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Abstract

Recent studies in contact linguistics have emphasized the aspect of language-internal grammaticalization that is triggered by accommodation to an external (contact-language) model (e.g. Heine and Kuteva, 2005). This is based on the notion that speakers make use of the available resources in order to match them to those of the target language. A problematic issue is contact-induced change in the domain of case representation. Synthetic case markers are usually thought of as fully grammaticalized morphemes. If contact-induced grammaticalization is, as Heine and Kuteva suggest, much like monolingual grammaticalization, unidirectional, how do we treat instances of rearrangement of the semantic meaning and scope of case markers? I will discuss this problem by examining a sample of Romani dialects, belonging to the so-called Northeastern dialect group (see Matras, 2002). Relying on specific constructions, like Subject of Negative Existence, External Possession, Privative, Partitive etc., I will compare and contrast the Northeastern dialects with their respective contact languages (Russian and Polish). Using semantic maps, I will demonstrate how the Romani dialects in question restructure their case representation system to accommodate to the systems of the model languages, and will discuss what it is exactly that gets equated when two languages come into contact.
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1 Introduction

This article analyzes a set of contact-induced changes in the Northeastern (NE) Romani dialects. The changes concern a restructuring in the ways
that Romani cases are used to represent the relations between constituents in various constructions. To present and illustrate these processes, a semantic map approach is used. This approach was first used in a 2008 PhD dissertation “Northeastern group of Romani dialects” (Tenser, 2008: 239–257; cited in Matras, 2009: 263–264). At the time the PhD dissertation was written, the semantic maps had not been previously used in conjunction with contact-induced grammatical change. Since then, the semantic maps approach has been used in (Gast and van der Auwerwa, 2012) to analyze/illustrate contact-induced language change in Mayan and Mixe-Zoquean languages.

Recent studies in contact linguistics have emphasized the aspect of language-internal grammaticalization that is triggered by accommodation to an external (contact-language) model (e.g. Heine and Kuteva, 2005; Matras and Sakel, 2007b), thus bringing together the fields of typology and language contact. Arguably, the most interesting cases of contact-induced change involve a transfer of pattern, rather than matter (PAT vs. MAT, in terminology coined by Matras and Sakel, 2007a). This is based on the notion that speakers make use of the available language-internal resources in order to match them to those of the target language. In traditional studies on language contact, the process is also known as ‘convergence’, or ‘metatypy’ (Ross, 1999) - the matching of grammatical meaning to forms. In the past decade such processes were viewed in light of the contact-induced grammaticalization framework proposed by Heine and Kuteva (2005). These inquiries have most recently resulted in an edited volume (Wiemer, Wälchli and Björn, 2012), which outlined several models or guidelines to approaching such processes.

Heine and Kuteva (2005; 2012) propose to analyze contact-induced grammaticalization within the general grammaticalization framework, regardless of whether or not the changes are triggered by contact. The general grammaticalization framework (Lehmann, 1982; Traugott and Heine, 1991; Hopper and Traugott, 2003) sets out various parameters that are indicative of grammaticalization processes. In their version of the model, Heine and Kuteva propose the following four parameters, for contact-induced, as well as language internal grammaticalization processes:

(1) Parameters of grammaticalization (after Heine and Kuteva, 2012)

a. **extension** (or context generalization): use in new contexts suggests new meanings;

b. **desemanticization** (or “semantic bleaching”), i.e. loss in meaning content;
c. decategorialization, i.e. loss in morphosyntactic properties characteristic of lexical or other less grammaticalized forms; and
d. erosion (or “phonetic reduction”), i.e. loss in phonetic substance.

The model also maintains that the grammaticalization cline follows a unidirectional path, such that the units undergoing grammaticalization change from lexical > grammatical, or from less grammatical > more grammatical structures.

A problematic issue within this framework is contact-induced change in the domain of case representation, which will be discussed in the present paper. This kind of change involves a switch in a language from using an inflectional case A to using an inflectional case B, the switch being conditioned by the model found in a contact language. Below are examples, to be further discussed later in this paper, illustrating the point, which involves Instrumental and Promotion of State constructions in Romani and Russian (for the use of the term ‘construction’ in this paper see discussion in section 2.3). The data for Romani dialects are taken from the RMS database (Elšík and Matras, 2001), along with index numbers for the relevant dialect samples. North Russian Romani has been in contact with East Slavonic languages (specifically Russian) for the past five hundred years. The Romungro dialect of Romania, not having any significant contact with Slavonic, is presented here as a control language, a stand in for the ‘inherited Romani’.

(2) Instrumental construction (‘to work with a hammer’)
   (a) (Russian)
   rabotat’ molotk-om
         work.inf hammer-inf

   (b) (Romungro Romani, Romania, ro-059, 693)
   ker-εs buki ekh-e ćokanoa-ha
         do-2sg work art-obl hammer-inf

   (c) (North Russian Romani, Russia, rus-008, 693)
   te ker-εs buty ćukane-sa
         comp do-2sg work hammer-inf

(3) Promotion of State construction (‘I become director’)
   (a) (Russian)
   ja stanovlj-usj direktor-om
         I become-1sg.refl director-inf
Example (2) presents the Instrumental construction, which takes Russian Instrumental case in Russian, and Romani Instrumental case in both of the Romani dialects. Example (3a-b) shows that while Russian uses the Russian Instrumental case in the Promotion of State constructions (just as in the instrumental constructions), inherited Romani uses Romani Nominative. In Example (3c) we see that North Russian Romani, in contact with Russian, has switched from using Romani Nominative to Romani Instrumental, thus extending the semantic range of Romani Instrumental under the influence of the model found in the Slavonic (Russian) model. As will become apparent in the current paper the phenomenon is quite widespread in all of the Northeastern (ne) Romani dialects, and concerns many different constructions. Specifically for the North Russian Romani, such rearrangements have been previously noted in Rusakov (2004) for Possessive and Locative constructions, as well for some uses of Romani Instrumental.

To explain phenomena such as the one discussed above, Ross (1996; 2001) proposes the term ‘metatypy’, which he defines as the “gradual convergence of languages, characterized by a tendency towards structural and semantic isomorphism” (Ross, 1996: 182). This definition can be applied to the data presented above, but does not help answer the question of what it is exactly that gets borrowed from one language to another.

