

The Theory of Illocutionary Acts as a Basis for the Description of the Syntax of Slovak Carpathian Romany

Anna Ráčová & Ján Horecký

This paper describes the syntactic structure of Slovak Carpathian Romany on the basis of the theory of illocutionary acts, i.e. acts by which something is uttered about reality and which carry the content (proposition) of the utterance as a basic communicative sign. Besides their form and content, illocutionary acts have special functions that reveal the intention of the speaker: the informational illocutionary act functions to provide information; the cogitative illocutionary act both introduces new illocutionary acts and expresses one's attitude toward them; the directive illocutionary act requires a reaction from the addressee; and the phatic illocutionary act performs the social function of involving others in the communication process. The ordering of illocutionary acts into larger thematic units result to illocutions.

1. Introduction

In Slovakia three varieties of the Romany language (Slovak, Hungarian and Vlach) exist. While these are primarily in oral communication, new social and political situations have arisen that often require Romany to be written. The written form is dominated by the Romany dialects spoken in the eastern part of Slovakia. They form the basis for the Romany-Czech and Czech-Romany pocket dictionary by Hübschmannová, et al. (1991) and for Šebková's textbook *Romaňi čhib* (1999). In addition, these dialects are mostly the ones most frequently used in the *Romano l'il nevo* newspaper as well as in the majority of Romany publications which have so far been published in Slovakia and in the Czech Republic. This variety of Romany is referred to in our research as *Slovak Carpathian Romany* (Ráčová - Horecký, 2000). The present paper outlines the basic results of our research into the syntax of Slovak Carpathian Romany, published in Ráčová – Horecký (2006).

2. The basis of description

We base our description on the theory of illocutionary acts, the foundations of which were established in Slovakia by Pauliny (1981) and developed further by Horecký (1996, 2001). Any illocutionary act is a discourse activity within which a speaker (the speaking subject) observes objective reality, focuses on a certain object, identifies it, refers to it by appropriate means of expression and specifies its (real or intended) features. An illocutionary act, then, involves a multilevel, gradual extension:

- (1) boy writes
(the boy) writes his homework
(the boy) writes his homework at the table

Predication co-occurs with inference, observation and the expression of the relationships between observations. While predication represents illocutionary acts and their organisation, inference produces series of illocutionary acts (of the same type), the illocutions. A sequence of illocutionary acts represents a continuous illocution.

3. General structure of illocutionary acts

The basic, general structure of an illocutionary act encompasses the nominative, the predicative and the circumstantial components.

3.1 Nominative component

The nominative component of the illocutionary act includes nominators, i.e., the names of objects, actions and relationships about which the utterance is made.

3.1.1 Denotation of objects

3.1.1.1 The denotation of an object can be expressed by a substantive, a pronoun or a numeral. If the nominator is expressed by a substantive, it can either be a concrete or abstract. Concrete nominators, of course, designate tangible, observable persons (*dad* ‘father’, *Margita*) or places/things (*kher* ‘house’, *kham* ‘sun’). Abstract nominators designate notions, ideas, or feelings that are less subject to sensory perception (*pharipen* ‘difficulty’, *chol'i* ‘anger’). In a familiar context, the nominator can be expressed by a pronoun, or it is not expressed at all:

- (2) a. *Ta ov mange sikhavel o drom, khatar te džal.*
‘So he is showing me the way to go’
b. *Avle andro ešebno gav.*
‘They came to the first village’

3.1.1.2 The nominator can be expressed by one word (*bar* ‘garden’) or by a more complex locution. A complex nominator can be expressed by a substantive with an attributive (*Europakri unija* ‘European union’), by two substantives joined by the conjunction *the* ‘and’ (*dad the daj* ‘father and mother/parents’), or by two substantives, the second substantive being connected with the first one by an instrumental case form (*e Kal'i le Šivaha* ‘Kali with Shiva’). In the first two locutions the syntagma is understood as an inseparable unit. This is not true for the final locution.

3.1.1.3 The nominator can be expressed by a domestic word (*čhavo* ‘boy’, *gurumñi* ‘cow’), by a borrowed word (*škola* ‘school’) or by a neologism (*sikhad'i* ‘school’).

3.1.1.4 The nominator can be modified by an adjective (*bari vika* ‘big cry’), a possessive pronoun (*tumari bibacht* ‘your unhappiness’), a demonstrative pronoun (*kola lolokici* ‘these flowers’), a possessive adjective (*le papuskere phrala* ‘grandfather’s brothers’), a numeral (*jekh raklo* ‘one boy’), a substantive in the instrumental case (*kalapa pavurenca* ‘hat with peacock feather’), a particle (*ča e Kal'i* ‘only Kali’), or by another coordinated name in apposition (*o Šivis, lakero rom, džanelas* ‘Shiva, her husband, knew’).

