Boretzky/Igla 1994: 14), it is one of the oldest pieces of vocabulary in Romani, and thus it is one of the core words in the Romani lexicon. On the other hand, *ka* seems to have derived as a specific form of the remote demonstrative in the late Proto Romani period (cf. Matras 2002:

106–112) a little later than *avro*. And it might be even much later after the split off of the Roman dialect, that *ka* began to have the meaning 'other'. Considering this time lag in the emergence of these two elements in Roman, it is likely that at the beginning only *avro* was used to express the meaning 'other', and then later the specific remote demonstrative *ka* appeared and began to have the same meaning. These two semantically overlapping elements then started opposing each other. And at this point, because *ka* goes back to a demonstrative, which by its nature semantically presupposes definiteness, it comes to be assigned with definite reference. In the meantime *avro*, gradually losing the domain of definite reference to *ka*, starts to cover the remaining indefinite reference. In this way a complementary distribution between *ka* and *avro* might have developed in Roman.

1.4. The situation in another dialect

Such a complementary distribution can also be seen in other dialects. In this section I will refer to the situation in other Romani dialects.

First of all, dialects differ in whether there is such an overlap as in Roman. The pronoun *avro* is likely to exist in almost all the dialects and its meaning also seems to be stable with 'other'. For the demonstrative *ka*, however, dialects differ firstly in whether this specific remote demonstrative still exists or not. And furthermore, even if the demonstrative itself exists in particular dialects, they vary in whether the demonstrative has the meaning 'other'.

In his study Matras has shown four dialects, in which exists a specific remote demonstrative, that also has the meaning 'other': Agia Varvara, East Slovak, Lovari and Roman (Matras 2002: 105). These four dialects are so far confirmed dialects, and it might be possible that another dialect showing the same situation will be found in the future. Because of limitations on reference books, in this paper we will look especially into the situation in the Agia Varvara dialect, where the usage of both *ka* and *avro* is mentioned in some detail, which makes it possible to compare these usages with those in Roman.

In the Agia Varvara dialect, which belongs to Vlach dialect group and is spoken in a region of Greece, there are two elements *aver* and *okova(okoa)* which have the meaning 'other'. For the definite usage e.g. in a contrastive expression '(the one ... ,) the other ... ' **o aver* is not used, but *okova(okoa)* is used instead (cf. Igla 1996: 42-3).

(14) Me mangáv *averá*. (Igla 1996: 43)

I love other

'I love the other.'

- (15) O jekh sas lonéstar, okoá da memelátar. (ibid.)
 the one was from salt other and from wax
 'The one (house) was made of salt, and the other made of wax.'

As *aver* cannot have the definite usage in this dialect, the division between the two elements concerning definiteness is clearer and sharper than in Roman.

As we can see above in example (15), however, unlike *ka* in Roman, *okova* (*okoá*) doesn't seem to take any definite article. Since demonstratives in the Romani language generally do not take a definite article, omission of the definite article for *okova* in Agia Varvara looks like nothing special.

As for this *okova*, however, the possibility of taking a definite article is still not deniable. For adjectival demonstratives in Agia Varvara, there are three patterns concerning the co-occurrence with the definite article: i) Demonstrative + Noun, ii) Demonstrative + Definite article + Noun, and iii) Definite article + Noun + Demonstrative. When the demonstrative is postposed to a noun like in the pattern iii), the definite article is obligatory. In recent times the concurrent use of a demonstrative with the definite article like in ii) or iii) is increasing in frequency in Agia Varvara, especially among young people, under the influence of the contact language Greek (Igla 1996: 40, 165, 226). Among the examples for *okova* given in Igla (1996), however, there were only examples of pattern i) like example (15) and no examples for patterns ii) or iii) were found. Therefore it is still unclear whether Igla's description could also be applied to *okova*. In addition, this is a description of the adjectival usage of demonstratives and thus not applicable to the pronominal usage. If this explanation also applies to *okova*, we must consider separately the situation before and after the definite article became obligatory due to the influence from Greek.

2. CO-OCCURRENCE OF DEMONSTRATIVE AND DEFINITE ARTICLE

In the Roman dialect *ka* and *avro* seem to have a complementary distribution with respect to whether their referent is definite or indefinite. This complementary distribution can also be seen in the Agia Varvara dialect in a more strict way.

Though *ka* is almost completely restricted to definite referents, a definite determiner such as the definite article is always obligatory: though *ka* is already presupposed to be definite, it still needs the help of another definiteness marker. This seems to go against the principle of economy. In Agia Varvara, on the contrary, *okova* doesn't generally need any definite article. Why does the situation differ between the two dialects? And why does only *ka* need a definite determiner unlike other demonstratives in Roman? Here I'd like to propose some hypotheses.