In her analysis of structural convergence in Amazonian languages, Aikhenvald (2002, pp: 267–269) recognizes two broad types of ‘convergence of pattern’: a) system-altering changes, which introduce new categories into language, and b) system-preserving changes, which add a new parallel term to an already existing linguistic form in a certain category. The convergence in the domain of case representation, discussed in the current paper, does not yield itself to the categorization within either of these types. On the one hand the system is not altered, since Romani synthetic morphological case remains intact as a category. On the other, no new terms are added to an existing paradigm, since all the individual morphological case markers remain intact as well. The change in this instance involved a redistribution of functions among the existing morphological cases.

The preceding example of contact-induced PAT change is not easily accommodated by Heine and Kuteva’s grammaticalization model, and the four
parameters proposed by the model. There is no erosion - all of the original Romani case markers are still present and intact in the NE dialects; and there is no one-way desematicization or decategorialization- as one case marker loses some of its functions, it gains other functions. Extension seems to be the only parameter that might be applicable here. In their earlier work (2005), for cases such as the one discussed here, Heine and Kuteva adopt the term ‘category extension’, where speakers establish equivalence between categories in L1 and L2. Through doing this, they write, speakers replicate the grammatical properties associated with these grammatical categories. My analysis is compatible with this view. I would add, however, that in addition to the grammatical properties the semantic properties are replicated as well. In the latest revision of their model, Heine and Kuteva propose to exclude some cases of contact-induced grammatical change from the grammaticalization framework, and rather view them as cases of ‘restructuring of grammar’. They write: “Restructuring involves those kinds of contact-induced change where there are no new grammatical categories created.” (2012: 179). According to this rendition of the model, rearrangements in the domain of case representation, such as the ones exemplified above (2–3), fall outside of its scope.

Matras and Sakel (2007a), propose a different model for analyzing contact-induced change. Within their model, they recognize two broad types of borrowing, that of ‘matter’ (mat) and that of ‘pattern’ (pat). They define the latter as involving the changes in “the patterns of distribution, of grammatical and semantic meaning, and of formal-syntactic arrangement… that are modeled on an external source” (Matras and Sakel, 2007a: 829–830). They also identify a specific mechanism for such pat borrowing, which they call ‘pivot-matching’, and which involves “identifying a structure that plays a pivotal role in the model construction, and matching it with the structure in the replica language, to which a similar pivotal role is assigned” (Matras and Sakel, 2007a). Importantly, within this model, pivot-matching might or might not lead to grammaticalization. The analysis presented in the current paper will be compatible with this model.

Gast and van der Auwera (2012, pp: 389–395) propose a somewhat different model of contact-induced grammaticalization, based on “interlingual identification of linguistic signs and categories”. As there is no rearrangement of the actual category of case in the examples above (the whole case system of Romani stays intact), it would seem that the examples to be discussed in this paper would fall under the umbrella of interlingual identification of linguistic signs without the interlingual identification of linguistic categories. Gast and van der Auwera (2012, p: 384) further propose to use the semantic map approach to present and illustrate their data on distributional assimilation in
the domains of TAM and modals, which arose from the contact of Mayan and Mixe-Zoquean languages.

In the following paper, I will present and analyze/examine various rearrangements in the domain of case representation that occurred in NE Romani dialects under the influence of Russian and Polish. Not all constructions in NE have been influenced by contact, and I will only discuss those constructions where interesting changes have taken place. There is also some degree of synchronic variation in expressing the various constructions discussed here; while these will be addressed and exemplified in the discussion section, their systematic treatment will not be the focus of this paper. The aim will rather be to demonstrate the mechanisms, by which the semantic range of, for instance, a specific Russian case serves as a model to be replicated for the semantic range of a specific Romani case. This process will be called 'semantic map replication' and I would argue that it is exactly the language-specific segments of the semantic map (the mappings of forms onto functions) that are borrowed from the Slavonic languages into the NE dialects in the domain of case representation. This type of analysis follows several aims: 1) to describe the mechanism of the contact-induced change in the absence of MAT transfer; 2) to show that it is the semantic map of the L2 that gets borrowed into the NE Romani dialects; and 3) to demonstrate a convenient and useful way of visually representing the data such as this. More generally, I aim to make a contribution, both in terms of empirical data and analysis, to the study of contact-induced grammaticalization.

2 Background

2.1 Romani and NE Dialects

Romani is an Indo-Aryan language, and it is the only Indo-Aryan language spoken natively in Europe. It is spoken by over four million people who call themselves Roma, Sinti, Kale etc. Linguistic comparison with the languages of India places Romani linguistic origin in the context of Central and Northern Indic languages (see discussion in Matras, 2002: chapter 3) Currently, many scientists assume that the ancestors of Roma have settled in the Byzantium sometime before the eleventh century (Matras, 2002: 1). The current linguistic landscape of Romani is not uniform. Many varieties, or dialects, and sub-varieties of the language are spoken throughout the world, but mostly in Europe. Some of the varieties are very closely related, while others are mutually unintelligible at first approximation, and yet others, like Finnish Romani, have for the large part undergone language attrition.
Due to its geographical spread and the absence of an official political and administrative Romani state with an established state language, Romani is especially susceptible to changes triggered by contact with the outside languages. As such, Romani, with the wealth of its linguistic variation and various situations of contact, makes for an invaluable subject of more general inquiries into language contact and linguistic typology. For the most comprehensive general description of Romani see Matras (2002); for a specialized historical discussion of some dialect differences see Elšík and Matras (2006).

Northeastern (ne) group of Romani dialects is a term that has been proposed to describe a group of dialects spoken in the Baltic region, parts of Poland and parts of Russia. It has been proposed in the literature that these varieties comprise a single unit, going by various names – ‘Northern’ group (Kochanowski, 1946), ‘Baltic’ group (Ventcel’ and Cherenkov, 1978), ‘Eastern sub-branch of the Northern metagroup’ (Bakker, 1999), and most recently under the name of Northeastern group (ne) (Matras, 1999; Matras 2002). Following Bakker’s classification, the Northeastern group is considered by many to be a part of the Northern meta-group of Romani dialects. The other member of the Northern meta-group is the Northwestern Romani group, comprised of Finnish Romani and Sinti.