3.1.1.5 When the illocutionary intent of speaker demands, the nominator is often multiply extended, most often (but not obligatorily) gradually, in the leftward direction: *kher* ‘house’, *nevo kher* ‘new house’, *šukar nevo kher* ‘nice new house’, *dadeskero šukar nevo kher* ‘nice new father’s house’. The specifying components agree with the head in gender, number and case.

3.1.2 Denotation of processes

The nominative component of the illocutionary act may also include the denotation of processes when expressed by the so-called de-agentive verb found, for example in the use of the verb *del* + the accusative of the particular substantive (*del brišind* ‘it is raining’). A similar structure involves the use of a causative verb (*zaraťol* ‘to get dark’).

3.1.3 Denotation of relationships

The nominative component can also denote relationships of ownership and affiliation. Romany does not have the verb *to have* by which real ownership of or affiliation to some object could be expressed. That is why ownership is expressed by a construction with the verb ‘to be’ in collocation, not with the expected nominative case, but with either the accusative case (*man* /Acc/ *hin* /is/ *graj* /N/ ‘I have a horse’), the dative case (*hin* /is/ *lake* /D/ *tranda berša* /N/ ‘he is thirty years old’), or the locative case (*mande* /L/ *nane* /is not/ *love* /N/ ‘I do not have any money’). Various shades of possessive relationships and affiliation are expressed by the form with the affix *-ker/-ger* (*chulaskero veš* ‘farmer’s forest’, *Romengeri phuv* ‘country of the Romanies’, *čiriklengere pora* ‘birds’ feathers’, *khereskeri blaka* ‘window of a shack’). Some linguists consider this form as the genitive of a substantive, others as a possessive adjective (Ráčová 2004). The possessive form is in concord with the substantive head in gender, number and case.

3.2 Predicative component

Within the predicative component of the illocutionary act, the denoted object is specified for activity and characteristics. The basis of the predicative component is formed by the autosemantic verb (e.g., *to sing*) which can then be extended by auxiliary verbs (e.g., *to start singing*, *to stop singing*).

3.2.1 The verb itself specifies the categories of person, number, time, manner and course of the verbal action (repetition, direction, location).

3.2.1.1 The grammatical categories of person and number are determined by the selection of the nominator which is in concord with the verbal person and number (*o Rom kerel buti* ‘the Romany works’, *o Roma keren buti* ‘the Romanies work’).

3.2.1.2 The system of verbal tenses (present, imperfect, perfect and future) identifies the time and space of a denoted event with reference to the point of utterance.

The present tense expresses either the action which takes place at the time of utterance (*Al'e so tu adej keres korkori, Betko?* ‘But what are you doing here alone, Betko?’) or an action that usually, repeatedly takes place (*Akana phirel pre univerzita sa externo studentka* ‘Now she attends the university as an external student’).

The action that precedes the moment of speech is expressed by the imperfect tense (*Džalas paš o graj, o čhaja džanas pro verdan* ‘He went beside the horse, the daughters went in the wagon’).

An action finished in the past is expressed by the perfect tense. (*E Kali phučľa sar pes ko paňi dochudne* ‘Kali asked how they had come to the water’).

An action that will take place after the moment of speech is formed by the future tense (*Dureder kerela peskeri but'i* 'He will go on doing his work').

A combination of tenses is also possible. The main criterion is the relationship to the time of speech and the completion of the process.

3.2.1.3 All of the above-mentioned tenses are used for temporal specification of either an action or an existing state. If it is necessary to express the course of action or state which does not exist in reality, or which is only supposed or conditioned, it is expressed by conditional mood, either present or past, which, however, does not express the relationship to the moment of speech (*džavas bi* 'I would go', *so kerd'as*, *te ul'il'as* 'what would you do if you were born').

3.2.1.4 A verb denoting a process reflects also various modifications of the course of verbal action. To denote a repetitive process, or a process taking various directions, iterative verbs are used. The feature of repetition in Slovak Carpathian Romany is most often expressed by infixes: *-ker-* (*kerkerel* 'to be in the habit of doing'), *-av-* (*čhivavel* 'to keep throwing'), or both *-av-* and *-ker-* (*demavkerel* 'to keep fixing with nails'). Variants of meaning deriving from the iterative process involve either modification a current, repetitive action taking place at the moment of speech (*chutkerel* 'to keep jumping up and down') or a permanent or usual action (*sikh'uvkerav* 'I teach/all the time').

3.2.1.5 If it is necessary to express that either the subject or the object of the locution should become what is denoted by the basic adjective, participle or substantive, the process is denoted by a verb with the infix *-ar-* when 'becoming' is directed at the semantic patient (*barva'arel* 'to make rich'), but with the suffix *-ol* when directed at the semantic agent (*barva'ol* 'to become rich'). Adding the reflexive particle *pes* alters the direction of a causative verb with the infix *-ar-* from patient to agent (*sas'arel* 'to treat [someone] medically' becoming *sas'arel pes* 'to treat oneself medically').