As the first hypothesis I assume, so to speak, "de-demonstrativization". At first glance both *okova* in Agia Varvara and *ka* in Roman seem to have the common meaning 'other', but in fact *okova* and *ka* are at a different level of de-demonstrativization: *okova* in Agia Varvara is semantically somewhat more particular compared to common demonstratives in Romani and seems to be in the middle of deviating from them, but yet incompletely. Therefore, like other demonstratives in general, no definite article is attached to *okova*. In the meantime, because *ka* in Roman is already in the more highly de-demonstrativized stage, it doesn't presuppose definiteness any more, like other demonstratives, and thus needs another definiteness marker like the definite article. The following figure shows the different stages of "de-demonstrativization":

Figure 1

demonstratives in Romani	-	+ DEM	de-demonstrativization
Agia Varvara	-	+ <i>okova</i>	low
Roman	def.article	+ <i>ka</i>	high

Okova in Agia Varvara would gradually become more de-demonstrativized, and in the future it might move to the same stage as *ka* in Roman.

The second hypothesis is from the perspective of the complementary distribution between KA and AVRO: below are is a figure displaying the complementary relationships between them in Roman and Agia Varvara, respectively.

Figure 2

Roman		Agia Varvara	
<i>ka</i>	<i>avro</i>	<i>okova</i>	<i>aver</i>
definite	indefinite	definite	indefinite

In Roman almost all the referents of *ka* are definite, but those of *avro* are mixed between definite and indefinite. Therefore the boundary between *ka* and *avro* is still unstable, and as a direct result of this instability there rises an anxiety that the boundary might move at any time, though in fact *ka* exclusively refers to definite objects at the time being. Consequently, there seems to be a need to reinforce *ka* with the help of another definiteness marker, the definite article, as a double assurance of definiteness, just in case. In Agia Varvara, on the contrary, the boundary between *okova* and *aver* is stable and the definiteness of *okova* is confirmed by two bidirectional assurances: an internal assurance by the fact that *okova* itself refers only to definite objects, and an external assurance by the fact that there is an indefinite counterpart *aver*, and this *aver* is defining the border between the two from the outside.

Here I proposed some hypothetical suppositions, but each idea still has some problems and they are yet lacking decisive evidence, so further consideration is required.

3. FURTHER PROBLEMS

In this article I investigated the two semantically similar elements KA and AVRO in Romani, focusing firstly on the distinction between them and secondly on the co-occurrence of the demonstrative KA with the definite article from the perspective of definiteness marking.

Besides Romani, a similar situation can also be seen in another language: for example, in Old Norse there was once a demonstrative (or definite article) *hinn* 'this one; that; the'. There were also other demonstratives *sá* 'that' and *sjá* 'this', and unlike these, *hinn* is semantically neutral concerning proximity. It is often translated as 'that', but it is also used in a construction like '(the one ...) the other ...' and often contrastively refers to the other object than the one referred to by *sá* or *sjá*. Besides *hinn*, there was also a semantically similar word *annarr* 'other, another; second, next; one (of two)' (cf. Faarlund 1994: 50; Faarlund 2004; Pettersson: Internet). Though the detailed usage of *hinn* and *annarr* is still to be investigated, the relationship between them concerning definiteness would be worth researching. By comparing the situation of Old Norse with that of Romani, a new light could be shed on the problems addressed in this article.

REFERENCES

- Boretzky, N./Igla, B. 1994 *Wörterbuch Romani–Deutsch–Englisch für den südosteuropäischen Raum. Mit einer Grammatik der Dialektvarianten*, Wiesbaden.
- Faarlund, J.T. 1994 Old and Middle Scandinavian, in: König E./van der Auwera, J. (eds.) *The Germanic Languages*, London/New York.
- 2004 *The Syntax of Old Norse: with a survey of the inflectional morphology and a complete bibliography*, Oxford.
- Halwachs, D.W. 1998 *Amaro vakeripe Romani hi – Unsere Sprache ist Roman. Texte, Glossar und Grammatik der burgenländischen Romani-Variante*, Klagenfurt.
- 2002 *Burgenland-Romani*, München.
- Halwachs, D.W./Ambrosch, G. 2002 *Wörterbuch des Burgenland-Romani (Roman)*, (Arbeitsbericht 10 des Projekts Kodifizierung und Didaktisierung des Roman), Oberwart.
- Halwachs, D.W./Ambrosch, G./Wogg, M. 1999 *Märchen & Erzählungen der Burgenland-Roma*, (Arbeitsbericht 8a des Projekts Kodifizierung und Didaktisierung des Roman), Oberwart.
- Igla, B. 1996 *Das Romani von Ajia Varvara. Deskriptive und historisch-vergleichende Darstellung eines Zigeunerndialekts*, Wiesbaden.

- Lyons, Ch. 1999 *Definiteness*, Cambridge.
- Matras, Y. 1994 *Untersuchungen zu Grammatik und Diskurs des Romanes. Dialekt der Kelderaša/Lovara*, Harrassowitz.
- 1998 Deixis and deictic oppositions in discourse: Evidence from Romani, *Journal of Pragmatics* 29/4: 393–428.
- 2000 The structural and functional composition of Romani demonstratives, in: Elšík, V./Matras, Y. (eds.) *Grammatical Relations in Romani. The Noun Phrase*, Amsterdam: 95–122.
- 2002 *Romani: A linguistic introduction*, Cambridge.
- Pettersson, P. *Demonstrative Pronouns*. http://hem.passagen.se/peter9/gram/g_prn_dem.html