The described dialects that have been placed in the ne group are spoken by the following groups:

- Russka Roma (RuR; also known as North Russian Romani, Xaladytka) – the major group of Roma residing throughout all of Russia, but concentrated in the Northern parts of the country. Over 150,000 speakers
- Polska Roma (PoR) – spoken by a group of Roma residing in Poland, once again with a greater density in the North of country. Over 30,000 speakers
- Litowska Roma (LiR; Lithuanian Roma) – spoken by Roma residing in Lithuania. Over 5,000 speakers
- Lotfitka Roma (LoR; also known as Lotfiko/Loftiko, Chuxny, Latvian Roma) – spoken by a group of Roma residing in Latvia, with a greater density in the Northern and Western regions. Over 10,000 speakers

These dialects have been described previously to various extents. The grammar of RuR was described by Sergievskij (1931), and then by Wentzel (1980). While these accounts serve as good guidelines, or grammar sketches, they are not complete: especially apparent is the lack of comparison of the Russka Roma dialects to other dialects of Romani. Helpful, but less comprehensive still, is the description of Lotfitka Romani grammar by Mānušs (1997), an addendum.
to his dictionary of this dialect. Closely related to the Lotfitka dialect is the
dialect of Romani spoken in Estonia, which was mentioned as a group in
Kochanowski (1946) without any linguistic description. A sketch of Polska
Roma grammar, with an analysis of this dialect within the greater scope of
Romani in general, is provided by Matras (1999). The grammar of Litowska
Romani was described in Tenser (2005). Finally a linguistic overview of the
Northeastern group has been made in Tenser (2008). In addition to the major
dialects listed above, Northeastern type varieties of Romani are spoken in
Belarus, Estonia and parts of Ukraine.

This work will also refer to some examples from a Polish Xaladytka dialect
(XaP). The speakers of this variety are recent (1–2 generations) migrants from
Russia to Poland.

2.2 Semantic Maps
The term ‘semantic map’, as applied by Haspelmath (1997) in relation to
Indefinites, is a mapping of functions in a certain domain (i.e. indefinite
pronouns) in relation to each other on a one- or two-dimensional scale in
such a way as to reveal the semantic closeness of these functions. The
method has been applied e.g. in van der Auwera and Plungian (1998), among
others, to other functional and semantic domains. The mapping is based on
a sample from a variety of unrelated languages, and thus the relations
revealed by the map are proposed to be universal. Matras and Elšík (2009)
also use semantic maps to discuss contact as well as universal functions
across Romani dialects.

In this paper I am using the term ‘semantic map’ in a slightly different way,
as it applies to the discussion of contact-induced language change. Used
in the present paper, the term still captures the mappings of forms onto
functions, as in the traditional application of semantic maps. My approach
also relies on identifying clusters of functions that are realized using the
same form. Unlike with the traditional use of semantic maps, the current
paper focuses on language-specific rather than universal form-function rela-
tions. This modification to the traditional use of the term allows capturing
and illustrating the processes that are particular to contact induced changes.
As such, my use of terminology follows that used by Croft (2009, p: 93),
who differentiates between universal “cognitive space” and language-specific
“semantic map”.

2.3 Constructions
The following analysis is based on a functional approach to constructions,
which maintains that “constructions are the primitive units of syntactic
representation" (Croft, 2009: 18). In the semantic map approach presented here, various constructions will be used as ‘functions’ onto which the forms (using specific cases) will be mapped. Some of the constructions presented in this paper will include Promotion of State, Time of Day Adverb and Pronominal Direct Object. For the purposes of this approach, no difference is made between the semantic and grammatical parameters of the construction, as long as there is a clear pattern of language use in a given language. While Promotion of State underscores the semantic properties of a construction and Pronominal Direct Object brings to the front its grammatical features, they are treated on the same level as far as patterns of usage are concerned.

Furthermore, the semantic field can be carved out into discreet constructions to various degrees of precision and in various ranges. For instance, Promotion of State could feasibly be further subdivided along the grammatical gender or the animacy axes, to yield more specific constructions, such as Animate Feminine Promotion of State (“she becomes a mother”) and Inanimate Promotion of State (“the fruit becomes rotten”). Similarly, when dealing with the semantic sub-domain of possession, the External Possession construction might or might not be included in the discussion. It, therefore, becomes up to the researcher to empirically discern the variable patterns of usage, and to identify what degree of granularity and what range to use when carving up the semantic space into constructions.

2.4 Data

The data in this paper, unless otherwise stated, comes from questionnaire interviews, elicited as part of the Romani Morpho-Syntax (RMS) database (Elšík and Matras, 2001) hosted at the University of Manchester. The data collection process for the database relies on the RMS questionnaire designed for the purpose of eliciting data on Romani dialects. It has a standardized format, with over 1000 items - lexemes, verb inflections and sentences - that are presented to Romani speakers during an interview, and are translated by them into the respective Romani dialect. By design, the aim of the RMS questionnaire is to elicit enough data to be able to provide a basic grammatical description of Romani varieties. The standardized format of RMS is conducive to inter-dialectal comparisons, but it is not specifically targeted at eliciting comprehensive data on case representation. Thus, some constructions in Romani are not readily available for current analysis. Throughout the discussion, various dialects of Romania (e.g. Ursari and Romungro), will be used as a control group - they are not part of the NE or the neighboring dialects, and are not in contact with the Slavonic languages, and are therefore more conservative than the NE dialects with respect to the domain of case representation. Whenever
applicable, I will also refer to inherited Romani case representations as reconstructed in Elšík and Matras (2006: chapter 16).

The pool of RMS samples considered in this paper is presented in Table 1. Most of these samples are available through the online RMS interface, a few others are archived and are as yet not publicly accessible. The examples throughout this paper will refer to the sample index number, as well as the RMS questionnaire sentence number.