3.2.1.6 Slovak Carpathian Romany also makes it possible to express a speaker's intention as to whether a process is completed or is just beginning. This can involve either phrasal verbs in connection with autosemantic verbs in the infinitive (*chudel te gil'avel*, *del te gil'avel* 'to start singing', *preačhel te gil'avel* 'to stop singing'), by phrasal verbs (*chal opre* 'to finish eating'), and very often by the Slovak prefix *do-* (*dochal* 'to finish eating').

3.2.1.7 Spatial placement (localisation) of verbal action is expressed either by phrasal verbs or by a Slovak prefix. In the first instance, the verb *čhivel* 'to throw' can become *čhivel andre* 'to throw inside', *čhivel avri* 'to throw out', *čhivel thele* 'to throw down', etc. To show placement, Slovak prefixes as *pre-*, *z-*, and *do-* occur in verbal phrases such as *prechu'el* (Sl. *preskočit'*) 'to jump across', *zdenašel* (Sl. *zbehnúť sa*) 'to assemble', *dodžal* (Sl. *dôjst'*) 'to arrive'.

3.2.2 *The category of modality*

The predicative component of the illocutionary act can also express the necessity, possibility or intentionality of carrying out the content of the predicate, hence the modality (Ráčová 2006).

3.2.2.1 Necessity is most often expressed by the borrowed modal verb *mušinel* ‘to have to’ (*me mušinav te džal* ‘I must go’). It can be expressed by the particle *musaj* which attaches either the finite form (*musaj te džan* ‘they must go’) or to the infinitive of an autosemantic verb (*musaj te džal* ‘they must go’). The grammatical categories of person, number and tense follow from the expressed structure itself when it involves a finite verb, but can also be expressed by a finite form of *jel/avel* ‘to be’ inserted between the particle *musaj* and the autosemantic verb in the infinitive form: *musaj som te džal* ‘I must go’. Additionally, necessity may be expressed by the modal verb *kampel* ‘it is necessary’ (*kampel te jel cicho* ‘it is necessary to stay silent’) as well as by the construction *si + te + a finite verb form* (*si te avas cicho* ‘we must stay silent’).

3.2.2.2 The basic means for expressing the modal category of possibility is the particle *šaj/našt’i* ‘can/cannot’ (*imar pes šaj/našt’i sikhavel* ‘he can/cannot learn again’). The possibility to carry out some activity can also be expressed in some other ways depending on the specification of the possibility (*can* in the sense of ‘to be allowed to’, ‘to be able to’, ‘to have the possibility to’, ‘to know’).

3.2.2.3 The modal category of intentionality (‘to want’) may be expressed by various means depending on its connotative specifications. For example, both *to want* ‘have an intention’ and *to wish* ‘to hope’ are expressed with the verb *kamel* (*O Fijalis kamelas te del le gras pro šlubrikos* ‘Fiala wanted to get the horse to a slaughterhouse’). On the other hand, *to want* in the sense of ‘to ask/desire’ may be expressed by the verb *mangel* (*So mangen te chal?* ‘What do you want to eat?’).

3.2.2.4 When expressing necessity and possibility, the nominator usually carries out the action expressed by the autosemantic verb in the locution and, at the same time, (s)he is the bearer of modal disposition, as expressed by the modal verb, for carrying it out (*Dežo mušinel te džal* ‘Dežo must go’; *Dežo šaj džal* ‘Dežo can go’). Intentionality (‘to want’) also includes instances when the subject carrying out the activity expressed by a particular verbal form is not identical with the bearer of modal disposition. This applies to various meaning shades of wish and desire. In these situations, the subject of the modal activity is designated by the conjunction *kaj* and the subject of the autosemantic verbal activity by the particle (*O Del* [carrier of modal disposition] *kamel* [wishes] *kaj te amen* [subjects carrying out the activity of the autosemantic verb] *te šingitinas avre manušenge* ‘God also wants us to help the others’).

3.2.3 Intention of verbal process

Expressed in the predicative component of the illocutionary act is also the intention of the verbal action, i.e. direction, the course of the verbal action from the agent to the patient (progressive intention) or from the agent back to the agent (regressive intention).

3.2.3.1 In this sense the intention finds its expression in the whole system of cases (the cases of affecting): the accusative (*kerel o luluđa* ‘to create flowers’, *phuterel o vudar* ‘open the door’, *gil’avel gil’a* ‘to sing songs’, *bikenel la gurunňa* ‘to sell the cow’, *marel le medved’is* ‘to beat the bear’); dative (*pal’ikerav tumenge* ‘thank you’, *phenel le rakleske* ‘to say to the boy’, *ačhel rikoňake* ‘to become a dog’); instrumental (*kerel manušenca* ‘to do with people’, *tradel le grenca* ‘to rush with horses’); ablative (*ačhel ola skalatar* ‘to become from this rock’,

chudel Kal'atar 'to bring from Kali', *phučel romňastar* 'to ask the wife', *ňiko le Romendar* 'none of the Romanyes'); locative (*džal romeste* 'to marry').

However, in the case system of the predicative component, there are also circumstantial cases (ablative, instrumental, locative, accusative, dative): ablative (*šerostar dži o pindre* 'from head to toe', *likerel pes vastendar* 'to hold by hands', *morel le ratestar* 'to wash off the blood', *merel bokhatar* 'to die of hunger', *dodžal Terňatar* 'to come from Terna'); instrumental (*rovibnaha* 'crying', *gulone hangoha* 'by a sweet voice', *demel piraha* 'to slog by a pot', *džal le dromeha* 'to go by the road', *lunge beršenca* 'for long years'); locative (*merel bokhate* 'to die of hunger', *duraleste* 'in the distance', *kurkeste* 'on Sunday'); accusative (*aver d'ives* 'the other day'); dative (*cinel lovenge* 'to buy with money', *svetos svetoske* 'for worlds', *jekh d'iveske* 'one day').

3.2.3.2 If the result of an action returns to the nominator, i.e., the object affected by the action becomes its subject, we speak about reflexive affectedness. It is most often expressed either by a verb with the reflexive particle *pes/pen* (*moralel pes* 'to wash oneself') or by a verb with the suffix *-ol* (*sikh'ol* 'to learn').

3.2.3.3 In addition to their reflexive affectedness, reflexive verbs can express some other relations, e.g., mutual or reciprocal affectedness (*arakh'am pes* 'we have met', *kamavenas pen* 'they loved each other') or the generalisation of action (*E Kal'i gel'a dži pre koda than kaj pes livinkereLas* 'Kali has gone as far as the place where the shooting took place').

3.2.4 Adverbial complements

For an illocutionary act to be successful in carrying out main, communicative function, the verb in the predicative component often needs to be semantically specified or supplemented. Here an important role is played by adverbial complements that specify the manner of the course of action, its quality, its degree, its means or the tool by which it was carried out, its cause, its purpose, etc. The adverbial complement of manner, for instance, can be expressed with the help of an adverb (*mišto* 'good'), by a prepositionless expression (*pariphnaha* '[with] pride', *angušteha* '[with] a finger'), by a prepositional expression (*andre dar* 'from fear'), by a comparison (*ačhel sar bar* 'to be like a stone') and by a predication (*Škiparaña obdikhelas les gres sar te na dopad'and'ilahas peskere jakhenge* 'Shkiparanja was looking at the horse as if she could not believe her own eyes').

3.3 Circumstantial component

Of importance for the functioning of illocutionary acts is their incorporation into the overall situation. The means for this incorporation are two situational complements in the circumstantial component of the illocutionary act: place and time.

3.3.1 The placement of the illocutionary act in space can be expressed by an adverb (*anglal* 'in front', *avri* 'out of'), by a non-prepositional case (by the locative in answering the questions *where at?*, *where to?*: *Prahate* 'in Prague, to Prague'; by the ablative answering the question *where from?*: *Prahatar* 'from Prague'; by the instrumental answering the question *which way?*: *dromeha* 'by the road'), by a prepositional case (*angle khangeri* 'in front of the church', *ko pañi* 'to the water') and by a predication (*džaha, kaj amen o Del ledžala* 'we shall go wherever God leads us'). This placement can be either static ('where at') or dynamic

(‘where to, where from, which way, how far’). When distinguishing the static and the dynamic situational complements of place, the key role is usually played by the context and the lexical meaning of the verb.

3.3.2 The placement of the illocution in time (in time and space, at a point in time) can also be static and dynamic. In various ways (by an adverb, a prepositional case and a non-prepositional case and by predication attached to the first illocution by an adverb of time), Slovak Carpathian Romany speakers can express (a) a point in time (*takoj* ‘immediately’, *prekal o kurko* ‘during the week’, *jekha oraha* ‘in an hour’, *štar orendar* ‘at four’, *kurkeste* ‘on Sunday’), (b) a period of time (*trin d’ives* ‘three days’), or (c) frequency of occurrence (*sako d’ives* ‘every day’).