2.5 Language Contact

This section will briefly describe the recent and current language contact situation of the NE Romani dialects. Evidence of contact with German is seen throughout all of the NE varieties, with common German loans, such as berga ‘mountain’ (< German Berg), bilda ‘picture’ (< German Bild), among others. Evidence of contact with Polish is also seen throughout all of the NE varieties, with common Polish loans, such as venka ‘fishing pole’ (< Polish wędka), breza ‘birch tree’ (< Polish brzoza), among others. Polish continues to be the language of contact for PoR, and to some extent for LiR. Russian is the current language of contact not only for RuR, but also for LoR and LiR, since until recently, and arguable even up to now, Russian language had an important presence in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Dialect Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUS-006</td>
<td>Russka Roma</td>
<td>Nizhnij Novgorod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS-008</td>
<td>Russka Roma</td>
<td>Ekaterinburg (Ural region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV-001</td>
<td>Lotfitka</td>
<td>Riga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV-004</td>
<td>Lotfitka</td>
<td>Ventspils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV-005</td>
<td>Lotfitka</td>
<td>Riga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV-006</td>
<td>Lotfitka</td>
<td>Riga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT-005</td>
<td>Litowska Roma</td>
<td>Šiauliai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT-007</td>
<td>Litowska Roma</td>
<td>Šiauliai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL-003</td>
<td>Polska Roma</td>
<td>Pabianice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL-010</td>
<td>Polska Roma</td>
<td>Pyskowice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL-012</td>
<td>Polska Roma</td>
<td>Lublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL-014</td>
<td>Xaladytka in Poland</td>
<td>Elk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL-019</td>
<td>Polska Roma</td>
<td>Zielona Góra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO-004</td>
<td>Ursari</td>
<td>Meglavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO-059</td>
<td>Romungro</td>
<td>Bahnea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Latvia and Lithuania. Latvian is the current language of contact for LoR. Importantly, Lithuanian language seems to have had only marginal influence on LiR, possibly because of the higher status of Polish and Russian until recent times. Polish Xaladytka (XaP) speakers are recent (1–2 generations) migrants to Poland from Russia, and their recent and current languages of contact reflect this fact. Table 2 above summarizes the language contact situation for the four main varieties discussed in this paper.

Case representation, presented in this paper, is not the only domain where Pat borrowing has led to interesting semantic rearrangements in the ne dialects. A well known effect of this type is the wholesale adaptation of the Slavic and Baltic (in case of Lotfitka) aktionsart prefixes (Rusakov 2004: 34–42 in connection with Russka Roma; Matras 1999:12 in connection with Polska Roma; Tenser 2008 in connection with ne as a whole). Another example of such rearrangement is the appearance in some ne varieties of the three-way distinction in the prepositions used with allative constructions, to match the Russian model (Tenser 2008: 228–229) – e.g. dro foro ‘to town’ vs. po targo ‘to the market’ vs. ke leskiri daj ‘to his mother’ (< Russian v gorod, na rynok, k ego mame).

### 2.6 Romani Case System

The discussion in this paper will benefit from a brief overview of the Romani case system. For a comprehensive treatment of Romani case, the reader is referred to Elšík (2000). Here, I will simply list and exemplify the Romani cases and give a brief discussion of the issues relevant to the ne dialects (Table 3). Romani has several noun declension classes, which vary by gender, thematicity, animacy and noun ending; Table 3 summarizes the Romani case using the word manuš ‘person’, a masculine animate noun ending in -Ø.

The basic inflectional grammatical case division in Romani is that between the Nominative case, the Oblique cases, and the Vocative case. The use of Vocative is in great decline in the ne dialects, and thus will not be discussed.

---

#### Table 2 Contact languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Recent</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russka Roma</td>
<td>German, Polish</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polska Roma</td>
<td>German, Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litowska Roma</td>
<td>German, Polish</td>
<td>Russian, Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotfitka</td>
<td>German, Polish</td>
<td>Latvian, Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xaladytka in Poland</td>
<td>German, Polish, Russian</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
here. The typical use of Nominative is as the subject of the phrase, although it is also often used within various prepositional phrases. The Oblique cases are formed using the oblique marker, which attaches to the noun base: SG -es and PL -en in the table. The Oblique stem without any further marking is used as an Accusative, or the case of the Direct Object. The rest of the cases are expressed with the appropriate markers that attach to the Oblique stem. These cases include Locative, Ablative, Dative, Instrumental and Genitive. The Genitive case has further marking, agreeing with its head for gender, number and case.

3 Data and Analysis

It is obvious that when it comes to case use, the dialects of the NE group differ from other Romani dialects with respect to a range of constructions. It is also obvious that while there is no transfer of actual phonological material (MAT, to use a term in Matras and Sakel (2007a)), new ways of expressing the constructions emerge due to contact with outside languages. This was noted and discussed by Rusakov (2004, pp: 21–29) for the Russka Roma (RuR) dialect. Here is an example taken from his work (Rusakov, 2004: 25):

(4) Possessor (‘he had a daughter and a son’)
(a) (RuR)
   les-te sys raklori i rakloro
   him-LOC was girl and boy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Oblique marker</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>manuš</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>manuš-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique/Accusative</td>
<td>-es/-en</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>manuš-es-Ø</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>manuš-en-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>-es/-en</td>
<td>-te</td>
<td>manuš-es-te</td>
<td>-de</td>
<td>manuš-en-de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>-es/-en</td>
<td>-tyr</td>
<td>manuš-es-tyr</td>
<td>-dyr</td>
<td>manuš-en-dyr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>-es/-en</td>
<td>-ke</td>
<td>manuš-es-ke</td>
<td>-ge</td>
<td>manuš-en-ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>-es/-en</td>
<td>-sa</td>
<td>manuš-es-(s)a</td>
<td>-ca</td>
<td>manuš-en-ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-kir</td>
<td>manuš-es-kir-</td>
<td>-gir-</td>
<td>manuš-en-gir-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>-es/-en</td>
<td>-kr-</td>
<td>manuš-es-kr-</td>
<td>-gr-</td>
<td>manuš-en-gr-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-k-</td>
<td>manuš-es-k-</td>
<td>-g-</td>
<td>manuš-en-g-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rusakov, basing his analysis on Croft’s (2001) Radical Construction Grammar, which takes constructions rather than individual constituents to be the operational units of language, explains this phenomenon as the result of equating, in the minds of the bilingual Romani speakers, of the Russian ‘u + Genitive’ construction with the Romani Locative construction (e.g. u menja doma ‘at my house’).

3.1 Possession and Locative
Let us investigate the mechanism behind this innovation. Here is another example, this time with an External Possession construction, ‘my nose hurts’, in Litowska Roma (LiR), Ursari (control) and Russian (L2):

(5) External Possession (‘my nose hurts’)
   (a) (Ursari, Romania, RO-004, 982)
       dukhal man o nakh
       hurts me.OBL ART.M nose
   (b) (LiR, Lithuania, LT-005, 982)
       man-de dukhal nakh
       me-LOC hurts nose
   (c) (Russian)
       u menja bolit nos
       to me.GEN hurts nose

Ursari represents the conservative Romani way of expressing External Possession with the Oblique (Accusative) case, as also reconstructed in Elšík and Matras (2006, p: 222). Looking at the LiR and Russian examples we see, like with the example from Rusakov above, equivalence established between Russian ‘u + Genitive’ construction corresponding to the Romani Locative. Here we are concerned with the question of the source of this equivalence. In order to answer this question, we should first examine the Stative Location constructions in the three languages. Let us look at the phrase is ‘next to you’:

(6) Stative Location (‘near you’)
   (a) (Ursari, Romania, RO-004, 846)
       pašal tute
       next.to you.LOC
What this set of examples shows is that the source of the equivalence is to be found in the Stative Location constructions. In the mind of a bilingual speaker, the use of the Russian Genitive with a locative preposition in the Stative Location constructions becomes equated with the use of Romani Locative in the same types of constructions. This is the first stage of the convergence, the point of ‘pivot matching’, to use the term established by Matras and Sakel (2007a, p: 830; Matras, 2009), around which further changes take place. The second stage then, is the spreading of this equivalence to other constructions, with the result that a whole range of constructions utilize the Romani Locative where the Russian equivalents use the locative preposition + Russian Genitive case. This two-stage process results in the External Possession constructions and Possessor proper in ne dialects being expressed through Locative case. Table 4 below summarizes the three constructions.