3.3.3 Additional delimitation of circumstances can be achieved by connecting modifiers that show special illocutionary constraints on an act to the main locution by means of various conjunctions. These conjunctions may be copulative (*E Monika thod’a tele o probi u lakero dad sas nechbachtaleder Rom pro svetos* ‘Monika passed the exam and her father was the happiest Rom in the world’), gradational (*But sikh’lom – na ča pal o čhib, the but pal o manuša* ‘I have learnt a lot – not only about the language but also about people’), adversative (*Oj sas andro gav jekhbarvaleder gadži, al’e bari izdrad’i sas* ‘She was the richest gaji in the village, but she was very miserly’), causative (*Na džala lokes bo sar džanes...* ‘It will not be easy, because as you know...’), conditional (*Te tuke kole čhavores mukeha, ta tut imar na kamav te dikhel pro jakha!* ‘If you leave the child, I do not want to see you any more!’), etc.

4. Content, form and function of the illocutionary act

4.1 Often the content of the illocutionary act is information – maintained or transferred, received or sent. Information concerning events is processed within narrative illocutionary acts. Information concerning objects is processed by descriptive illocutionary acts. Information concerning the relationships between objects and events is presented within explicatory illocutionary acts. While the intention and structure of these acts may differ, all types of informational illocutionary acts have a shared characteristic they do not require any action on the part of the receiver. However, reaction to the content and subsequent action by the receiver is the intention of directive illocutionary acts, since they transfer to the addressee a command, a request, or a proposal for carrying out some activity. The receiver is denoted by a phatic illocutionary act – by an address.

4.2 The basic form of informational illocutionary acts has three components: the nominator, the predicator, and the situational complement. Directive illocutionary acts – direct commands expressed grammatically, i. e., by the imperative, have only the predicative component extended by the addressee (by a phatic illocutionary act). Cogitative illocutionary acts have two components. In the first one, the nominator is expressed grammatically by a human substantive/pronoun; in the second, the predicate involves a verb + a conjunction + the main illocutionary act, which may remain unexpressed: *Me džanav kaj jov musaj te šunel./Me džanav oda* ‘I know that he must obey/ I know that’.

4.3 The function of the informational illocutionary act is to provide information, the function of the cogitative illocutionary act is to introduce new illocutionary acts and express ones attitude toward them, the function of the directive illocutionary act is to require the action/reaction of the addressee.

5. An analysis of some illocutionary acts

5.1 Cogitative illocutionary acts

5.1.1 Cogitative illocutionary acts are very closely connected with the discursive activity of human beings, they constitute a most distinct expression of verbalisation, and a linguistic representation of both the state and activity of the mind of the speaker. In contrast to other illocutionary acts they are composed of two members. In the first component the state or the activity of the mind is expressed; in the second, the content-providing illocutionary act which constitutes the basis for the first component:

- (3) *O Roma na džanenas, savo dživipen len užaren*
 N + P conjunction CONTENT
 The Roma did not know what life was ahead of them

The basic structure of cogitative illocutionary acts allows for them to be used for mediating knowledge everywhere the receiver does not have the possibility of perceiving the transferred information directly, i.e. immediately.

5.1.2 According to their content or the subject of verbalisation cogitative illocutionary acts can be divided into four classes. First, they can express the speaker's state of mind (*džanel kaj* 'to know that', *prindžarel so* 'to know what', *šunel sar* 'to have the feeling as if', *pa'al hoj* 'to believe that'), the activity of the mind (*bisterel so* 'to forget what', *gondolinel kaj* 'to think that'), the receiving/processing of information (*džanel hoj* 'to realise that', *dikhel sar* 'to see how', *šunel hoj* 'to hear that') and the provision of information (*vakarel kaj* 'to say that', *phenel sar* 'to say how'). The second member of the cogitative illocutionary act is joined to the first member (N + P) by a conjunction which indicates its character.

5.1.3 A special type of cogitative illocutionary act is represented by a conditional illocutionary act. Such an act verbalises the inferential activity of the mind which is directed at a specific activity, the results of which have not been carried out yet. The first member of the illocutionary act expresses a not yet carried out activity, while the second states the circumstance, i.e. the condition, of carrying out this activity. The ordering of the first and the second member is often reversed. The real condition is expressed with the help of the conjunction *te* which is most often connected with a verb either in the present indicative or in the future tense (*Te man chaha, furt ačhoha ajso dzaralo* 'If you gobble me up, you will always remain so furry'). More rarely the real condition of carrying out a certain activity is expressed with the help of the present conditional which is sometimes connected through the use of the conjunction *te* in combination with the particle *bi* (*...te bi avehas ajso lačho... ta tajsja džava* 'if you were so good/kind... so I will go tomorrow...').

Unreal (hypothetical) circumstance, i.e. condition under which the activity expressed in the first member of the conditional illocutionary act could be carried out, is expressed with the help of the perfect conditional. The verb in the second member of the illocutionary act can sometimes be either in the form of the present or of the imperfect of the indicative (*Na bašavel/bašavelas pal noti, bo pes šund'ahas sar naprogramimen kompjutros* 'He does not/did not play by the notes because [if he did] he would feel as a programmed computer'). It is also possible to have both members in the form of perfect conditional. In this situation, the verb in the structure expressing the condition for the realisation of the activity is connected with the conjunction *te* and the verb in the second element with the particle *bi* (*E Fel'a te džan'ahas... može bi leske nič na phend'ahas* 'If Fela had known... maybe she would not have told him anything'). Between the two members of the conditional illocutionary act there can be temporal relatedness which is indicated by using the temporal conjunctions *sar* or *kana* in temporal meaning. (*Sar na preačheha te gravčinel, ta tut figinava pro tragaris!* 'If you do not stop yelling I will hang you on the ceiling!')

5.2 Directive illocutionary acts

5.2.1 A directive illocutionary act requires the reaction of the receiver to its contents either physically or verbally. A directive illocutionary act above all gives a command (prohibits); however, directives also express directionality, the orientation of the process or activity. As a result, the addressee, not the nominator, is usually expressed in the directive. The addressee can be expressed explicitly by a direct term of address (in the vocative case – here a certain merging with the phatic illocutionary act occurs by incorporating the addressee into the discourse) or by a pronoun. However, very often the existence of the addressee can be inferred from the context.

The content of the directive illocutionary act can be expressed as a command, order, request, wish or plea, and even as an instruction or piece of advice. The given types of the directive illocutionary act express both the varying extent to which the speaker and the addressee are involved in the realisation of the content of the illocutionary act and the degree to which the above is categorical, indispensable or crucial. The varying shades of the categoricity of directive illocutionary acts are reflected in their form.

5.2.2 The command or order is most often expressed implicitly – grammatically – by the imperative, but the degree of cruciality can be modified by particles. The command can be intensified with the help of the particles *ča*, *no*, *no ta*, *av*, *se*, *šaj* placed in front of the imperative or can be lessened with the help of the particles *ča*, *arde* placed after the imperative. Modification can also be achieved lexically, as in *mangav tumen, na bisteren* 'please, do not forget'.

5.2.3 More rarely the directive illocutionary act is shaped explicitly, with the help of performatives (I am ordering you to). Slovak Carpathian Romany has only a narrow scale of performatives to express orders (*paračolinel* 'to keep commanding'), and even those that can be found are usually borrowed from Slovak (*prikazinel* 'to order', *rozkazinel* 'to command'), or at least modified by a Slovak prefix (*zaphenel* 'to prohibit'). Moreover, the degree of cruciality expressed by a performative can be determined only from the communicative context: e.g. *mangel* can mean both 'to request' and 'to plead'.

5.2.4 The orientation of the directive illocutionary act can also include the author (*avas džas* ‘let us go’) or even be aimed at a third person where directionality is expressed with the help of the particles *mi*, *kaj* or *te* ‘may he/they’, etc., in conjunction with a verb in the 3rd person present (*mi dikhen [o Roma]* ‘may the Roma see’, *te na domukhel* ‘may he not allow’). If an order, direction, request or plea is referred to, the content of the directive act is expressed by another illocutionary act attached by the conjunction *kaj te*, *kaj mi*, *te*, or by the particle *mi*:

O Del phend'a le Noemoske kaj te ačhavel bari šifa ‘The God said Noe to build a large ship’,
Mangavas les, kaj o košiben pal tu mi lel tele ‘I begged him may he takes the curse off you’,
Mangenas le Devles te šigitinel lenge ‘They asked the God to help them’, *Mangenas the jon vaš ma le Devles, mi del mange čhavores* ‘They also interceded for me with God may he give me a child’.

5.2.5 Along with the imperative and the performatives the directive illocutionary act can be formulated also by diverse other means often dependent on context or communicative situation to reveal their status as directives.

5.2.5.1 One class of these less obvious directives involves the use of either the modal verb *mušinel* ‘must’ or the modal particles *šaj/našti* ‘can/cannot’. In certain communicative situations they can be interpreted as an order: *Kalo mušinel te kerel but'i* can be interpreted not only as an announcement of obligation ‘Kalo needs to work’, but also as an order (‘may Kalo work’, ‘I want/I request him to work’). Similarly, the interrogative sentence *Šaj sikhaves odi chmara?* ‘Can you show that cloud?’ can be interpreted not only as a question, but also as a mild form of order.

5.2.5.2 A specific case of the directive illocutionary act is represented by instructions and pieces of advice, e.g. recipes formulated in the 1st person plural of the present: *O kompira randas tele, čhingeras puro hranolky a pekas len avri* ‘We peel the potatoes, cut to chips and fry’.