A more insightful and illustrative way to present this data is to use the semantic map approach. This approach allows to visually represent the phenomenon described above. Below, in Fig. 1, is the set of three language-specific semantic maps of the three constructions from Table 4.

The labeled boxes represent the specific constructions (functions), and the lines around them represent the forms that are used to express these constructions. Thus, in Ursari, there are two different forms that are used to express Stative Location on the one hand, and both Possessor and External Possession on the other hand. In Russian, all three constructions (Stative Location, Possessor and External Possession) are expressed with the same form (Russian Genitive), and LiR follows suit by also using a single form (Romani Locative) in all three constructions.

**Table 4** Possession constructions – Ursari, RuR and LiR, and Russian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Ursari</th>
<th>RuR, LiR</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possessor</td>
<td>Obl.</td>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>Loc. prep + Gen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Ablative

Let us now look at constructions involving the Romani Ablative case. In LiR, the Romani Ablative has merged into Romani Locative (Tenser, 2005: 10), so LiR would not yield good examples here. To examine the Ablative case we will look at examples from the Lotfitka Romani (LoR) dialect. The pivot construction is the Source construction, which is a prototypical construction to be expressed by Ablative. Romani Ablative is reconstructed to be the inherited case for Source, Material, Origin and Partitive constructions (Elšík and Matras, 2006: 223).

(7) Source (‘they heard the story from me’)
   (a) (Ursari, Romania, RO-004, 543)

\[
\text{on šund-e paramisi man-dar}
\]
\[
\text{they heard-3PL story me-ABL}
\]
The form ‘Ablative preposition + Genitive’ in Russian gets equated, through this kind of pivot matching, with the Romani Ablative. The result is that the scope of Ablative in NE dialects, including LoR, is extended to other constructions, such as Partitive constructions:

(8) Partitive (‘two of them’)
   (a) (Ursari, Romani, ro-004, 1029)
       duj andar len-de
       two from them-LOC
   (b) (LoR, Latvia, lv-005, 1029)
       duj len-dyr
       two them-ABL
   (c) (Russian)
       dvoje iz nikh
       two from them.GEN

As well as Privative constructions:

(9) Privative (‘except for the old man/men’)
   (a) (Ursari, Romani, ro-004, 1044)
       yn afare de phuro
       in exception of old.man.NOM
   (b) (LoR, Latvia, lv-005, 1044)
       vienegu phuren-dyr
       except.for old.man-ABL
   (c) (Russian)
       kromje starika
       except.for old.man-GEN

The three constructions discussed above can also be put on to a semantic map, similar to the one presented for the Locative constructions. In Fig. 2 we see that while in Ursari the three constructions are expressed using three different forms/cases, LoR aligns with the Russian language in using the same form for all three.
It is perhaps this equating of Slavonic Genitive with Romani Locative on the one hand, and with Romani ABL on the other hand, that facilitates the merge of Locative and Ablative case markers in the Polska Roma and Litowska Roma dialects.

We can add the Origin construction (such as ‘she is from Germany’) and the Object of Comparison construction (such as ‘she runs faster than anyone’) to this conglomerate of constructions that take Romani Ablative in the NE dialects under the influence of Russian:

(10) Origin (‘she is from Germany’)
(a) (LoR, Latvia, LV-001, 1032)
   \[ jej sy sasen-dyr \]
   she is Germany-ABL
(b) (RuR, Russian, RUS-006, 1032)
   \[ joj jav-el germanija-tyr \]
   she come-3SG Germany-ABL
(11) **Object of Comparison (‘(s)he runs faster than anyone’)**

(a) (LoR, Latvia, LV-004, 870a)

```
joj uxt-ela sygedyr saren-dyr
she run-3SG faster everyone-ABL
```

(b) (PoR, Poland, PL-003, 870b)

```
jof nasj-el sygedyr sarenen-dyr
she run-3SG faster everyone-ABL
```

For comparison, in Ursari the Origin construction is realized through an ablative preposition + Nominative (andar i Dżermania), and the Object of Comparison takes the Romani Locative case.

### 3.3 Oblique (Accusative)

The Subject of Negative Existence construction takes the Romani Oblique (Accusative), with the pivot point being the Pronominal Direct Object. Compare the following two sets:

(12) **Subject of Negative Existence - Pronominal (‘I/he was not home’)**

(a) (Ursari, Romania, RO-004, 339)

```
ou nas khere
he.NOM NEG.was house
```

(b) (LiR, Lithuania, LT-005, 333)

```
man na sys khere
me.OBL NEG was.3SG home
```

(c) (Russian)

```
menja nje bylo doma
me.GEN NEG was.3SG home
```

(13) **Pronominal Direct Object (‘he did not see me’)**

(a) (Romungro, Romania, RO-059, 353a)

```
vo na dikhli-as man
he NEG saw-3SG me.OBL
```

(b) (LoR, Latvia, LV-006, 353a)

```
jou man na dykx-ja
he me.OBLNE NEG saw-3SG
```

(c) (Russian)

```
on menja ne videl
he me.ACC NEG saw-3SG.M
```

What further facilitates the identification of the pivot point in these examples is the case syncretism between Russian Accusative and Genitive for the
pronoun (*menja*). Accordingly, in Subject of Negative Existence constructions in NE that use a noun rather than pronoun, we often find that noun in the Romani Nominative case:

(14) Subject of Negative Existence – Nominal (RuR, Russia, rus-008, 985)

\[ e \text{ stekla na sys pro skamint } \]
\[ \text{ART bottle.NOM NEG was.3SG on table} \]