5.2.5.3 In some communicative situations an illocution formulated as an indicative sentence in the present tense or the future tense, or as a condition, can be considered as a command: *U pal'is, sar aveha andal e chañig avri, mukeha e brad'i a phereha o pañi, al'e jekšeber čhoraveha (pokropineha) man, bo oda ela džido pañi* ‘And then, when you get out of the well, you will drop the bucket /into it/ and fetch water, but first you will sprinkle me, because it is the live water’, *Te na aveha čit, džaha pro pindre!* ‘If you are not silent (be silent, otherwise), you will go on foot!’

5.2.5.4 A specific directive illocutionary act is represented by a question. When a speaker turns to an addressee with a question, he/she expects a reaction from the other. Whether the addressee will consider the illocution as requiring a verbal or physical reaction depends on the communicative situation and the semantics of the utterance. The directive may elicit information which the speaker is unfamiliar with, as in a request for the time (Do you have the time?), or it may require a more physical reaction, as in a request to have a window shut (Could you shut the window?) Some questions may elicit either or both types of response. If a speaker asked *Avaha adaj dži rañi?* ‘Shall we be here until the night?’, the addressees Yes/No response or his/her doing something so that they do not stay until the night would both be appropriate responses. In the case of the so-called rhetorical question the speaker

expects from the addressee a verbal reaction, an approval or denial of his/her question. The positively and the negatively oriented questions are not equivalent. When expecting a negative answer the speaker formulates the question positively and vice versa: *So sam? Vandraka?* ‘What are we? Vagabonds?’ (= we are not vagabonds). *Na dikhes, hoj oda gurumňa?* ‘Don’t you see that it is a cow?’ (= I can see).

5.3 Phatic illocutionary acts

The basic function of a phatic illocutionary act is to include into the communication (into a concrete discourse) the persons carrying out some activity, to denote them and ascribe a function to them. The persons functioning in phatic illocutionary acts are most often denoted by personal names (*Mižu, Margit*) or by appellatives (*phrala* ‘brothers’, *pheňa* ‘sisters’) and preserve certain semantic and grammatical characteristics, above all humanity, grammatical gender and number. They can also be denoted by figurative names (*mro jiloro* ‘sweetheart’; literally: my little heart). For including them into the discourse a special grammatical form, the vocative, is normally used, although the nominative can be used in place of the vocative when addressing.

The phatic illocutionary act by which the speaker includes another/others into the communication can take the form of an announcement, exclamation or question.

6. Types of illocutions

Within linguistic communication, the ordering of illocutionary acts into larger thematic units result in illocutions. These are descriptions, narrations, explanations and accounts. The cogitative and directive illocutionary acts usually do not create independent illocutions, but are incorporated into other illocutions.

By reasonable ordering of illocutionary acts people formulate illocutions about the state of their linguistic consciousness and its activity. Nevertheless, even illocutions cannot by themselves represent the linguistic conscience. That is why within discursive activity people formulate more complex units from them. These complex units are denoted as texts. However, their more detailed analysis does not constitute an object of syntax but of stylistics and rhetoric.

Analyzed Romany texts

BÁRSONY, Michal. *Romano nevo ľil*. 2003, Vol. XIII, pp. 587–9; 10.

DEMETEROVÁ, Helena. *Rom ke Romeste drom arakhel. Rom k Romovi cestu najde. Paramisa the sune. Povídky a sny*. Praha: ROMAŇI ČHIB, 1994.

DUDI-KOŤO, Ladislav. *Romano džaniben*. 2002, No. 1-2, pp. 13-25

FABIANOVÁ, Tera, HÜBSCHMANNOVÁ, Milena. *Čavargoš – Tulák. Romaňi paramisi – Romská pohádka*. Praha: Apeiron, 1991.