‘the bottle was not on the table’

### 3.4 Instrumental

There is also a conglomerate of constructions in NE that use Romani Instrumental. The pivot point here is the Instrumental and Comitative constructions, which traditionally take Instrumental in Romani. The functionality of Romani Instrumental is extended, under Russian influence, to the Promotion of State constructions that was discussed in the introduction to this paper, as well as Time of Day Adverbs (*utro-sa* ‘in the morning’, *ratja-sa* ‘at night’):

(15) Time of Day Adverbs (*in the morning’, ‘at night’)

(a) (RuR, Russia, rus-006, 404, 775)

\[ \text{utro-sa} \quad \text{ratja-sa} \]
\[ \text{morning-INS} \quad \text{night-INS} \]

(b) (Russian)

\[ \text{utro-m} \quad \text{noch-ju} \]
\[ \text{morning-INS} \quad \text{night-INS} \]

Rusakov (2004: 23–4) also mentions other Russian or Slavonic-particular constructions with the Instrumental case that have affected RuR, such as:

(16) one sys syr pšal phenja-sa  \hspace{1cm} (RuR) ‘they were like brother and sister-INS’

\[ me tu-sa nesoglasen \hspace{1cm} (RuR) ‘I don’t agree with you-INS’ \]

\[ duj paše-sa berš \hspace{1cm} (RuR) ‘two and a half-INS years’ \]

LoR dialect in particular also extends the use of Romani Instrumental to certain Location constructions, where Russian uses the Russian Instrumental:

(17) Instrumental with Location (*near you’/ ‘next to you’)

(a) (LoR, Latvia, lv-006, 846)

\[ blaku \quad tu-sa \]
\[ \text{near you-INS} \]
3.5 Overview

Below (Fig. 3) are the semantic maps for some NE dialects, with over a dozen constructions that have been affected by this kind of process, preceded by the maps for the same constructions of Ursari and Russian.

For the constructions below, the RuR semantic map differs from the one for Russian only in the Privative construction, in which RuR uses Locative, rather than Ablative. This can be accounted for, once again, by the equating of Russian Genitive with both Romani Locative and Ablative cases. The semantic map of LoR matches the Russian map very closely. The only exception here concerns the Possessor and the External Possession construction conglomerate, which in LoR are divorced from the Stative Location construction, and take the Romani Dative case, following the model of the Latvian language.

As further evidence for the contact-induced nature of this phenomenon, we can look at the semantic map of Polish, as it differs from Russian, to see if these differences are reflected in the PoR dialect as compared to RuR or LoR. Figure 4 presents the semantic maps of Polish and PoR for the comparison with the maps in Fig. 3.

Here are the examples of the relevant constructions in Polish and PoR:

(18) Origin ('she is from Poland/Germany')
    (a) (Polish) ona pochodz-i z Polsk-i
        she come-3SG from Poland-GEN
    (b) (PoR, Poland, PL-010, 1032) joj podža-l Sasen-dyr
        she come-3SG Germany-ABL

(19) Source ('they heard the (story) from me')
    (a) (Polish) słysz-ą histori-ę ode mnie
        heard-3PL story-GEN from me.GEN
    (b) (PoR, Poland, PL-003, 543) jone shund-e dava man-dyr
        they heard.3PL this me-ABL
(20) Partitive (‘two of them’)

(a) (Polish)
\[ dwa \quad z \quad nich \]
\[ \text{two} \quad \text{from} \quad \text{them.GEN} \]

(b) (PoR, Poland, PL-012, 1029)
\[ duj \quad len-dyr \]
\[ \text{two} \quad \text{they-ABL} \]
(21) Privative (‘except for (my) grandfather’)
(a) (Polish)
\[
\text{z \_wyjątk-iem\_ dziad-k-a} \\
\text{with \_exception-INS\_ grandfather-GEN}
\]
(b) (PoR, Poland, PL-012, 1043)
\[
\text{opru\c\_ myr-e\_ papos-tyr} \\
\text{except\_for\_ my-OBL\_ grandfather-ABL}
\]
(22) Object of Comparison (‘her brother is five years older than her’)
(a) (Polish)
jej brat jest o pięć lat starszy od niej
her brother is by five years older from he:GEN
(b) (PoR, Poland, PL-012, 977)
lakr-o pšašl sy phuredyr panč beršj la-tyr
her-M brother is older five years her-ABL

(23) Instrument (‘do you know how to work with a hammer?’)
(a) (Polish)
wiesz jak pracować z młot-em
know:2sg how work:inf with hammer:INS
(b) (PoR, Poland, PL-003, 693)
džin-es te ker-ėl buty jek hamros-a
know:2sg compdo:3sg work indf hammer:INS

(24) Comitative (‘wash your hands with warm water!’)
(a) (Polish)
umyj ręce ciepł-q wod-q
wash:imp hands:acc warm-INS water-INS
(b) (PoR, Poland, PL-003, 377)
mor vasta tat-e panjes-a
wash:imp hands warm-obl water:INS

(25) Promotion of State (‘you become director’)
(a) (Polish)
zostan-iesz dyrektor-em
become:2sg director:INS
(b) (PoR, Poland, PL-012, 354b)
tu čh-es dyrektoros-a
you become:2sg director:INS

(26) Time of Day Adverb (‘in the evening’)
(a) (Polish)
wieczor-em
evening:INS
(b) (PoR, Poland, PL-003, 404)
belvela-ke
evening:DAT
(27) Possessor (‘I have two sisters’)
   (a) (Polish)
       (ja) mam dwie siostry
       I.NOM have.1SG two sisters
   (b) (PoR, Poland, PL-019, 477)
       sy man duj phenja
       is I.OBL two sisters

(28) Subject of Negative Existence (‘I was not at home’)
   (a) (Polish)
       (ja) nie byłem doma
       I.NOM NEG was.1SG home
   (b) (PoR, Poland, PL-003, 333)
       (me) na somys khere
       I.NOM NEG was.1SG home

(29) External Possession (‘my nose hurts’)
   (a) (Polish)
       boli mnie nos
       hurt.3SG me.DAT nose
   (b) (PoR, Poland, PL-019, 982)
       dukha-l man nakh
       hurt-3SG me.OBL nose

(30) Stative Location (locative preposition + GEN/LOC; ‘I stood next to you’)
   (a) (Polish)
       stal-em obok ciebie
       stood-1SG next.to you.GEN
   (b) (PoR, Poland, PL-019, 846)
       terd-y somys pašj tu-te
       standing-F was.1SG near you-LOC

Comparing Fig. 4 with Fig. 3, we see that the differences between Russian and Polish are reflected in the differences between the respective Romani dialects in contact. Specifically, looking at Fig. 4-a we see that, compared to the Russian semantic map, the Possessor and the Subject of Negative Existence constructions in Polish are divorced from their respective conglomerates. The Subject of Negative Existence is found in the same conglomerate as the Subject, taking the Nominative case. PoR follows suit here, and has the same arrangement. The Possessor in Polish, unlike in Russian, is expressed through
Figure 4  Semantic maps of Polish and PoR

Nominative, related to the use, in Polish, of the possessive verb ‘to have’. Accordingly, PoR does not express Possessor through Locative, but rather shows a conservative Romani pattern of using the case of the Direct Object. The dialect of Xaladytka in Poland (XaP) in this respect matches the Polish model exactly, expressing possession with the borrowed Polish verb ‘to have’.
and a Nominative case on the Possessor. The most likely path of change here involved an initial switch from a stable conservative Romani use of Direct Object case to the use of Locative under the influence of Russian, just like in RuR. Having an altered Possessor constructions gave a license for further change to the Polish model, once the XaP speakers were exposed to this language of contact. Here are the examples of the Possessor construction in Polish, PoR and XaP, for comparison with (27):

([31] Possessor (‘I have a two sisters’) )

(a) (Polish)

\begin{align*}
&\text{ja} & \text{mam} & \text{dwie} & \text{siostry} \\
&\text{L.NOM} & \text{have.1SG} & \text{two} & \text{sisters}
\end{align*}

(b) (PoR, Poland, PL-019, 477)

\begin{align*}
&\text{sy} & \text{man} & \text{duj} & \text{phenja} \\
&\text{is} & \text{L.OBL} & \text{two} & \text{sisters}
\end{align*}

(c) (XaP, Poland, PL-014, 477)

\begin{align*}
&\text{me} & \text{majin-av} & \text{duj} & \text{phenja} \\
&\text{L.NOM} & \text{have-1SG} & \text{two} & \text{sisters}
\end{align*}

External Possession construction is also divorced from the Stative Location conglomerate in both Polish and PoR: Polish uses Dative here, and PoR makes use of the Romani Oblique case, this being a conservative Romani way to realize this type of construction. Similarly, some instances of case representation in LoR are conditioned by its contact with Latvian, and differ from the respective constructions in other NE dialects. This particularly concerns the use of Romani Dative in LoR for the External Possessor, following the model of Latvian (note, that other NE dialects use Romani Locative in this construction, under the influence of Slavonic). Thus we see that the rearrangements in the domain of case representation, apparent in the NE dialects, are truly the result of contact.

4 Discussion

It is important to keep in mind several caveats concerning the data presented here. I only used constructions where there is evidence of contact induced change, thus leaving out constructions which are not undergoing any changes. For instance, Allative construction, such as ‘you come to me’, which takes Dative case in Russian, would in principal be a good candidate for PAT change in Romani. Somewhat surprisingly, this construction in NE has not undergone contact-induced change, and regularly takes Romani Nominative:
(32) Allative (LiR, Lithuania, lt-005, 398)

\[
\text{tu javj-an ke mə}
\]

you came-2SG to me.NOM

‘you came to me’

Also, as mentioned in the introduction, many constructions discussed above exist in their respective dialects as variants. For instance, in RuR, the Time of Day Adverbs are not always expressed through Instrumental, as in (15a), but examples with old Locative case are also found:

(33) Time of Day Adverb (RuR, Russia, rus-006, 522):

\[
bivel'-e
\]

evening-LOC

(‘in the evening’)

Importantly, variants are often found in the samples from the same speaker. Thus, in the RuR sample (rus-006) we find both (34a) and (34b):

(34) Promotion of State (‘I became director’)

(a) (RuR, Russia, rus-006, 354a)

\[
\text{me kerdž-om po dir'ektaro}
\]

I made-1SG REFL director.NOM

(b) (RuR, Russia, rus-006, 355a)

\[
\text{me kerdž-om pe dir'ektoro-sa}
\]

I made-1SG REFL director-INS

This is in line with Heine and Kuteva's (2012, p: 175) proposition that grammaticalization process is “the story of minor use pattern developing into a major use pattern”, which would support the synchronous existence of two different variants.

Finally, as mentioned in the introduction, many potentially interesting constructions are simply not found in the data due to the specific nature of the RMS questionnaire used to elicit dialect samples.

4.1 **Toward Semantic Map Harmony**

In the context of contact-induced language change, semantic maps are not only a great illustrative tool, they can also have a certain degree of explanatory value. The traditional use of semantic maps in universal cross-linguistic context ascribes semantic relatedness to adjacent constructions. The closeness of the nodes on a semantic map reflects the closeness of the respective categories in language. If
we assume the same inference for the language-specific semantic maps in the context of contact-induced change, it can be argued that the underlying mechanism for semantic map borrowing, demonstrated in this paper, is a tendency, on the parts of the bilingual speakers, toward semantic map harmony.

Keeping in mind the data and the caveats mentioned above, let us once again walk through the mechanism of semantic map replication, from the point of view of a bilingual speaker and a bilingual community, using a specific example. A bilingual speaker of Russian and RuR has two semantic maps at their disposal. According to the Russian-specific semantic map, the following constructions are realized using one form (Russian Instrumental case): Instrument, Comitative, Promotion of State, Time of Day Adverbs, and some Location constructions (rjadom s toboj ‘next to you’). According to the Romani specific semantic map, Instrument and Comitative constructions are realized using the same form (Romani Instrumental case), while the other three constructions are realized through other means. In the mind of the bilingual speaker, parts of the two semantic maps (the use of the specific form-function pairs) become equated; the Instrument and Comitative constructions serve as the pivot point (Matras and Sakel, 2007a) for this equating. Next, the semantic range of the Romani Instrumental case starts extending to match the semantic range of the Russian Instrumental case – the bilingual speaker starts using Romani Instrumental with Promotion of State and Time of Day Adverbs constructions. In the terminology of Matras and Sakel (2007a) this is the innovation stage of PAT replication.