- FABIANOVÁ, Tera. *Sar me phiravas andre škola. Jak jsem chodila do školy*. Nakladatelství a vydavatelství ÚDO České Budějovice ve spolupráci se Společenstvím Romů na Moravě, 1992.
- FEJCZO, Eugen. *Romano nevo lil*. 2003, Vol. XIII, pp. 587-9; 11.
- FERKOVÁ, Ilona. *Čorde čhave. Ukradené děti*. Společenství Romů na Moravě, no date.
- GIŇA, Andrej. *Bijav*. Praha: Apeiron 1991.
- GIŇA, Andrej. *Pal o Dilino. Romano džaniben*. 1999., No. 3-4, pp. 112-118.
- GODLA, František. *Te na phiras andro Štrasburgos pre nisoste. Romano nevo lil*. 2003, Vol. XIII, pp. 594-596, p 6.
- GODLOVÁ, Erika. *Ul'om sar Romaňi o kada hin mire dživipnaskro drom, Romano nevo lil*. 2003, Vol. XIII, pp 591-593; 11; 16.
- HORVÁTOVÁ, Agnesa. *Pal e bari Roma. Romano džaniben*. 2002, No. 1-2, pp. 88-98.
- HÜBSCHMANNOVÁ, Milena, ŠEBKOVÁ, Hana, ŽIGOVÁ, Anna. *Romsko-český a česko-romský kapesní slovník*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství 1991.
- HÜBSCHMANNOVÁ, Milena (ed.). *God'aver lava phure Romendar. Moudrá slova starých Romů*. Praha: Apeiron, 1991.
- KOVÁČ, Milan, MANN, Arne B. (eds.). *Boh všetko vidí. O Del sa dikhel. Duchovný svet Rómov na Slovensku. Romano paťaviben pre Slovensko*. Bratislava: Chronos Publishing, 2003.
- KUDLIČKOVÁ, Lýdia (ed.). *Romaňi tav'ard'i. Rómska kuchárka*. Bratislava: Minority Rights Group Slovakia, 1997.
- LACKOVÁ, Elena. *Rómske rozprávky. Romane paramisa*. Košice Východoslovenské vydavateľstvo, 1992.
- REIZNEROVÁ, Margita. *Kal'i. Paramisa*. Praha: Romaňi Čhib, no data.
- RUSENKO, Arnošt. *Trin pheňa. Tri sestry. Paramisa*. Praha: Romaňi Chin, 1994.
- SLEPČÍK, Jan. *Lavutaris anel maškar o nipi paťiv*. In *Romano džaniben*. 1997, No. 3-4, pp. 48-51.
- ŠAMKO, Michal. *Košiben. Prokletí*. In *Romano džaniben*, 2002, No. 1-2, pp. 71-86.
- ŠEBKOVÁ, Hana. *Romaňi čhib. Učebnice slovenské romštiny*. Praha: Fortuna, 1999.
- TARAGOŠ-LOJZA, Ladislav. *O Bašaviben – miro dživipen (kotorá le lavutariskera biografiatar)*. In *Romano džaniben*. 1997, Vol. IV, No. 3-4, p. 66.
- TAYLOR, Kenneth N. *Miri jekhto Biblija andro obrazki. Moja prvá Biblia v obrázkoch vo východoslovenskej rómčine*. Bratislava. 1994.

References

HORECKÝ, Ján. 1996. The Content and Form of the Illocutionary Acts. In *Discourse and meaning. Papers in Honour of Eva Hajičová*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin, pp. 31-38.

HORECKÝ, Ján. 2001. Obsah a forma výpovedných aktov. In *Človek a jeho jazyk 2. Jazyk ako pamäť kultúry*. Bratislava: Veda, pp. 79-85.

HÜBSCHMANNOVÁ, Milena, ŠEBKOVÁ, Hana, ŽIGOVÁ, Anna. 1991. *Romsko-český a česko-romský kapesní slovník*. Praha: SPN.

KAMIŠ, Karel. 1999. *Čeština a romština v českých zemích. Překonávání komunikačních bariér v multietnické společnosti*. Acta Universitatis Purkynianae 41, Studia linguistica VI. Ústí nad Labem.

KOSTIC, Svetislav. 1994. Participium necessitatis (participium futuri passivi) neboli gerundivum v hindštině a výrazy nutnosti v romštině. In *Romano džaniben*, No. 3, pp. 35-40.

LÍPA, Jiří. 1963. *Průručka cikánštiny*. Praha: SPN.

PAULINY, Eugen. 1981. *Slovenská gramatika. Opis jazykového systému*. Bratislava, SPN.

RÁCOVÁ, Anna, HORECKÝ, Ján. 2000. *Slovenská karpatská rómčina. Opis systému*. Bratislava: VEDA.

RÁCOVÁ, Anna, HORECKÝ, Ján. 2005. The Directive Illocutionary Act in the Slovak Carpathian Romany. In *Asian and African Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 74-82.

RÁCOVÁ, Anna, HORECKÝ, Ján. 2006. *Syntax slovenskej karpatskej rómčiny*. Bratislava: Iris.

RÁCOVÁ, Anna. 2004. On the Possessive Form with the Affix -ker- in Romany. In *Asian and African Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 104-113.

RÁCOVÁ, Anna. 2006. The Category of Modality in Slovak Carpathian Romany. In *Asian and African Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 73-79.

ŠEBKOVÁ, Hana, ŽLNAYOVÁ, Edita. 1999. *Romaňi čhib. Učebnice slovenské romštiny*. Praha: Fortuna.

Anna Rácová
Slovenská akadémia vied
Klemensova 19
813 64 Bratislava
Slovakia

Ján Horecký
Mariánska 15
900 31 Stupava
Slovakia

e-mail: kaorraco@savba.sk