The second process in the Matras and Sakel model is propagation, which is the process responsible for linguistic change spreading throughout and being accepted by the bilingual speech community. The process of propagation happens over a period of time. What happens during this time? Looking at the data for Romani Instrumental case use in RuR, we find that there is variation in applying this case to the relevant constructions. Using Romani Instrumental has already become a productive way to derive Time of Day Adverbs throughout the RuR speech community. The use of Romani Instrumental with Promotion of State constructions co-exists with the use of Romani Nominative, often in a sample from the same speaker. Location constructions such as (Russian rjadom s toboj ‘next to you’), are consistently realized in RuR with the use of Nominative. Figure 5 summarizes the propagation process of Instrumental in RuR.

The semantic and structural range of Romani Instrumental has thus seen a significant shift in the direction of Russian Instrumental, but does not completely coincide with it. I agree with the proposition pointed out in Wiemer and Wälchli (2012, p: 37) that “the amount of convergence that would be necessary to reach full isomorphism is so exorbitant that even
long-lasting and intensive contacts will not be enough to reach it”. Full semantic map harmony is a somewhat idealistic proposition. Nevertheless, it is very apparent as a tendency. As pointed out in Matras and Sakel (2007a, p: 235–236), the outcome of pat borrowing does not necessarily lead to a one-to-one correspondence between the constructions in the two languages, due, among other things, to the language-internal constrains within the replica language.

4.2 Directionality and Prototypes

An examination of the data presented in this paper reveals another tendency, presented in Fig. 6. Semantic map replication has a direction, as the example from the Instrumental conglomerate of the semantic maps presented above demonstrates. Let us take three constructions from the conglomerate - Instrument, Promotion of State and Time of Day Adverbs. In Ursari (taken here as conservative Romani) the three constructions are realized through three different ways: Instrument constructions use Romani Instrumental; Promotion of State constructions use the Romani Nominative case; and Time of Day Adverbs are separate lexical items. These three different ways are represented in the Fig. 6 below as ‘A1’, ‘A2’ and ‘A3’. Russian, on the other hand, has one way of realizing all three of these constructions - it uses the Russian Instrumental case. This is represented by ‘B’.

A dialect of Romani, such as RuR, that aims at cross-linguistic semantic map harmony with Russian, needs all three constructions to take the same form. In this case, there is a choice to be made here - RuR, theoretically, can choose either ‘A1’, ‘A2’ or ‘A3’ as a single form to express all three functions. In other words, the bottom line of the Fig. 6 for RuR has to be either
Only one way is chosen, of course, namely ‘A1’ – using the Romani Instrumental for all three constructions. This is the form that becomes recognized as the pivot point, resulting in the empirical data that we have observed in examples above.

Some implications can be made in conjunction with this observation. The first one concerns the directionality from the point of view of functions; the question here is – what functions donate their form to what other functions. This is the type that Heine and Kuteva consider when stating their unidirectionality principle. Figure 7 summarizes this kind of directionality for constructions discussed in this paper.

Looking at Fig. 7, it is hard to argue for the unidirectionality of grammaticalization. It is hard to argue that the constructions on the left side are more lexical or less grammatical than the constructions on the right. As such, the data presented in this paper does not follow the grammaticalization path proposed by Heine and Kuteva. The constructions on the left, however, can be claimed to be less marked or more prototypical than the ones on the right.

There is also another kind of directionality that is apparent, from the point of view of forms; the question here is – within a certain function, what types of forms are being replaced with what other types of forms. Figure 8 summarizes this second kind of directionality, as it is found with the data in this paper.

As can be seen from Fig. 8, in the semantic map extensions discussed above, there is a strong tendency to change from less specialized contexts to more specialized contexts. With Time of Day Adverbs, the conservative Romani use of a lexical, analytical way of expression with Nominative (e.g. literally ‘in the day:nom’) is replaced with a synthetic, more grammatical and productive way of using the Instrumental (‘day-ins’). In many other instances of change.
presented above, the change is from less specialized grammatical cases (Nominative or Oblique/Accusative) to more specialized semantic cases (Dative, Instrumental, Locative). If we take a case hierarchy approach based on grammaticalization (Primus, 2011: 313, after Lehmann (1988)), which states that Nominative and Oblique are more grammaticalized in comparison to the semantic cases, the direction of the change in Ne Romani data seems to go against the grain of a grammaticalization path.

Another implication concerns the prototype theory (see Gast and van der Auwera, 2011 for review). The direction of change is from Instrument/Comitative construction to the Promotion of State construction; this implies that the Instrument/Comitative constructions are more prototypical of, or more central to, the category INSTRUMENTAL in the model language (Russian). As such, this observation can be used as empirical data for the multidimensional view on markedness, as applied to Romani by Elšík and Matras (2006); this views considers markedness as any sort of asymmetry. The fact that the Instrumental/Comitative construction is a better candidate for being a pivot point in semantic map replication makes it less marked than a Promotion of State construction – a weak candidate for a pivot point. This is yet another way in which language contact can be useful to the study of markedness in linguistic typology.

5 Conclusion

The type of analysis presented above serves several aims. I have demonstrated that the semantic maps approach is a convenient tool to both describe and visually represent the data on contact-induced language change in the absence of mat transfer. I also suggest that in addition to illustrative power, semantic maps have some explanatory potential, and argue that the semantic maps
themselves can be borrowed from one language to another. More generally, I demonstrate how a typological tool such as semantic maps can be used to an advantage in the study of language contact. I also suggest that the study of language contact can, in turn, be useful to the field of typology, providing empirical data for inquiries into prototypes and markedness. Finally, my data shows that the semantic map replication in the domain of case representation exhibits directionality. I believe that the tendencies exhibited by my data are not compatible with the analysis based on the unidirectionality of grammaticalization proposed by Heine & Kuteva (2012, p.163). Furthermore, my data does not readily yield itself to the analysis in terms of the four parameters of grammaticalization that are part of their model.

Naturally, the value of the approach employed in this paper is not limited to the domain of case representation. It can be used to describe and represent other contact-induced changes, for example in the domain of indefinite pronouns, distribution of prepositions, as well as in the domain of subordination and coordination. The semantic maps approach can also prove useful with other situations of language contact where no MAT transfer takes place, as well as in the fields of areal convergence, second language acquisition, and the study of heritage language.

List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LiR</td>
<td>Litowska Roma Romani dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LoR</td>
<td>Lotfitka Romani dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Northeastern Romani dialects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>Pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoR</td>
<td>Polska Roma Romani dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>Romani Morpho-syntax (database)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RuR</td>
<td>Russka Roma (Xaladytka) Romani dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Time-aspect-mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XaP</td>
<td>Polish Xaladytka Romani dialect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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